OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

---

2 GEORGE V., 1911-12

VOL. CIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, INCLUSIVE.



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1911-12

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 26, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

APPOINTMENT OF TRANSLATOR.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons for the appointment of Mr. Charles E. Duckett to the position of translator on the permanent translation staff of the House of Commons, laid on the table of the House with other papers on the subject on the 23rd of January, 1912, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THE WEDNESDAY SITTINGS.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That on Wednesday the 31st of January, and all subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the session, the House will meet at three o'clock p.m., and that the sitting on such days shall in every respect be under the same rules provided for other days, and that on said Wednesdays government orders will have precedence immediately after notices of motions for production of papers.

He said: The usual practice has been to give Government Orders precedence immediately after Questions. Last year I suggested to my right hon. friend that it might be better to permit Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers to have precedence, and I thought it well to follow the same practice this year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not disposed to object to this motion, but it has been represented to me that private members should be given another opportunity to be heard on the motions coming under Public Bills and Orders. Therefore I would suggest to my right hon. friend that the motion be made to take effect, not next Wednesday, but the Wednesday following, that is, the 7th of February.

Mr. BORDEN. If my hon. friend is urgent, I would be glad to accept his suggestion; but at the same time he knows as well as I do that there is not a motion on the order paper that has not been called already six or eight times. Under the circumstances, unless my right hon. friend is urgent, I would prefer to hasten our work as much as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I agree with my right hon. friend that every opportunity has been given to every member to be heard; but for some reason or other, they have not been heard, and therefore I would ask him to have the motion take effect on the 7th of February. May I ask my right hon. friend if he is prepared to say to-day what new legislation we may expect during this session, or have we about all the programme of the government, with the exception of the supplementary estimates and the measure regarding the extension of the Manitoba boundaries?

Mr. BORDEN. I am not prepared to-day to give my right hon. friend the information in that regard, but I think it probable that before the completion of next week I shall be in a position to do so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. May I ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce if he will take up the Grain Bill on Tuesday?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Motion, amended by striking out 'the 31st day of January' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the 7th day of February,' agreed to.

THE GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. DEVLIN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to call the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister and the Postmaster General to a report which appears in the Ottawa 'Citizen' purporting to contain statements made by the hon. the Postmaster General at a public meeting in Eganville in South Renfrew on the 25th instant, in which report the Postmaster General, referring to the new transportation policy of the government, is represented as indicating that the Georgian Bay canal will be built, that it was a part of the new government's programme. I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if he can give any information to the House as to when that article of the government's programme

will be brought before the House for consideration.

Mr. BORDEN. I have already informed the right hon. leader of the opposition that within a week from to-day we will give full information of the government's programme.

Mr. DEVLIN. May I ask the Prime Minister if the government have agreed on a policy in regard to the building of the Georgian Bay canal?

Mr. PELLETIER. I may inform my hon. friend that I did not open my mouth last night on the Georgian Bay canal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a very sad commentary on the ministerial press.

Mr. PELLETIER. They have been badly educated by the Grit press.

THE WRIT FOR SOUTH RENFREW.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see that the Postmaster General and the Minister of Agriculture have been enlightening the electors of South Renfrew; so I assume that the writ for South Renfrew has been issued.

Mr. BORDEN. My right hon. friend must not assume too much. As a matter of fact, I expect to take up that matter to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then I will renew my question on Monday.

SUPPLY—INTERCOLONIAL TRADE.

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

Mr. EMMERSON. As I notice that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat, I would like to call the attention of my right hon. friend the leader of the government to the matter of the payment of the balances due the census enumerators. I have a letter received to-day stating that the enumerators in the county of Westmorland have not yet received the balance due them.

Mr. BORDEN I am very glad that my hon. friend has brought the matter to my attention. It is apparently a departmental matter and consequently it is impossible for me to give any opinion, but I will take the earliest opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and I am sure he will attend to it at once. I agree in what my hon. friend has said about the desirability of having payments made at the earliest possible moment.

TRADE BETWEEN CANADA AND THE WEST INDIAN ISLANDS AND AUSTRALIA.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (St. John City). I desire to draw attention to some matters connected with the negotiations for the improvements of trade relations between Canada and the West Indian Islands and Australia. I do not propose to take up much time for the reason that so far as this side of the House is concerned, our belief in the desirability of improved trade relations between Canada and the British West Indies, as well as between Canada and Australia, is proved by documents which have been laid on the table and by the fact, which no doubt every hon. member knows, that in every reasonable way Canada has given encouragement for trade between herself and those countries. I would like, before proceeding with my remarks, to ask my hon, friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) if the steamship service between Canada and the West Indies remains in the same condition as that in which it was when the present government came into office? Shortly after the opening of the session I called the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that Messrs. Pickford & Black, the contractors for the West Indian service, had declined, during last year and while the late government was in office, to continue the service any longer under the then existing arrangement, and a temporary arrangement was made by the late Minister of Trade and Commerce which was exceedingly unsatisfactory to the business men of St. John who were doing business with the British West Indies. As the result of that temporary arrangement, the service to Halifax was to be one in every eleven days and to St. John one only in twenty-two days. The people of St. John have been for a number of years striving very earnestly to develop trade with the British West Indies, and have been fairly successful. It came to them, therefore, as a great disappointment when this reduction was announced so far as St. John was concerned. Representatives of the Board of Trade brought the matter to my notice and I took it up with the late Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he informed me he would take energetic measures to have the service improved and give satisfaction to the business men of St. John. But the calamity happened to the country on the 21st of September of the defeat of the late government, and the late Minister of Trade and Commerce was not able to pursue the matter any further. I would like to ask the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) if anything has been done?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). The matter remains exactly where it was left by the old minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is unfortunate that the whole of this winter shall be allowed to pass away without anything being done

towards improving the service. I regret that I cannot find in the estimates for the coming year any increase in the steamship subsidy to the West Indies, and I, therefore, suppose—and it will be with great reluctance—that we may take it for granted that there will be no improvement in the coming year.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). I do not think my hon. friend should take too much for granted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman hold out to me the hope that in the supplementary estimates, which I presume will appear a little later, there may be a vote for improvement in the service?

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). To a man so optimistic as my hon. friend it should be scarcely necessary to hold out any hope.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was optimistic when I had good ground for being so. If I had been Minister of Trade and Commerce during the past three months, I think I would have had an amount in the main estimates for the improvement of the service to the West Indies, and I think that before this, that service would have been improved. There are two ways of improving the trade conditions between Canada and other countries. There are two barriers to trade. One is the tariff. The other is no communication at all or inadequate or expensive communication; and the trade between Canada and the West Indies may be hampered by the nonimprovement of the service as well as by the tariff remaining as it is, and trade relations can be improved by giving a better steamship service as well as by a reduction of the tariff between the two countries. And I do think that my hon. friend, instead of giving attention simply to the one question of getting improved trade relations so far as the tariff between Canada and the West Indies is concerned, should have devoted his attention earnestly to the improvement of the steamship communication and if possible the reducing of the rates of freight. The commissioners appointed by the Canadian and British and by some of the West Indian governments as well to consider the question of improved trade relations and better steam communication made a very strong recommendation in favour of an improved steamship service. They recommended that there should be two services between Canada and the Windward Islands —one being a direct service from Halifax all the year round, and the other a service between Montreal and the West Indies but calling at St. John during the summer months, and a direct and exclusive service between St. John and the West Indies during the winter months. I had the opportunity of conferring with the representatives of the Board of Trade of St. John to whom was entrusted the matter of considering the West Indies service, and I had reason to believe that the people of St. John would be entirely satisfied with that. I believe also it will be satisfactory to the people of the province of Quebec, Ontario and the western provinces, because in summer we would have a steamship service starting at Montreal and calling at St. John and in the winter an exclusive and direct service to the port of St. John.

With the very excellent railway accommodation we have now between St. John and the west, it was felt that that service would be very satisfactory to the people of the upper provinces and of western Canada in both summer and winter. Of course, it will cost Canada something more than it is now paying in order to secure this important service. I understand the British government has not expressed its willingness to give the aid that was recommended by the Royal Commission; but it does seem to me that if the government is—as I am glad to believe it to be—desirous of improving the trade relations between Canada and the British West Indies and of enlarging the trade between the two countries, it should not allow $50,000 or even $100,000 to stand in the way of securing frequent, rapid and satisfactory steamship service. Therefore, I hope that when my hon. friend comes to consider what aid he will ask his colleague the Minister of Finance to provide in the supplementary estimates for steamship services, he will not forget to put in an additional amount in order to secure, at as early a day as possible, better communication between Canada and the West Indies. The country will, I am sure, approve of the expenditure, and I have no doubt that the results will justify such action on the part of the government.

I observe that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has laid on the table a report relating to this subject of trade between Canada and the West Indies. That report recites the appointment of the Royal Commission, reports the action which was taken by representatives of the late Canadian government, as well as representatives of the British government and the representatives of the several West Indian islands. In concluding the committee state the willingness of this government to meet the representatives of the several West Indian colonies, at the earliest convenient opportunity, if possible, during the month of March, 1912. That, I presume, will be for the purpose of endeavouring, if possible, to carry into effect the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners. I hope that the result will be, if not a reduction in

tariff between the two countries, at all events, an improvement of the means of communication; for, as I have said, improved communication will probably go as far in improving the trade between the two countries as a reduction in the tariff.

Now, I have observed, from the returns laid upon the table, that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) is following along the lines laid down by his predecessor in endeavouring to improve the trade relations between Canada and Australia. The returns show that ever since 1900, at all events, the late government has been continually urging, so far as properly could be urged, upon the consideration of the Australian government the desirability of making some preferential trade arrangement between the two countries. So far, their efforts have not been successful. I shall not take up the time of the House by reading the returns, but will very briefly state the nature of the last communication on this subject by the late government and will also read the latest communication from the present government. Mr. Ross represents the Canadian government in Australia. I find that on November 7, 1910—just ten years after the late government entered upon negotiations—the Department of Trade and Commerce communicated with Mr. Ross as follows:

> Instructed by Minister of Trade and Commerce direct you should inquire Australian government will they make any concession to the Canadian government if the duty is abolished on Australian mutton. Will they make any concession if duty is reduced 1½ cents? Instruction to observe that in either case such action would be opposed here.

And on February 9, 1910, Mr. Ross cabled:

> In reply to your telegram of the 7th, have had an interview with Minister of Customs. In their opinion, think it a better course to pursue to exchange present preferential tariff early next session parliament in June without reference to mutton. Better postpone more extended preferential arrangement owing to the political situation. Our private opinion Australian government will not commit themselves definitely on account of the elections in April.

On the 6th August, 1910, the leader of the opposition, then the leader of the government, cabled Premier Fisher at Melbourne:

> It has long been the wish of the Canadian government to have better trade relations with Australia. Ross, our agent, is authorized to negotiate, and I express hope that results satisfactory to both parties may be reached.

On the 8th August, 1910, Premier Fisher cabled the right hon. gentleman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as follows:

> In reply to your cable of the 7th, every effort will be made to facilitate the discussion of this matter with Ross, as I heartily reciprocate your wish that results satisfactory to our respective governments may be reached.

Nothing more was done during that year. We find that on the 16th December, 1910, Mr. Ross advised the department that there had been no further developments in reference to reciprocal trade between Canada and Australia, but stated that he understood it was the intention of the Prime Minister of Australia to discuss the matter with the Prime Minister of Canada when they met at the Colonial Conference in London in the May following. I am not aware whether there was any discussion at the Colonial Conference or not; but we know that no results were attained, for the return which brings the facts down to the 15th of the present month makes reference to the negotiations, but does not state that anything was accomplished. Then the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) takes the matter up, and on the 28th of December last writes the following letter to the Hon Mr. Tudor, Minister of Trade and Commerce for Australia. I think it would be well that the letter of my hon. friend should be placed on 'Hansard' as showing the action taken:

> Since 1898 our two countries have been endeavouring from to time to time to arrive at an agreement for better mutual trade relations but so far without success.
>
> In the meantime, Canada has admitted the British Colonies, including the West Indies as also the Dominions of South Africa and New Zealand, to the advantages of her British preferential reduction over non-preferred countries, and which amounts to about 30 per cent. of the duty. A return has been accorded by South Africa and New Zealand, and negotiations are now going on for preferential return from the West Indies, and with fair prospects of success.
>
> It seems to me too bad that with our great sister Dominion in the Pacific we have not been long since able to arrange our trade on a preferential basis, and I can assure you that Canada is very desirous both on sentimental grounds and for reasons of mutual advantage, that this anomaly shall be removed as speedily as possible.
>
> We give you already a considerable free list for some of your staple products, although we got no very great return from you in that respect for any of our great staples. We stand ready to give you a substantial preference upon all articles of export in return for a substantial preference to our exports to your country and a free entrance for some of our natural products.
>
> Proposals have been made to exchange your limited preference for a limited preference of entry into our country, but it scarcely seems adequate that we should proceed on so restricted a basis.

Can we not at least approach the matter with a sincere desire and a determination to come to some fair agreement, and thus bind our two countries closer together on the lines of commercial intercourse and exchange? If your government will make a proposition, I shall be very much pleased to take it up with my colleagues, and to pursue the negotiations with you to a finish, and I do not see why we should not come to conclusions which would be mutually advantageous. Once preferential inducements are added, our steamship communications can be bettered, and by this means our two kindred peoples will become more intimately acquainted with and interested in each other.

If, on the other hand, you wish Canada to make a proposition to you with the assurance that you desire to follow it to a completion, I shall be glad to place a proposal before you for consideration.

May I hope to hear from you in good time? Our Mr. Ross will give you any desired information as to our products, our exports and imports.

I desire to say that in my opinion the action of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in sending this communication to the Australian government is worthy of all commendation; but may I point out what I think is one objection, from the Canadian standpoint, to my hon. friend's letters? My hon. friend rather puts it that the improvement of the tariff relations is to precede the establishment of better steamship communication between the two countries. He suggests that if we can get a preferential tariff satisfactory to Canada then the steamship communication might be improved. In my judgment this country should move ahead irrespective of any improvement in tariff relations between Canada and other countries, and wherever there is an opportunity to develop trade, Canada should encourage the establishment of proper steamship communication in order to give facilities for trade. As I said before, high freight rates and inadequate steamship accommodation are just as much a barrier to improved trade between any two countries as the raising or maintaining of a tariff wall. The late government has shown an example which my hon. friend might well imitate. I find that for the encouragement of foreign trade between Canada and other countries, including Great Britain and the Dominions beyond the seas, Canada gave, last year, the very large sum of $1,440,000. It seems to me that everyone must recognize that the improved steamship accommodation which has been secured by means of these very handsome subsidies has been a very great factor in developing the foreign trade of Canada to the enormous proportions which it has now attained, and of which every Canadian is so proud.

But, Sir, in considering whether or not my hon. friend has good ground for hoping that he will be able to accomplish anything by his negotiations as Minister of Trade and Commerce, I am constrained to say that the past record of the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden), not only in his actions, but in his speeches, does not give very strong ground for the hope that my hon. friend will receive encouragement in the work which he has undertaken of endeavouring to improve the trade relations between Canada and these respective countries by diplomatic action. My hon. friend, I know, is at times enthusiastic in favour of enlarging the foreign trade of Canada. We know that as long ago as 1891, my hon. friend, in a most admirable speech which he made in this House, declared that he and the government of which he was a member were in favour of widening the bounds of commerce on every side and then, as if some one were asking the question, he said: "With the United States? Yes," but we find, Mr. Speaker, that when the opportunity came for my hon. friend to lend the force of his great power, and his surpassing eloquence towards widening the bounds of commerce with the great republic to the south, after some consideration, when about to plunge into the late political campaign, my hon. friend was one of the very strongest in denouncing the proposal which had been made by the late government to widen the bounds of commerce with the United States. Then I find that no longer ago than the 8th day of December last, my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Mr. Borden), who, when he speaks, must be taken as speaking for the party which he leads, was the guest of the Canadian Society of New York, and made a speech upon that occasion. He, I suppose, felt called upon to give to the people he was addressing some explanation of the action of the party of which he is the leader in turning down or seeking to have turned down the best—I say it advisedly—the best trade arrangement which was ever offered to the people of Canada. He felt called upon to explain the extraordinary course which the Conservative party had pursued with reference to that question. He was addressing a number of intelligent gentlemen who were familiar with the history of the negotiations which had taken place between Canada and the United States for many years past. He was addressing gentlemen who knew that all parties in Canada had been for years endeavouring to obtain better trade relations between these two great countries, and who would naturally be surprised at the action of the Conservative party, and would expect to hear some reason for the extraordinary position which the Conservative party, under the leadership of my right hon. friend, had taken. What was the language of my right hon. friend on that occasion? And remember,

Mr. Speaker, that what I propose to read is not apparently a mere newspaper report made upon the spot; the whole report of the speech bears evidence that my right hon. friend had, in accordance with the practice of many eminent statesmen, both in the mother country and in America, furnished typewritten copies of his speech in advance to the newspapers, with the understanding that it was to be printed when it had actually been delivered. I shall quote from the report as published in the St. John 'Standard,' the leading Conservative paper in the province of New Brunswick, although I saw the same report, word for word, in the other Conservative papers in Canada.

The right hon. gentleman said that:

> For thirty years and more we have followed certain national ideas and policies which we firmly intend to pursue and continue in the future. We reached the conclusion that the recent proposals were inconsistent with those ideals and policies.

Now, I come to the language to which I invite the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The right hon. gentleman proceeded:

> Moreover, we entirely disbelieve in the framing of tariffs by diplomatic methods. That system has been tested between different states under the British flag, notably in South Africa, and the results have been far from satisfactory.

Is my hon. friend aware that the right hon. leader of the government has made that declaration as to what would be the policy of the Conservative party in the future, and as to the principles for which they stand in so far as trade between Canada and other countries is concerned? Remember, the right hon. gentleman was not stating what was and what would be the policy of the Conservative party simply as between Canada and foreign countries, but he was laying down the general principle that, so far as relations between Canada and foreign countries were concerned and so far as relations between Canada and sister colonies of the empire were concerned, he and his party entirely disproved of any attempt to make tariffs as the result of diplomatic action. Yet, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is, apparently with a light heart and hopeful spirit, moving ahead just as if his leader had not made that declaration. Would it be unfair for the governments of the British West Indies and the government of Australia, when they read this declaration of the right hon. leader of the government, to have a slight suspicion that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was not sincere in these negotiations but was simply playing with the governments of these important British possessions?

It may be that my right hon. friend has been misreported. I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when I saw this statement I was surprised at it, but it was explaining the course of the Conservative party in reference to the arrangement with the United States.

The language of my right hon. friend the leader of the government is in harmony with statements which have been made by members of the Conservative party in this House and throughout the country and, giving to the language of my right hon. friend the meaning which must necessarily be given to the words which he uttered, he appears to have deliberately made the declaration that in so far as Canada is concerned she is going to act independently in her tariff legislation, she is not going to have any negotiations in relation to tariff matters either with foreign countries or British possessions, she is going to act independently in the framing of her own tariff, to enter into no negotiation in future and to leave other countries, foreign as well as British, to do as they please in so far as their tariffs are concerned.

I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House. I thought it well to call attention to this statement of my right hon. friend, not, as I have said, a casual statement, but a statement made as embodying the well settled views and policy of the Conservative party in so far as the arrangement of tariffs is concerned. It seems to me that the course of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is entirely out of harmony with the statement of his leader. So far as we on this side of the House are concerned, and I am sure in so far as the Liberal party throughout the country is concerned, we believe in doing everything possible to enlarge the bounds of Canadian trade. We believe in giving to our people facilities and encouragement for the exportation of their produce and manufactures to all the countries of the world, whether it is to the United States, whether it is to British possessions, whether it is to France, or to any other country of the world, and we believe there is no more effective way of doing this than in connection with the improvement of transportation, negotiating with the governments of those countries with the view of having improved trade relations with them. That has been the policy of the Liberal party in the past; that will be its policy in the future. It will be satisfactory to me, and, I am sure, it will be satisfactory to the members of this House to learn that the right hon. leader of the government has been misreported by the newspapers of his party, but, as the same verbatim report appeared in different newspapers, I assume that the hon. gentleman was correctly reported and that in that speech he

laid down the policy of the Conservative party, and gave a clear declaration as to what would be its course in the future in so far as tariff relations between Canada and other countries are concerned.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal St. Antoine). Mr. Speaker, it had been my intention at the last session of parliament to bring this matter of Australian-Canadian reciprocal trade relations to the attention of the House because it seemed to me that it was a matter of very considerable importance. But, the Reciprocity Bill which was brought down by the former government so altered our entire situation that I felt it inopportune to go on with the discussion. I, however, am very glad, at this time when the matter has been raised by the hon. member for St. John, (Mr. Pugsley) to take occasion to make a few observations to the House in connection with Canadian-Australian trade. When that Reciprocity Bill was brought in last session, as I said a moment ago, our status in so far as our power of negotiation was concerned was completely altered from what it hitherto had been. We were practically inviting all the other sister dominions throughout the British Empire to come in as an incident of the bargain that we were making with a foreign nation, sending them, so to speak, around to the back door and letting them in with a stranger's ticket when we should take them in at the front door and deal with them as sisters in the same great nation. Now that the reciprocity question is settled, and let us believe it is settled for many years to come, and we are back where we were before, prepared to negotiate with other parts of the empire, I think we can well spend an afternoon in discussing wherein our trade relationships can be improved. I believe that the present government, even in the short time it has been in office, has given ample proof that it is extremely anxious to enlarge our trade relationships. Because we did not accept the late government's proposition as regards reciprocity with the United States, we have been accused of unwillingness to enlarge the opportunities of Canadian trade with other parts of the empire. That accusation, I believe, Mr. Chairman, is entirely unjust. The reason the reciprocity arrangement was opposed by members on this side of the House and was rejected by the country, in my opinion, was that it involved an entangling alliance in the matter of tariffs and made it possible, or even probable, that we should lose our liberty of independent action.

Now, the very condition of affairs which throws on this side of the House the responsibility on account of the rejection of reciprocity with the United States is a condition of affairs which we would welcome if it related to an arrangement which we might make with other parts of the British Empire. The more we can get entangled and bound together with the other parts of the empire, the better it will be for us all. We were the first self governing Dominion to adopt the principle of preferential trade. It is now 13 years ago since we made our famous offer to Great Britain and since that time we have kept that offer in force although our friends in the motherland have not reciprocated. It appears to me that we have gone as far as we can in that direction; the next step is that when the motherland is prepared to place her children upon a better basis than strangers in her market we shall be prepared to make still further concessions than those we have already made. But for the time being while Great Britain is unable to give any advantages to us it seems to me that we cannot be called upon to make any larger opportunity for her. But with the other members of the empire that have a fiscal policy similar to that under which we live, which have tariffs that can be reduced towards favoured nations, with them we can make preferential treaties and along that line of least resistance it seems to me it would be wise for us to go. Both Canada and Australia have already adopted the principle of reciprocal arrangements with other parts of the empire. Canada has made an arrangement of that kind with New Zealand and with South Africa. She has offered concessions to the West Indies which they have not yet reciprocated and she has also offered concessions to many other parts of the empire. Australia on her part has reciprocal trade arrangements with South Africa, and with New Zealand, and she grants a preference on British goods going in to that country, so that both Canada and Australia have established the precedent that they are prepared to make arrangements of this kind. But, although these two countries are the two leading British possessions they have as yet no mutual arrangement the one with the other, and each towards the other is a stranger in the matter of tariffs. Canada and Australia, although they are both countries carrying on large commercial operations throughout the world have comparatively small dealings the one with the other. We find that Australia imports annually goods to the amount of about $300,000,000 and yet all that we Canadians send her is about one and one-third per cent of that. We find that Australian exports annually goods valued at $360,000,000 and yet of these exports we take but one nineteenth part. So that the trade as it at pressent exists between Canada and Australia is very much less than we in both countries would wish it to be. That may be partially due to defective steamship service, as

the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has alleged, but yet we must not forget that we have two steamship lines heavily subsidized from Canada, one from the Atlantic ports and one from the Pacific ports, and that we are annually contributing about $300,000 towards the expense of these two services. It is quite probable that a third service is desirable and necessary directly between Vancouver via Hawaii, and the ports of Australia, and I would even be prepared to urge upon the government that if Australia shows herself willing to contribute liberally towards such a third service that service might be created inasmuch as I think there would be traffic enough for these three services between the two countries.

But, for the present, the matter I want to specially discuss is the question of tariff concessions on the part of the two countries with a view of increasing their mutual trade. There are many strong reasons it seems to me that should appeal to this House and to the thinking people of this country why such an arrangement should be consummated. These reasons are both sentimental and economic and as such we know they have force with British peoples. In the first place Australians and Canadians are people of kindred races. There is a common language, there is a common historic back-ground, there is a common method of doing business and it should not be at all difficult for these two countries to deal with one another. The difficulties which exist in the way of our dealing with the Latin people of South America for example, do not exist between Canada and Australia. In the second place be it remembered that both these countries face on the Pacific ocean and that there is a smooth and tranquil highway of trade which can be traversed every succeeding year in a lesser period than before by reason of faster vessels, and which really brings the two countries in point of expense of transportation very close the one to the other. Then it is to be borne in mind that Canada lies in the northern hemisphere whereas Australia lies in the southern hemisphere and that there is an alternation of seasons—when it is winter here it is summer with them, when our agricultural products are in such abundance that we are glad to export them theirs are most scarce, and vice versa; and that it would be quite possible to imagine a condition under which we could profitably in certain seasons of the year each send to the other what the other lacked. Let me point out also that to a very considerable extent Canada and Australia produce complementary products. We have no sub-tropical sections of Canada but a very considerable portion of Australia, almost all of Queensland, is sub-tropical and the relationship between Canada and Queensland is practically the same in so far as products are concerned as exists between Canada and the West Indies. In the exchange of the products of the northern zone for the products of the sub-tropical zone there ought certainly to be ample opportunity for trade. Further let me point out that there are no complications by way of outside trade arrangements that should hinder each of these two countries from dealing just as they saw fit with each other. That was the most embarrassing feature of the America-Canadian reciprocity proposal; that if we were to give the United States certain advantages in our market we would necessarily have to give these same advantages to 12 other foreign nations who had no claim upon us and who would give us absolutely nothing in return. But in this case we can make just such arrangements as we wish with the other parts of the British Empire and not feel that we have to concede one single item to any outsider, it being purely a domestic and family affair. I do not need to point out to the House that if our trade relations with Australia and other parts of the empire can be increased and enlarged it will mean the strengthening of the empire, it will mean the keeping of our money and resources within the empire in mutual building up each with the other one common consolidated whole. Notwithstanding the reasons that exist for greater trade between Canada and Australia, I have pointed out how small our mutual trade is: The United States are sending to Australia eight times as much as we are, Germany is sending five times as much, Belgium and Switzerland, little countries in Europe, are sending to Australia more than Canada does. I think that is due to the fact largely that we have not as yet been able to mutually give to this question that consideration which it naturally deserves.

There are precedents that can be cited, why a preferential treaty should be made. Take for example some of the preferential treaties we are now working under with other parts of the empire. We have a treaty with New Zealand. In 1903, New Zealand granted Canada a preference in return for that which Canada granted her. That preferential Act, which imposed extra duties on goods from foreign countries, was extended in 1907. Under it, the general tariff on dutiable goods from foreign countries is 30·55 per cent, but goods entering New Zealand from the United Kingdom or British possessions come in on an average tariff of twenty and three-fourths per cent, so that you will see that fully one-third of the duty to strangers is rebated towards members of the same imperial household. Now, that has had a very marked effect upon our trade with New Zealand. In 1902—the year before New

Zealand granted us a preference—the total trade between Canada and New Zealand was $357,873; in 1906 it was $1,036,129; and in 1911 it was $1,917,978, showing that within ten years it has increased between five and six times the amount formerly exchanged between the two countries, and one of the best features of that exchange is that the imports and exports bear an almost equal relation to each other. For example we send to New Zealand goods to the extent of $1,004,370, and we take goods from New Zealand to the extent of $913,608, the balance of trade being almost equal, which is an evidence that the most healthy kind of interchange exists between these two parts of the empire.

We have also an arrangement with South Africa, an arrangement that has proved profitable and that we are glad to continue. Foreign goods entering South Africa are taxed on an average of 17.38 per cent, but goods that come into South Africa from the United Kingdom or British possessions, like Canada, are taxed at the rate of 14:38 per cent. You will notice that the tariff of South Africa is comparatively low. We get a three per cent advantage, not very much, but it certainly has been enough to stimulate the trade in Canadian flour and some other articles with that country.

I do not wish to allege that the government, which passed out of power so recently, has in any way been neglectful or derelict in its duty in dealing with this Australian-Canadian preferential question. One has only to look through the files of the correspondence brought down to see that for the last 11 years that question has been constantly a subject of negotiation between the two countries, and that on more than one occasion it seemed as though a mutually satisfactory arrangement had been arrived at. But, political conditions in Australia have been, since the establishment of the commonwealth there, uncertain until up to a comparatively recent date. There have been in Australia three political parties, namely, the free traders, the protectionists, and the labour party. None of these was able to control a majority in the legislature, and consequently it was only by a series of combinations that any party could rule. These combinations were made and broken with great frequency, with the result that during ten years unstable conditions were the rule in Australia. When I was in Australia two years ago I had the opportunity of discussing this matter with some of their leading statesmen, among others the Prime Minister of to-day. I found they were unwilling indeed to deal with anything that affected the tariff, because the government of Mr. Deakin was a fusionist government, and his ministry contained free traders and protectionists in nearly equal number and consequently did not wish to raise any question that would involve a discussion of the tariff. They feared that if they did so the Cabinet might fall to pieces. They were kept in power merely by common dread of the outside enemy, namely, the Labour party, and that was practically the only cement that then held the government together.

Since I was in Australia the government existing then has passed from power and a Labour government—frankly labour—has come in and now controls both Houses. And it would seem as though the time had arrived when we Canadians might deal with a stable government. I may add here that the Labour government of Australia is avowedly protectionist—protectionist from a somewhat different point of view from that on which the question is usually discussed in this country, but nevertheless they are protectionist. They are protectionist from the point of view of the workingman himself. Consequently it seems that we will have protection as a settled policy in Australia, and with a settled government in that country there should be no difficulty in our making some progress.

I may further say that I believe that our case has been repeatedly placed before the successive governments that have come one after another in Australia, with a good deal of ability and a good deal of discretion, by our Canadian representative, Mr. D. H. Ross. Mr. Ross is persona grata with both sides of the Australian House; he seems to have friends quite as many in one party as in the other, and he is particularly au fait with the matter and has frequently presented memorials to the government which have been seriously considered by them. I do not think there is much difficulty in respect of information, for I believe that the Australian government have had from Mr. Ross all that they could desire. It seems to me that now an opportune time has come for us—when there is a settled government in Australia, a government which is frankly protectionist—to open up and carry on negotiations with good hopes of getting them carried through.

You will notice by the returns brought down this year that the latest proposition is that we should give our minimum tariff for their minimum tariff. I sincerely hope that our government will not adopt that rough-and-ready method of arriving at an agreement with Australia. The question involved is one that requires more delicate handling than that. It is a question that should take into consideration the conditions as they exist in both countries and the mutual relationship that obtains between the two. Let me point out, in the first place, that both Canada and Australia, in providing a maximum and a minimum tariff that should extend the maximum to

the stranger and the minimum to the other members of the great British family, always had their eyes upon Great Britain. The ex-Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will admit that that is what was mainly in his mind when his preferential tariff was submitted to this House. If you examine the Australian returns, you will find that one-half the imports come from Great Britain and that of that one-half, 64 per cent are on the preferential list. But, if you examine the list of the goods that Australia imports from other parts of the empire exclusive of Great Britain, you will find that 95 per cent of them are affected in no way by Australia's preferential trade tariff. Further than that, if you examine the Australian tariff you will find that while it contains 711 items, 294 of them carry preferential reductions and the remainder are exactly the same in the maximum as in the minimum. It would seem to me therefore that for us to offer them our minimum tariff or for them to offer us their minimum tariff, would simply mean giving a very slight reduction upon a large number of items, the great majority of which could under no circumstances be exported from one country to the other. It would seem to me, that a far better method of arriving at a really valuable increase of trade would be a list-for-list arrangement, in which we would endeavour to make such concessions as we might on the surplus products which Australia exports, and they in their turn, would endeavour to let into Australia on favoured treatment these things which we are already sending them or which are being sent to them by competitors similarly situated to ourselves. We send about $4,000,000 worth of goods annually to Australia and of that $4,000,000 worth, 80 per cent are covered by five items of the tariff. There you will see that the range of articles is comparatively small, and that it would be far more beneficial to our mutual trade if important reductions could be made on a few items rather than very slight reductions on a large number.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What are the five items.

Mr. AMES. Fish, lumber, agricultural implements, motor vehicles and paper. It is possible perhaps by correspondence to say, we will give you our minimum tariff if you give us yours; but when it comes to making a list-for-list arrangement, that cannot be done by two countries six thousand miles apart, either by mail or by cable. The parties must get together, and I believe the time has now arrived when this matter is of sufficient importance to make it obligatory upon a member of the Australian government and a member of the Canadian government to meet at some common point and take it up in conference, with a view to arriving at a mutually satisfactory arrangement. If it were possible for our Minister of Trade and Commerce to visit Australia, I think I can assure him, from what I know of the men whose names figure in this correspondence, not only that he would have a hearty welcome, but that they would meet him as far as possible in arranging a mutually beneficial basis of trade; or if the Australian Minister of Finance came to Canada, I am sure that we would find him to be a man with whom we could discuss this matter to our mutual satisfaction. Even if the ministers could not come together a competent commission might meet; for I am satisfied that a satisfactory arrangement cannot be made unless the parties sit down together with the determination to stay until something is really accomplished. In an arrangement of that kind I think we Canadians can afford to be pretty generous, because at the present time the balance of trade is largely in our favour. We to-day send to Australia eight times as much as Australia sends to us. Last year we sent to them $3,900,000 worth of goods, while they sent to us in return only $480,000 worth. It is obvious that it is not profitable to have trade going all one way. Freight rates, if nothing else, could be very much improved if the quantity of freight coming back were equivalent to the quantity going out. We see what has happened in New Zealand where a really equitable arrangement has been made: the imports and exports are nearly equal; and a similar arrangement made between Australia and Canada might make the balance of trade pretty nearly equal between the two countries. Our trade with Australia has grown 75 per cent in the last four years, and yet Australia sent us last year less than in 1907. So that it appears to me that we could afford to be generous in our dealings with Australia, inasmuch as at the present time the benefit seems to be on our side.

Mr. GUTHRIE. What are the chief imports into Canada from Australia now?

Mr. AMES. I will give them in a moment. If you make a comparative examination of the Australian and Canadian tariffs, you will find that on goods sent from Australia to Canada, taking dutiable goods only, our tariff wall amounts to 31·29 per cent. I have not the figures at my disposal to show what was paid in the same year on Canadian goods going from Australia, but as we pay the maximum rate, I was able to get the figures of the total foreign imports going into Australia, and find that

the average rate on them is 24·06 per cent. So that our rate against them is 7·23 per cent. higher than their rate against us. However, our importations from Australia are in large measure admitted free; so that if we take the figures of the total trade from Australia to Canada, we find that the average rate of duty upon it is 16·9 per cent., while the average rate of duty on the total foreign trade to Australia is 21·5 per cent. Therefore on dutiable goods alone we have a higher wall against them than they have against us; but if all classes of goods are taken into account, they have a higher wall against us than we have against them. This is due to the fact that fully half of the four or five classes of goods that we take from them are on the free list. Now, as I have pointed out, we grant a wider margin of preference. For example, if the initial Australian duty were 24 per cent., the preferential rebate of ¼ would bring it down to 18 per cent. If the Canadian initial duty were 31 per cent., ⅓ off that would bring it down to about 21 per cent. We give a greater preferential reduction than they do, but we start with a higher tariff wall against them than they have against us, and in the end, if minimum were given for minimum, ours would still be higher against them than theirs against us.

When we come to the question of a list-for-list arrangement, we shall have to consider what we can send them and what they can send us. Perhaps the best way to find out what we can send them is to see what the United States are sending, because the United States are sending them from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year, while we are sending them only one-sixth to one-eighth as much; and yet the great bulk of the goods which the United States are sending to Australia, on exactly the same terms as we are sending, are goods which we can produce and on which we could compete with the United States in the Australian market. My contention is that if we are able to secure in the Australian market a slight advantage over our American competitor, we shall be able to divert a considerable portion of that trade from the United States to Canada, which I think is a very justifiable object. Looking, then, over the list of goods shipped by the United States to Australia, we find the principal ones to be: boots and shoes, of which in 1909 they sent $263,000 worth; ammunition and explosives, of which they sent $279,000 worth. I may say that on boots and shoes, the duty against both the United States and ourselves is 35 per cent; the preferential rate is 30 per cent, on ammunition the duty is 5s. 6d. maximum, and 5s. minimum. On explosives the duty is 20 per cent. maximum, 15 per cent. minimum. Had we the 5 per cent. advantage on explosives I think we could do a considerable business in that line. Some of the other goods are fish, furniture, india-rubber, manufactures, metal manufactures, paper, timber, wood manufactures, vehicles, bicycles and motors. Of furniture the United States sends them $222,000 worth a year. On that the duty is 35 per cent. maximum, 30 per cent. minimum. A 5 per cent. advantage would, I think, help us to do a considerable business in that line. Of india-rubber manufactures the United States sends them $135,856 worth a year; the duty is 25 per cent. maximum, 20 per cent. minimum. Of metal manufactures, the amount sent by the United States is very large—over $1,000,000 worth of wire, over $3,000,000 worth of machinery, over $1,000,000 worth of other metal manufactures, $6,810,000 worth of railway iron, over $400,000 worth of plates and sheets. On these goods there is a varying tariff, but in most cases the difference between the maximum and the minimum is about 5 per cent. on the cost of the articles, and if we had that advantage, I am quite certain we could do a large trade with Australia in metal manufactures. With regard to paper, ordinary news print paper is free. The United States sent $799,000 worth in 1909. Of timber the United States sent $2,887,000 worth. Of wood manufactures they sent $389,000 worth. Of vehicles, bicycles, motors and parts they sent $487,000 worth.

Mr EMMERSON. What is the nature of the timber shipped from the United States? Is it mainly southern pine?

Mr. AMES. No, the timber shipped from the United States is almost all Douglas fir and Oregon pine from the American Pacific coast—Oregon and Washington. We claimed there that our Canadian product is better than the American, and we urged that if we were able to secure a slight advantage we could supply their wants very largely from our British Columbia forests. Now, taking these articles a little more in detail, let me show some of the main items of our present exports:

Exports of some Canadian Products to Australia for the year ending March 31, 1910.

Class of goods—	Amount.
Tinned fish..	$ 475,000
Agricultural implements and machinery..	1,260,000
Printing paper (mostly news print..	800,000
Undressed lumber..	340,000
Bicycles, motor cars, &c	300,000

Our total exports to Australia are $3,900,000. So it will be seen that these five items make up fully 80 per cent of all we send to Australia. In 1909, we shipped $650,000 worth of rails and fish-plates. They were trying them out on

the Victorian railway when I was there, and I understood from Sir Thomas Tait that they were satisfactory. It is easy to see what an advantage a slight reduction on these six items would be to Canada. Take, for instance, fish in tins. These imports into Australia consist almost wholly of salmon, the total imports of fish in tins being about $2,285,000 annually. As I have shown, we send about $471,000 worth. That is, we supply about 21 per cent, or one-fifth of what Australia imports, the other four-fifths coming from the United States. The duty on tinned salmon going into Australia, wherever it may come from, is 1d. per pound. But if we could get a slight reduction, we could certainly largely increase our exportation at the expense of the Americans. Australia already gives South Africa a rebate of ½d. per pound on fish from that country. Thus the precedent has been established, and there is no reason why Australia should not give to Canada a rebate on the duty on fish. Take the case of timber: Australia in 1910 imported $10,278,900 worth of timber, of which $4,500,000 worth was from the United States, $2,600,000 from Norway and Sweden, and $375,000 worth from Canada. It will be seen that the United States sends to Australia twelve times as much timber as we do—practically the same kinds of timber and if anything not quite so good. The tariff upon that timber is 2s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet. We feel that if Australia would make a slight reduction, we could get a much larger quantity of British Columbia timber into Australia than we do. They allow white pine from New Zealand to come in at only 6d. per 100 feet. If they would give us anything like the same rate, we should be in a very much better position than we are. Another product of which we could send very considerable quantities at certain times of the year is apples. I had the opportunity of going through some of the most magnificent apple orchards in Tasmania, where apple culture is brought, perhaps, to the highest stage known in the civilized world. But as everybody knows, Canada and Australia have alternating seasons. I was in Tasmania in November, and the apple trees were in full bloom—it was the beginning of spring. The apple crop would be harvested in February and March. But they have practically no apples of their own in October and November and December, the very months when our apples are at their best. New Zealand has gone so far as to recognize this by reducing her tariff from 1d. per pound to ½d. per pound during November and December, thus permitting apples from the north to come in, though she is a large exporting country in the right time of the year. It does not seem to me altogether an unreasonable proposition that we should admit Tasmanian apples into Canada at a time when our apples are practically exhausted and that they should allow our apples in when their native supplies are low. There are quite a number of other fruits that could be exchanged on the same basis.

The same is true of eggs—these could be admitted on favourable terms at the time when the importing country has least and the exporting country has most. Another item in which our export to Australia is large, is newsprint paper. It is admitted free into Australia no matter where it comes from. If the Australians could be persuaded to put a slight duty against newsprint from foreign countries, and allow ours to go in free, it would give us a tremendous advantage; and I do not think it would raise the price of paper to them, because we can offer far more for export than they can consume. And if they would reduce slightly their duty on wrapping paper made by the Kraft process—the general tariff is 5s. and the United Kingdom tariff 4s. 6d.—if they could give us this slight advantage we could compete with Sweden and Norway on a basis that would largely help some of our mills in the province of Quebec. New Zealand gives an advantage of $12.21 per ton on Canadian wrapping paper over that produced in Norway and Sweden, and the result is that our Canadian mills are sending quantities of wrapping paper to New Zealand. Were we permitted some slight preference in the Australian market, it would be a great advantage to the mills in Quebec that use the Kraft process in the manufacture of paper. There is quite a range of articles which I have referred to, on which the Australians have a double tariff, with a slight difference between them. If we could gain the advantage of the minimum tariff we could replace to a large extent the goods manufactured by the United States. Among them are agricultural machinery, rubber goods, boots and shoes, metal manufactureries, textiles, vehicles, bicycles and motors. If an arrangement could be made by which we could get our lumber, our fish, our fruit (at certain times of the year), and our paper free into their markets; and if they will be prepared to put on a slight tax on the paper produced elsewhere, and give us their preferential rates on a number of manufactured articles, I think we should be content, and we should have the means of considerably increasing our trade.

But, of course, if we ask these boons, we must be very generous in dealing with Australia. We can hardly expect her to give us further advantages, particularly as trade stands eight to one in our favour, unless we are prepared to make concessions

to them. Now, what commodities does Australia produce? Australia does not produce as large a variety of exportable goods as Canada. We get the best indication of her surplus by looking over her list of exports to Great Britain, for nearly everything that Australia produces in greater quantity than she requires for home consumption she sends to the English market. The British consumption of Australian goods amounts to $150,000,000 a year. Certain articles which Australia sends to Great Britain come into direct competition with our exports. We could hardly expect to send wheat or flour to Australia, nor could we send cattle, for our cattle meet their chilled beef in the British market. They compete also in sending large quantities of minerals—gold, silver, copper and lead.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is Australia's export of wheat?

Mr. AMES. About $25,000,000 a year. There are a number of articles that we already admit free from Australia—we could hardly do better than that.

We allow all skins, hides, rabbit skins, sheep skins and other skins to come in free. We allow wool in free, we allow tin in free and we allow their unmanufactured timber, many beautiful hardwoods that can be used in the manufacture of furniture, and special timber that will resist the torredo, and can be used in wharf construction, and also paving block timber. All of that timber is of most excellent quality and it is all admitted free. But, on the other hand, there are certain lines which Australia would be extremely glad to put on the Canadian market more extensively, lines on which we have a distinct maximum, intermediate and minimum tariff. Some of these articles are:

Article.	Maximum.	Minimum.
Butter	4c	3c.
Apples	40c. bbl.	25c. bbl.
Leather	15%	12½%
Chilled mutton	3c.	2c.
Meat in tins	27½%	17½%
Tallow	20%	15%

If we should give to Australia our minimum tariff on these items we would undoubtedly considerably increase our importations of them from that country. We might even do better than our minimum tariff, inasmuch as the number of articles Australia can send us is so limited compared with the very large variety we can send them. Then, as I said, a list-for-list arrangement can only be dealt with when commissioners sit beside each other and concession is given for concession. The New Zealand principle that the computed loss of revenue on each article should be balanced might be applied and in that way the concessions made to measure up by some rule mutually agreed upon.

Australia produces a great deal of very excellent light wine. I can speak from knowledge for I have been there, I have seen the actual making of the wine, and have tasted it as well, Hocks and Chablis and wines of that character. The Australians would be very glad if they could get from us the same preferential treatment as we give to France on light wines and I think our Pacific coast people would find that the Australian wine would supplant the Californian if such an arrangement was made. There are other items which we include under the French treaty such as lime-juice, prunes, raisins, currants, &c. If we could give to Australia the preference we give under the French treaty it would help them very much in these lines.

Mr. DEVLIN. Apart from natural products, are there any manufactured goods in which we might give them a preference?

Mr. AMES. I have pointed out that there are a number of manufactured goods we can send to Australia, but that there are very few manufactured goods that Australia could send to us.

Mr. DEVLIN. And in these manufactured goods that we might send them according to the list enumerated by the hon. member could we compete with the Americans in Australia?

Mr. AMES. My contention is that at present the Americans get the advantage of Canada because we are both treated as strangers, but if we were given a slight preference in Australia of even 5 per cent or 10 per cent on the selling price over the American manufacturer we could, in many items displace the American manufacturer. In fact the point I mainly have in mind and am endeavouring to persuade the House to consider, is that it is of primal importance that these two great parts of the British Empire should be linked together as closely as can be and there are a great many advantages that would accrue if we had a mutually satisfactory preferential trade arrangement.

I believe that the trade now carried on between the two countries is a mere bagatelle compared with what might be effected if there were proper facilities for transportation and mutual concessions made under the tariffs of the two countries. That would be of great advantage. It would help us to build up our shipping on the Pacific and to build up the empire generally, it would strengthen us in dealing with the great problem that we must some day face, the defence of British interests on the Pacific ocean. But, I feel that the proposal of minimum for minimum, a rough-and-ready system of giving 400 items that neither country could possibly send and

omitting to give substantial reductions on the few items on which they might trade, would never enable us to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. My contention is that it would be advisable if the government should consider this matter of sufficient importance to request the Minister of Trade and Commerce or some other party deputed by the government to meet the Australian government representatives, to sit down with them to consider an arrangement, concession for concession, and to endeavour, in that way, to arrive at some mutual sacrifices by which the volume of our trade would be increased.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. member said that, under certain circumstances, our manufacturers could compete in the Australian market with American manufacturers. If we could do that in Australia why is it that we could not do it in our own market? My hon. friend said that, with a very slight reduction, I think he even specified 5 per cent on boots and shoes and several other articles, we could compete against the United States in the Australian market, and yet the contention of my hon. friend, as I understand, would be that we cannot in our own market compete against the manufacturers of the United States with respect to these particular articles. Then my hon. friend argues that we should have participated in such a policy because it would tend to build up our shipping trade on the Pacific. I presume the same argument would apply with respect to enlarging our trade with the United States, that it would have the effect of building up our shipping and coasting trade on the Atlantic seacoast.

Mr. AMES. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) will admit that the first requisite, if a country is to export manufactured articles, is that it should be able to retain its home market. Unless we can be sure of our home market it is not probable that we will have very much to export. I am a strong advocate of retaining our home market and if, after our home market is supplied, we can get, in other portions of the globe, preferential terms, we shall probably be able to cheapen the very articles here as well, through the fact that a larger quantity of articles permits a less cost of production.

Mr. EMMERSON. What about the shipping?

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce). We have had a very nice, sociable discussion, undertaken and carried out in good spirit, and I believe that the speeches which have been made, particularly the one just made by my hon. friend (Mr. Ames), will be of very great value not only to members of this House, but also generally as exposing, in a very frank, plain and comprehensive way, the groundwork for possible trade between ourselves and the Commonwealth of Australia. Looked at in one way there is a sameness of production between Canada and Australia which does not augur very well for a mutual interchange on a preferential or reciprocity basis. Looked at in another way, taking into account the two considerations of which we sometimes lose sight, that in the first place there is a reciprocity of seasons between Canada and Australia and in the second place a reciprocity of certain productions along quite an extended plane, we see that, outside of the great bulk which is common to both countries, there is a very wide margin for successful and remunerative exchanges between Canada and Australia.

If we add to that certain preferences which might be given by each and which will enable each in the markets of the other to meet competition from outside countries that have not that preference, I do not think we are entering upon a hopeless quest when we endeavour to carry out from this time forward what my hon. friends formerly in their government attempted to carry out in their time with the purpose of bettering the trade relations between the two governments. Frankly speaking, I have no fault to find in this respect with the administration of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think the ten years which have passed and which have now been succeeded by another régime, were particularly unfavourable to the consummation of a trade arrangement between Canada and Australia mainly from the fact, which has been alluded to by my hon. friend, that matters political were always strenuous in Australia, and there was no very decided certainty of the tenure of office of any government which happened to be in power. Looking over and studying carefully all the negotiations which have taken place during the last ten years, we see that they have proceeded upon the plane of endeavouring to get some arrangement and to link that arrangement up on as wide a basis as possible, but at the same time willing to take the initial step upon a distinctly narrower basis in the hope that there would be an eventual widening of it. There is a point for difference of opinion as to whether it was wise to make a proposal looking to preference for preference under the conditions which exist rather than to take a little longer time and try and secure a trade arrangement upon a more mutually profitable and commercially extended basis. Taking the 294 items upon which they give the British trade preference; it looks large when it is put down in columns on paper, it would seem

as though Canada would actually get a preference on each of the 294 items in the list and that the arrangement would work out very advantageously. But upon scanning the list you find that there is an almost infinitessimal number from which Canada could reap any benefit at all. So that, I think the argument of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat is a very good argument, that it would be better to sit down together and frame a list of really serviceable exchanges between the two countries leaving in what would be mutually advantageous and leaving out what would be barren and unfruitful. It seemed a few weeks ago to Mr. Ross, our agent in Australia, that it might be possible for the Australian government to put upon its statute-book, at the session just past, a British preference in favour of Canada, and the question was asked as to whether this government would advise that an effort be made to bring that about. Looking at the matter as carefully as I could, I came to the conclusion not to make that effort and it was for the reason that I thought it would be better, instead of tieing ourselves up to an exchange of preference for preference, to try and come to an arrangement which would be less expansive in the matter of items but more fruitful in the matter of actual results. The proposition that I have made in writing to the Minister of Trade and Commerce of Australia is one which I hope will result in a conference, if possible, between members of the governments and if it is not possible between members of the governments, at least between special commissioners who shall be empowered to act by the two governments in that line. To my mind it is far better that members of the government shall be brought together where they can exchange views, can authoritatively dispose of item after item under discussion and can give and take in the way of coming to a favourable conclusion. I hope that idea may be carried out and I hope it may be carried out just as soon as posible.

My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) thought that we were rather putting the cart before the horse when we favoured preferential trade arrangements as a precursor to improved steamship arrangements. Well, that is a matter of opinion. My hon. friend is of the opinion that the improvement in trade communications should precede the other, at least that it should not be retarded in the least because the other does not exist and that it serves as an incentive to preferential rates. My own opinion is, and I hold it pretty strongly, that it is a great assistance to the betterment of steamship communications to have the inducement of favourable tariff rates between two countries. That holds as well with reference to our trade relations with the West Indies as it does with Australia, in fact, I think a little more so; I have made these few remarks with reference to our relations with Australia. It is not my part to indicate what I think will be the course of negotiations. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has given us his views very extensively and very pertinently, but if it so happens that I am to be one of the negotiators, it would probably be better that I should not have gone too largely into the matter prior to my meeting our friends from the other side.

With regard to our relations with the West Indies, I laid on the table of the House the return to which my hon. friend has alluded. The matters in hand at the present time sprang out of and are based upon preceding negotiations and examinations the most important and comprehensive of which was that which was gone into by the British West Indian commission of which two Canadian Ministers were members. The three things which are under consideration now between ourselves and the West Indies are improved telegraphic or cable communications, improved steamship communication and improved trade relations. For a number of years Canada has given to the West Indian Islands a large and generous preference which has met with generous appreciation by the West Indian Islands and which, they acknowledge, has been a help to the West Indies in various ways and particularly in reference to the encouragement of their sugar industries. I am not going to take up the time of the House to dilate upon the conditions which seem to me to favour a reciprocal arrangement between ourselves and countries situated as the West Indies are. Suffice it to say at the present time that all of these three points that I have mentioned are very important. Improved cable and telegraphic communications contribute to quickness in the transaction of business and the increase of trade. The same is true, but in a still larger sense, of improved steamship communications.

I am not very enthusiastic and I have not been for a number of years over the steamship communications which have been existing between ourselves and the West Indies. I do not think they have been up-to-date, as modern and as enterprising as they should have been and as I think it is necessary for them to be in order that they shall adequately promote trade and commerce. We have not had as quick, as rapid, or as punctual communication as it is possible to have consistent with the conditions there and which it is necessary to have in order to promote trade to its greatest extent. I would not consider it a matter for very much doubt or hesitation if it comes to be a question between a larger amount of good as com-

pared with a smaller amount of money if the first will bring you an adequate service and the second will only keep you halting along with an inadequate service. I think that hon. members on both sides of the House would favour an idea like that. It is better economy to spend well and get good returns than to spend poorly and to get equally poor or worse returns. What measure of help we may get from the West Indian Islands we do not yet know.

However, the proposition that was made by this government on my report to the Colonial Secretary was this: That the Canadian government was ready at any time to meet the representatives of the West Indies so that we might go into the matter face to face with each other in order to carry out what seems to be pretty well in train for being accomplished. Already nine legislatures in the West Indies, including British Guiana, have passed resolutions in favour of carrying out the conclusions of the West Indian commission. I may say that since that return was prepared, I notified the Colonial Secretary to intimate to the West Indian Islands that if they would send their representatives to Ottawa for a conference, we would be very happy to welcome them here, but that if they would rather that the conference should be held in the West Indian Islands we would send our representatives there. Since that I may say that I have received by cable a communication, informing the government —and I am sure all members on both sides of this House will receive the announcement with pleasure—that it has been decided that the West Indian commissioners appointed by the different legislatures shall come to Ottawa, and I expect at present they will be here about 27th of March. The date was fixed late in March originally in order that if we had to go to the West Indies we would not be there in the very hottest season, but happily the West Indian commissioners are coming here, and they will include representatives from most of the islands of the West Indies and from British Guiana. I am sure these gentlemen will receive from the members of the opposition and from the government a right hearty welcome.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I hope that we may be able to have results, as a return for the long and somewhat patient negotiations which have been going on now for a series of years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), that we have had a very important discussion on this matter, and I was glad to notice that the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley), on our trade relations with the West Indies were so well received by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). I do not know what trade is to be developed with the West Indies, but be it much or be it little we are all anxious to get it even if we have to pay pretty liberally for the privilege. I regret that our efforts to stimulate trade with Australia, efforts that have been constant for the last ten years, have been fruitless. I may say to my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), that the exposé he has made to-day of the possibilities of trade with Australia is, in my judgment, the clearest we have ever had in this House. He has told us the way in which that trade can be developed if any trade can be developed with Australia. Of course, it is quite true that the uncertainty of government in Australia has been one reason for the ill success of our negotiations in the past, and I fear there is no certainty that the government now in power will remain long in office, but if a fusionist government under Mr. Deakin is returned I know that he will be most anxious to have with us favoured trade relations. But, the difficulties in the way are not only political. Australia has only two large staples of export, wool and meat. We buy Australian wool to-day, but we buy it largely through Great Britain, and perhaps if we had direct communication from Australia we might get that product direct to Canada. But, I should judge that there is no market at all in Canada for Australian meat and I do not know that the tariff views of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) would favour a very large importation of meat from Australia to Canada. At all events there are some sections of our country where such a proposition would not be favourably received. For my part I think it would be well to make some sacrifice to develop a trade with Australia. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), that there is a wide field in Australia for Canadian manufactured goods, and if it is possible to induce the Australian government to give us a slight preference over the Americans the benefits to us would be immense. I think it possible that in a very few years we could increase our export trade to Australia which is now only $1,000,000 annually, to perhaps $12,000,000. I agree with the suggestion that we should send commissioners to Australia. We have at present in Australia a very able Canadian agent in Mr. Ross, who is well versed in business, who is conciliatory and diplomatic. He has the ear of all parties in Australia and no better man could be found to negotiate, but Mr. Ross could not move a step forward in these negotiations without being in constant communication with the government here, and the better way is for us to send a commissioner to Washington.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I said Washington, and I am sorry I made the slip. We did send a commissioner to Washington and we failed.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). It lies heavy on your heart.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not sorry we did so, but I am sorry that the people of Canada did not view our efforts in what we consider the proper light. If we are to send a commissioner to Australia I do not know any better man than the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is qualified by his position as head of the department and still better qualified by his enthusiasm in the work and the information he has with regard to it. I would even trust him with the light wines of Australia, and I therefore think that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) were to go to Australia and associate Mr. Ross with him there might be a possibility of bringing back a trade treaty with our fellow-subjects. But the great difficulty about that arrangement is that both parties to the negotiation would be protectionists, and it is very difficult for a protectionist in one country to convince his fellow-protectionist of another country to make way for him by lowering the tariff.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). How was it at the Washington Conference?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There, we exchanged natural products for natural products. One of the difficulties in that case, and it will be a difficulty in the present case also, is, that there would have to be secret negotiations. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has suggested that they should sit around the table and consult with each other, and that is an excellent way of doing business and the only proper way to do such business, but last year that procedure was characterized as secret negotiations and as dangerous negotiations. The Minister of Trade and Commerce put that objection most eloquently last year, but let him not be afraid of his own arguments then, let him have secret negotiations with the Australian government if he will, and if he can bring us back a good trade treaty we will approve of it. The Labour party in Australia is composed of protectionists to a large extent, the Fusionist party was composed one-half of protectionists, and it would be difficult for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to persuade the protectionists of Australia to give Canadian manufacturers a preference in their market. They would be something like the protectionists in this country who are ready to give Great Britain a preference on manufactured goods provided the British manufacturer does not compete with the Canadian manufacturer. My hon. friend will find the Australians most patriotic, but I fear he will find them ready to trade with Canada on such conditions as will not let the Canadian manufacturer compete with the Australian manufacturer in the Australian market. However, let him try his hand at the job, and if he succeeds in bringing us back a good arrangement we will be most anxious to approve of it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax). I desire to express my feelings of satisfaction at the remarks made by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Ames), which were exceedingly interesting and which lucidly put before the House the possibilities of Canadian trade with Australia. I rise to suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that at the conference which is to take place in Ottawa in March next with the representatives of the West Indian Islands, the Canadian government should invite to be present those who are interested in the steamship business between St. John, N. B., Halifax, N. S., and the West Indian islands.

The question of trade between Canada and the West Indian islands is largely one of steamboat transportation, and it is a very difficult question. In some of the recommendations made by the West Indian Commission respecting the steamship service between Canada and the West Indies they are obviously in error. Some of those recommendations are impossible to carry out. I wish to suggest to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that a steamship service between Canada and the West Indies which departs from Halifax is very much hampered by reason of the fact that the steamers are obliged to call at the port of St. John, at which port they secure very little traffic, which traffic the steamboat company could carry as readily by absorbing the increased railway rates between St. John and Halifax, which they are willing to do, thus making Halifax a port of departure throughout the whole year. It might, however, be possible to secure for the port of St. John another steamboat service which would be as much to its advantage as the present one. I rose merely for the purpose of making the suggestion that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce avail himself of any information he may secure from persons in St. John and Halifax who have been for many years interested in our trade with the West Indian Islands.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken part in this debate but that I happen to have received a letter from one of my constituents which illustrates the desirability of larger trade between Canada and the Aus-

tralian colonies. In the town of Owen Sound we have a company, the North American Bent Chair Company, Limited, which manufactures nothing but chairs. My information is that last year that company shipped to Australia and New Zealand $171,000 worth of chairs, and they tell me that if we could obtain a preference in the Australian markets and an increase of the preference that obtains in New Zealand, they could double that exportation, bringing it close to $400,000 a year. This is one illustration of what Canada might accomplish if we had a preference in the Australian markets.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Can the hon. gentleman tell me through what ports their shipments to Australia are chiefly made?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I cannot say, but I think it is likely through Atlantic ports.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Through Canadian ports or through New York?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Most likely through Canadian ports. I am glad to know that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has already taken steps to have a conference on the subject. I agree very largely with the remarks of the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, with the exception of his attempt to show that the action taken by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce with a view to obtaining a preference for Canada in the Australian market is at variance with his opposition to the late government's reciprocity measure. I think I can show that it was strictly in accordance with his previous attitude in that regard, because had we adopted the reciprocity pact, we would not to-day be discussing the possibility of better trade relations with Australia; we would have been deprived of the only weapon we have for obtaining preferential trade with Australia, namely, the ability to give them something in return for what they may give us. If that reciprocity arrangement had passed, Australia would have been able to send to this country free of duty every article which, under that arrangement, the United States could have sent in free. I say that the present policy of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is strictly in line with the position he took on the reciprocity measure. That policy has in view reciprocity within the empire, which is a very different thing from reciprocity with a foreign nation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I was quoting from was a declaration of the Prime Minister made at a banquet in New York to the effect that the Conservative party are unalterably opposed to the framing of tariffs by diplomatic action, and he gave as a reason for that conclusion the dissatisfaction which had occurred among the British possessions in South Africa; and what I said was that I was not able to reconcile the present demand of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce for reciprocal tariffs between Canada and Australia and between Canada and the West Indies, framed by diplomatic action, with the declared policy of the Conservative party as thus stated by the Prime Minister.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It may be that the Prime Minister is not correctly quoted, but even if he is, my hon. friend will not deny that in the course of his speech he said that he was surprised that the Minister of Trade and Commerce should now be attempting to extend the trade relations of this country when he rejected the opportunity of having reciprocity with the United States, and he maintained that his present action was inconsistent with the position he took with reference to the reciprocity pact. I say that it is entirely consistent, because now he is able to negotiate a trade arrangement with Australia which he would not have been able to do had the reciprocity pact passed.

Mr. F. B. McCURDY. (Shelburne-Queens). Mr. Speaker, I regret to observe a disposition on the part of some members of this House to belittle the possibilities of trade between Canada and the West Indian Islands. It is common knowledge that for many years a large and profitable trade has been done by Halifax merchants with those islands—that the foundations of many substantial Halifax fortunes were made in that trade. That was particularly in the days of wooden ships. Although under modern conditions the steamship service is not, in my opinion, adequate, yet it is a fact that a business of considerable and increasing magnitude and financially satisfactory, exists to-day at Halifax, and it can be largely extended. The West India steamship service is a more difficult one than some of us are aware, because it is not a question of ocean-going boats running from a port in Canada to a port in the West Indies, but it necessarily includes a sort of coasting service. A boat suitable for carrying mails from Halifax to Kingston, Jamaica, for instance, is not qualified to call at the small ports of the Windward Islands. There must be either a central depot in the West Indies to which large ships would go, with coasting vessels of lighter draught to go from there to the smaller ports, or else vessels of lighter draught to do the combined services, which would mean a slow service for mails and unsatisfactory accommodation for passengers. Export trade with the West Indian Islands, consisting of flour, fish and general produce, has been largely controlled in the past by New York and West Indian houses with large financial resources.

Controlled, as it has been, by old-established New York houses with large financial resources, it can only be diverted with difficulty. But, even with the inadequate transportation system we have had, that trade is being diverted and it is a matter of interest to know that large New York houses have found it necessary in order to retain their trade, to establish branch houses in Halifax or St. John, and ship Canadian exports of flour to the West Indies via Halifax, using the steamship service that is subsidized by this government. When the matter of steamship subsidies was before the House recently, I took occasion to suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce the possibility and advisability of the Canadian government railway system taking up this portion of the steamship service, and either acquiring existing lines or putting on a new service. I have been glad to note here to-day, that the hon. minister was prepared to go to the extent of recommending a larger subsidy if necessary, in order to provide an adequate service. The Intercolonial railway carries a large part of the produce destined for the West Indies via Halifax and then hands it over to the steamship company. It might be possible; it should be possible;—it would under business control, though the government operations of this kind may be carried on at some disadvantage compared with private business—to have the railway see that freight through to its destination. I am convinced that if the Intercolonial railway does not take up that service, some other railway will, and will take it up because of a prospective profit. If the Intercolonial railway is to continue in business and is to continue to accomplish the purposes for which it should exist, it should avail itself of every opportunity for profitable expansion of its business. The West India steamship service, in my opinion, is such an opportunity. But if this is not possible, then such a subsidy should be available as will provide a service to place our exporters in a position to compete without a handicap with foreign firms. The present steamship service, we know, is not satisfactory. The present operators of the steamship line have built up a large business and, considering the subsidy, has given perhaps as good a service as could be expected. But the trade can be facilitated and much enlarged, and I am satisfied that if better steamship service is provided—preferably as I have stated by an Intercolonial railway-steamship service—the results will be totally satisfactory, both to the railway, the export merchants, and consequently to the producer and manufacturer in Canada.

64½

Conditions, I take it, have been imposed upon the steamship company which have been objectionable. Calls were required at ports where insufficient cargo was available to make these calls profitable. So, as the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) pointed out, it would pay the steamship company better to absorb the railway rate on outgoing shipments than to make calls where small quantities of freight only were to be had.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must be misinformed as to St. John. They had a trade going from St. John to support one line of steamers.

Mr. McCURDY. The subsidy is conditional upon a call at St. John once in every twenty-two days, but I am informed that the total amount of freight collected for each trip in St. John does not average much more than $1,000. And any person with experience in shipping can figure out for himself whether or not a quantity of goods that pays $1,000 of freight would justify the service.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But while a call is made once in twenty-two days in St. John, a call is made once in eleven days at Halifax. Is it not true that large quantities of freight are sent from St. John by rail to Halifax for shipment, because the goods cannot be kept waiting? Such goods went through St. John when we had the same service as Halifax has now.

Mr. McCURDY. How long is it since the change was made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About eight months. At the termination of the contract, Messrs. Pickford & Black insisted upon giving a reduced service stating that they would not continue to give the same service for the subsidy they were receiving. A temporary arrangement was made which still exists, under which they give a service every eleven days at Halifax, and every twenty-two days at St. John. I am informed that it is by reason of this inferior service that goods are sent forward by rail to Halifax rather than await the call of the steamer at St. John. The arrangement is unfair to the port of St. John.

Mr. McCURDY. The point I wish to make is with regard to facilities and extending the trade generally between Canada and the West Indies. I do not wish to set the advantage or disadvantage of any one port up as against the other. Let the generally enlarged trade find its natural port. It is a matter of common knowledge that before the days of steamship subsidies, the West Indian trade centred in certain localities for perfectly natural reasons. That is the answer I would give to the hon. member for St.

John. But I do not wish to speak of one port as against another; our purpose here is to seek to extend and increase the West Indian trade.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE LINES.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I regret that the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) is not in his place. But I suppose the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), who is leading the House will be able to give me the information I desire. I see it stated in the 'Evening Journal' that the Postmaster General made an announcement yesterday on the nationalization of the telegraph and telephone lines by the Dominion. It is a rather startling announcement, and I desire to ask if the government has considered this matter of nationalizing telephones and telegraphs. Also I see it announced that the Postmaster General said that free rural mail delivery will be given. I am sincere in asking for information on these points. Does this represent the personal view of the Postmaster General, or did he speak for the government?

Mr. FOSTER. (Toronto). I think it would be more satisfactory if the hon. gentleman would put the question to the Postmaster General himself. We have had an illustration already to-day of the inadvisability of tieing ourselves up completely to items in newspapers. While trying to be as correct as possible, they are tinged with human frailty, I fear.

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

SUPPLY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe the item 'Wingham—Public Building—Tower Clock, $2,000,' was allowed to stand. I was speaking when the House adjourned on Wednesday last at six o'clock. I have only a little more to say. I noticed in some of the papers the statement that my hon. friend, the former Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) announced that the government had decided to abandon the land on Sussex street, as the site for a new departmental building. I observe also that in one of the newspapers the language of the former Secretary of State was quoted for the purposes of showing that I evidently was unaware of the statements which that hon. gentleman had made.

I have, however, looked at 'Hansard' report of his statement and what he said, as I interpret it, is not that the government had decided that the Sussex street site was not suitable for a departmental building to be erected now, or looking to future needs. I take it that what the hon. member for Russell meant was that that land would not be sufficient for all the accommodation that would be required now or in the future and therefore a sub-committee of council had been appointed with a view to looking over other available sites in order to purchase the land in advance of the actual requirements. It is true we had differences of opinion as to the extent to which we should use the land on Sussex street.

When I became Minister of Public Works, plans had been prepared under direction of my predecessor for two departmental blocks and also a Palace of Justice which were intended to cover all of the land purchased from Sussex street up to Mackenzie avenue and also to cover Mackenzie avenue. Subsequently when by an arrangement between the government and the City of Ottawa and the Ottawa Improvement Commission the City of Ottawa proposed to buy certain lands along Sussex street and facing the river in order to improve the driveway, the Ottawa Improvement Commission made a very strong protest to me and other members of the government, including the then Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), against the closing of Mackenzie avenue, saying that it would be desirable to keep that avenue open as a public driveway particularly because a portion of Major's Hill park had been taken for the Chateau Laurier. I yielded to the view of the Ottawa Improvement Commission as urged upon me. I directed the Chief Architect to prepare new plans for a building which would come only to the edge of Mackenzie avenue. Owing to the change, we had to take one story off the building in order to give proper light in the wells and we had to narrow the building by some 40 feet, the width of Mackenzie avenue. It took some time to prepare those new plans and while they were under consideration quite a feeling was expressed by prominent citizens of Ottawa, which, I may say, was shared in by the late Governor General, who is a warm friend of Ottawa as well as of Canada, and who takes a very enthusiastic view of the future of Canada and of Ottawa and who urged very strongly that it would be a mistake to erect a building upon any part of the land acquired, that it should all be left open as a public park and that the building should be put either on the other side of Sussex street or in some other locality. I felt bound to give weight to these representations which were made to me and which I knew were shared in by at least one gentleman who is now very prominent in the Conservative party. I deferred coming to a final decision as to the construction of the building until the return of the late Prime Minister from England. After his return, as my hon, friends know, the House

was dissolved, the general elections came on and therefore there was no time to deal with the matter. But it is in no sense true that we had decided, as a government, to abandon the land on Sussex street. On the contrary, I would have expected that a part of it at any rate, would have been utilized for some departmental buildings, while, of course, it would be the part of wisdom to acquire land in some other locality to provide for the very pressing needs of the public service.

One statement with regard to the Langevin Block in answer to the Postmaster General who, I think, tried to unduly press the charge that the late government had been neglectful of the interests of the employees of the Post Office Department. If there is any fault anywhere, it is on the part of those who built the Langevin Block in the first instance. It was constructed by the Conservative government a good many years ago, not by the Liberal government and, instead of acquiring land right through to Sparks street and erecting a building which would have plenty of light and ventilation, for the different public offices, the building was erected on only half the block so that the rear offices are not lighted at all and it is exceedingly difficult to get proper ventilation.

With regard to the congestion, as I said the other day we recognized that trouble and sought to remedy it. Since I have been minister, we have rented a large number of buildings in Ottawa. We have rented commodicus premises in the Grand Trunk building for our Railway Commission,, splendid accommodation at large expense. We rented the old Y. M. C. A., the Rosenthal building, the Brennan building, the Imperial Realty building and some others, endeavouring, as fast as we could reasonably do so, to give accommodation; but the new buildings had to be erected before we could get the accommodation. I entered into negotiations for the Blackburn building some time ago, and the new Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) is only carrying out to completion the negotiations we entered upon.

I do not like to charge my hon. friend with exaggeration, but I think he is exaggerating when he speaks of the rats being so destructive. I think if that is so, it is the fault of the caretaker. If a building is neglected, rats will accumulate. The Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) says rats were so wary because they were born and brought up while the Liberal government was in power. I would rather think that the fact that it was only after the new government came in that they became so vicious and started in to devour the postal notes, shows that they have seen the procession moving towards the public crib and would like to be in with the crowd, and the only thing they could find was these postal notes and money orders.

Mr. MONK. I merely wish to correct the impression, if it exists, that anything has been absolutely decided as yet about the sites. What I told the committee and what is the fact is that the government has not yet had time or opportunity to fully study this important question. A committee of the Privy Council has been appointed, we are very anxious to get to work and to take up the matter as soon as possible because our accommodation is entirely insufficient and inadequate and every day demonstrates more conclusively that we have no rooms, that the departments are very ill provided with absolutely essential accommodation. We have to continue leasing buildings as has been done in the past and we are extremely anxious, if possible, to put an end to that by commencing the construction of our own departmental building as soon as possible.

Personally I would be very sorry to see the Sussex-street site abandoned. I have only had time to cast my eyes upon the plans of a justice building to include the Justice Department, the Supreme Court, the Exchequer Court and the Railway Commissioners, in fact everything pertaining to justice. That plan has been prepared by one of the most skilful architects. It seems to me it would be possible at any rate to install that part of our departments on the Sussex-street property leaving sufficient space around to give the necessary relief to such a very handsome building. I can assure the committee that as soon as the House has adjourned we will take up the question and try to bring it to a solution as soon as possible.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As some newspapers have sneered at me about the 'ratty' condition of the Langevin Block, and have held me responsible for the congestion there, I wish to vindicate myself once more, and to say that when I took office in the Post Office Department five years ago I found that there were certainly too many people congregated together within those walls. But the Post Office Department occupy only one floor and the cellar for the parcels the Archives and the old files. I immediately called upon the Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. King.

I was then Postmaster General and Minister of Labour. I urged upon Mr. King to fully consider the question, to study the building from the labour point of view and to prepare a report. I may say that the city of Ottawa had laid a complaint to the Department of Labour. Mr. King

prepared a lengthy report at my request which I laid before my colleagues in council. In that report it was stated that there was too much congestion and that the employees required more space. Council immediately decided that a new departmental building should be erected. Then my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) started the expropriation proceedings on Sussex street. We know that it takes months and even years to get reasonable valuations of properties such as those on Sussex street, and, especially when such properties are to be purchased by the government, you must go quietly to work and get as good a bargain as possible. That took two or three years, but meanwhile we began to look around to find in the city of Ottawa some available space to accommodate the employees of the Post Office Department. It was reported to me that the only possible thing for the department would be to get hold of the upper floors of the building occupied by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. Unfortunately, I could not convince Mr. Fisher or my hon. friend the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) to vacate the premises, and we had to look elsewhere. There was only the Blackburn building available. It was started two years ago, and it is not yet completed. But, to put the facts right before the public, let me say that what is now being carried out by the Minister of Public Works is nothing else than what was decided upon by his predecessor. It was decided to take flats in the Blackburn building. That building is not yet completed and none of the employees of the Post Office Department have been transferred since the 21st September to any outside building. Not until the Blackburn building is completed will they be transferred from the Post Office Department. It was only just that I should rise and state what the facts of the case are

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 22) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Jameson.

On section 2.

Mr. BEST. Is not this railway already constructed?

Mr. JAMESON. It is with the exception of a branch line of about fifteen miles known as the North Mountain railway, which I am given to understand will be built very shortly.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. BEST. Why is the guarantee increased from $25,000 to $30,000 per mile?

Mr. JAMESON. The Dominion Atlantic railway consists of the amalgamation of several short railways running from Yarmouth to Windsor, with one branch from Truro to Windsor. In 1908 they were empowered to build this North Mountain railway and the security authorized was limited to $25,000 per mile. The object of increasing the guarantee to $30,000 per mile is to enable them to improve the railway by laying heavier rails and putting steel bridges in the place of the original wooden bridges. The company has not, perhaps, made as much progress in the past as some other companies, but I believe it is the intention of those now in control of the road to put it in condition so as to improve transportation in that part of Nova Scotia, which no doubt, my hon. friend (Mr. Best) will deem a very desirable thing.

Bill reported, read a third time and passed.

CAP DE LA MADELEINE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 43)—Mr. Paquet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to know from the Chairman of the committee on what ground this railway is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. LENNOX. The ground, I do not think, is a very satisfactory one, but it is a time honoured one, if that be any justification. There was not a word that I remember raised in the committee against declaring this railway a work for the general advantage of Canada. On many occasions, when I was in opposition, I fought vigorously for the principle that there ought to be some evidence that a work really is for the general advantage of Canada before we embody that declaration in any Bill. But we have been in the habit on all occasions of practically taking that for granted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where does the road begin and where does it end?

Mr. LENNOX. That I leave to be explained by the gentleman who is promoting the Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that of late years, at all events, after a good deal of criticism, it came to be clearly understood that the committee would not allow such a clause to be inserted without some evidence to show that it was based on fact. We know that the provincial legislatures have been constantly asserting provincial rights and declaring that this parliament ought not to declare roads of a purely local character to be for the general advantage of

Canada. This road is wholly within one province. It does not connect one province with another, and it is, therefore, a provincial work under the terms of the British North America Act. What right have we to falsify the record by declaring that a purely local work is for the general advantage of Canada when we have not a particle of evidence to warrant our making that declaration?

Mr. HENDERSON. My recollection is that this road was described in the committee as a short line of about six miles long to connect the water-front with the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway for certain purposes. The fact that it connects with the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway, which is a work for the general advantage of Canada, was accepted as sufficient to warrant this parliament in making that declaration. That question was not discussed in the committee, but I presume that is the reason why this clause was accepted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the case of some railways which, though wholly within a province, were connecting links in an interprovincial system, it was held that they might be considered as being for the general advantage of Canada. But this is a short branch line only six miles long, not constructed by the Canadian Pacific railway, but to be constructed by a separate company and is purely of a local character.

Mr. LENNOX. It is already constructed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then this takes it out of provincial jurisdiction. It was constructed under a provincial charter, as a purely provincial road, and we are now declaring that it is a work for the general advantage of Canada. The British North America Act is very explicit on this point. It provides that the incorporation of companies for provincial objects shall rest exclusively with the provincial legislatures.

The British North America Act gives this parliament power in exceptional cases to declare a work to be for the general advantage of Canada. Surely we ought not to act in a capricious manner, and assume a jurisdiction that we would not otherwise have by inserting those words. I understood that, in view of the protests which the provinces had been making in recent years, we had come to the conclusion that we would not make that declaration except in cases where it was perfectly clear that it was justified; otherwise we could assume jurisdiction over all provincial works simply by making that declaration.

Mr. HENDERSON. I cannot understand why a small line of railway such as this, to be operated by the Canadian Pacific railway, should be refused Dominion jurisdiction when the main line is under that jurisdiction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is there any evidence that this line is to be operated by the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. LENNOX. It is so stated in the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am inclined to think that if the hon. gentleman will refer to the Railway Act he will find that where one line of railway crosses or connects with another line, if the latter has been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, the other one would as a matter of fact, come under the same jurisdiction.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Only in respect to the crossing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Act was changed to limit it to the point of crossing.

Mr. GUTHRIE. It was certainly stated by the promoter of this Bill that the charter of this small branch line was now under the control of the Canadian Pacific railway, and that it would be operated by the Canadian Pacific railway, and would become a part of its general system. Under these circumstances my opinion is that it should be declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. You cannot operate two lines under two jurisdictions, one provincial and the other Dominion, when they are really parts of one system.

Mr. MONK. From my knowledge of the local conditions, I may say that there are immense industries being established at Cap de la Madeleine, near Three Rivers, and it is impossible for the local railways to serve these industries. Hence an amalgamation with the Canadian Pacific railway was obtained, and this necessitated giving to this railway a federal charter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could understand that if there were any evidence before the committee that the Canadian Pacific railway had leased this road, but there is no allegation to that effect.

Mr. MONK. That is the object of the Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is my hon. friend able to say that the arrangements for that purpose have been completed?

Mr. MONK. I am not able to say that, but I know that that is the object the promoters have in view.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no statement here that the amalgamation has taken place.

Mr. COCHRANE. They could not enter into a contract until this Bill passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why not? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company can lease

a road incorporated by a provincial legislature. The Quebec legislature could give this company power to lease its road to the Canadian Pacific railway and after that was done it might very properly be brought under the Dominion jurisdiction.

Mr. MONK. I am informed that the arrangements are practically completed, but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would not complete them until this empowering clause was passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we declare this small road, without any amalgamation, to be for the general advantage of Canada, how can we refuse in the future to make a similar declaration with regard to any branch line that connects with the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Northern?

Mr. MONK. I think that each case should be appreciated on its merits, and where the promoters of a Bill and those who know the local conditions state what the object of the legislation is and the circumstances which render that legislation necessary, that is to my mind sufficient evidence for the House that it is a project for the general advantage of Canada. During the years that I have been in parliament such a statement has been regarded as sufficient.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Algoma Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Boyce.

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Boyce.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Jameson.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —Mr. Fripp.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Alberta Electric Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Alberta Interurban Railway Company.'—Mr. Bennett (Calgary).

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 45) respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord. —Mr. Achim.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am informed that before 6 o'clock my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), made some further statements about my department. I was not in the House and of course his remarks were not answered because they were made in my absence.

Mr. CHISHOLM. (Inverness). The minister intimated the other evening that he would give me some information with reference to a public building at Port Hawkesbury in the county of Inverness. Is it the intention of the government to buy a site for a public building there?

Mr. MONK. There were negotiations for the purchase of a site but the item has been left out of the main estimates and I think those negotiations will have to be suspended under these circumstances.

Mr. CHISHOLM. (Inverness). Would it not be possible for the minister to purchase a site before the 31st March? The grant will not expire before then.

Mr. MONK. It might be done.

Mr. CHISHOLM. (Inverness). An engineer of the department was there last year, he looked over several sites and got prices and, I understand, reported in favour of purchasing a site owned by Mr. Bain. This engineer was not influenced by myself or any one else in making that selection. The selection was acceptable to the community and the price reasonable, the lowest price at which you could buy property of the importance of this property. It is the best site for this purpose in the town. Port Hawkesbury is a thriving town with a fine fishing industry with a most promising future in store for it. It now has a prosperous population of 2,000 and prospects of a large increase in the near future. I trust, therefore, that the minister will see that this site is purchased, if the Bain site is not eligible for any reason, better known to the minister, let him select another site, and let the property be bought. Since the appropriation is there, provided by the late government, it is too bad not to go on and buy a site and erect that public building with as little delay as possible. I ask the minister to take it into consideration and, if possible, purchase a site before March 31, and have included in the supplementary estimates an item sufficient to erect a respectable building.

Mr. MONK. I would be glad to take the matter up at any time with my hon. friend. I cannot give him an absolute promise—that the site will be purchased. I understand there is no absolute agreement as to the site, but I am not very sure about that. As soon as these estimates are disposed of I will be glad to take the matter up with the hon. gentleman, but I cannot give an absolute promise because, of course, I alone cannot conclude a transaction. I shall give every consideration to what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. CHISHOLM. (Inverness). I asked the minister the other day for some information with regard to the dismissal of the caretaker at the Inverness public building. The minister was good enough to promise he would bring down the necessary information before the discussion of the Nova Scotia items.

Mr. MONK. I noted what my hon. friend had asked me in regard to Mr. McLennan. There was a complaint against Mr. McLennan of interference in politics and he was dismissed on that account.

Mr. CHISHOLM. (Inverness). Who made this complaint?

Mr. MONK. The recommendation for the dismissal was made by the defeated candidate, Mr. Gallant, because of his interference in politics. Now that there are investigators named, if my hon. friend wishes for an investigation he can have it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I would be glad if the minister would be kind enough to give this man a chance to show his innocence because I am convinced he is innocent, and that he did no more than exercise the right of every citizen. He voted as he saw fit. I am very glad that the minister has agreed to have his case investigated. While I am at this I might refer to another case, that of the general repairer of telegraph lines in Inverness county. He was notified some time ago that he would be dismissed. The minister was kind enough to give him the privilege of having his case investigated. I would suggest that pending this investigation Mr. Kennedy be allowed to remain in his office. If he is innocent I assume that the minister will see that he is continued in his position and if he is guilty it will be time enough for him to be dismissed when his guilt is actually proven. If the minister will be kind enough to allow this man to remain in office until such time as the government's agent will investigate the case I will be very glad.

Mr. MONK. I will consider my hon. friend's request and I think it should be considered. I would like to have some further reason urged for an investigation in the first case to which he has referred. We are trying to make these investigations at as little cost as possible but still there are several of them and they involve considerable expense. Therefore, if my hon. friend will confer with me and show some probable cause for investigation I will be very glad to grant one. As to the second case, I will give my hon. friend's request my best consideration. I do not know the details but I will find them out to-morrow morning.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I will be very glad to confer with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to understand the plan of the minister not only in regard to this case but in regard to a large number of cases throughout Nova Scotia and the country generally. His plan appears to be to dismiss the official first and investigate afterwards. I would like to know what the result of these investigations will be. Will he restore the official to his former position if it turns out that he is innocent and that the charge laid against him by the defeated candidate is shown to be incorrect? There is not much use in our asking for these investigations if they do not bring about some result, and if the minister will say that it will be his policy to restore a party to his former position if it turns out that there is no ground for the charge, there would then be some purpose in carrying on these investigations. The expense would be incurred for no purpose whatever unless that was done.

Mr. MONK. In case it were established by an investigation that the department had made a mistake I consider that it would be the duty of the government to provide some indemnity in the shape of occupation, at any rate, for the party who had been treated unjustly. That would appear to me to be the fair and just course. Last night I think I established that in 1896 the proceedings were of a far more summary nature and I quoted a number of cases in which the dismissal took place without any denunciation whatever and without any investigation. We have progressed since that time and we have no dismissal, without a denunciation, which the minister has to appreciate, and, if an investigation is found to be, prima facie, just, it is granted. We are, therefore, advancing towards a higher civilization. But, if upon investigation, it is established that there has been a failure of justice, I think the duty of the department should be to do its best to make amends to the party who had been dismissed. There is a case to which my hon. friend referred the other night and in connection with which he stated that he had written and had received no answer. I expressed the opinion that I must have mislaid or not received the letter of my hon. friend, but I find that I received it and immediately referred it for information in the department. My organization was not very good at that time, it is not very good yet, but on receipt of the letter I referred it at once to the officers of the department for information. The information was not sent to my hon. friend but I have it at his disposal.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Does the minister purpose to grant an investigation into the case of Mr. Sutherland of Canso, that I wrote him about?

Mr. MONK. In the case of Canso, if the hon. gentleman has a fair ground for investigation, it will certainly be granted. There is an investigator named for the purpose, and if there is any kind of allegation that the person named has not had justice rendered, an investigation will take place.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I cannot understand how a ground can be established by a defendant who does not know what the charge against him is. In so far as Sutherland is concerned I am not able to find out if any charge was made against him. How is Sutherland to show that he has the right to a trial unless there is something specific? The minister has adopted a very curious method and it does not strike me that it is in accordance with the usual principles of British justice that the defendant should be told to show ground why he ought to have a trial. The principle that I have been accustomed to is that the defendant is innocent until some one lays a charge against him and tnen, if he knows what the charge is, justice requires that he shall have an opportunity of answering it. That does not seem to be the method of my hon. friend at all. Some secret charge is laid against the official by somebody and on that secret charge my hon. friend dismisses the official. Then he comes to us and says that if this man can show fair ground for a trial he will give him a trial and if it turns out that he has not done anything wrong he will compensate him. That is an extraordinary method. I do not think we have made much progress during the last few years if that is the best we can do. I should think the minister should commence at the other end, he should first notify the man that a charge has been made against him of some kind and ask him to appear and stand his trial and if nothing is proven he should allow him to remain in his place. This is a practical case and I want to know how I am to deal with it. What am I to do as representing Mr. Sutherland? How am I to convince the minister that Mr. Sutherland has the right to a trial? He does not seem to be willing to give it to him unless I show him that he has a right to it. Every man has a right to a trial who is accused of anything. The minister ought to be frank enough to say he will give him a trial and that if he is found innocent he will put him back in the position of which he was unjustly deprived.

Mr. MONK. The procedure indicated by my hon. friend is the procedure which we conceive as a general rule to be the proper one. I do not know if my hon. friend was here last night when we were discussing this question. I gave a number of instances of cases that occurred in 1896, when the method of dismissal was that one with this addition that there was no charge at all. Information as to the party who recommended the discharge was generally refused.

I gave instances last night of several discharges in my own constituency in 1896, and the then minister told me that the dismissals had been made on representations of members from the city of Montreal. There was no charge and no investigation. I have some cases in which Mr. Blair told me that he did not think it his duty to give the information as to who had made the complaint or as to who had recommended the man who took the place of the man discharged. An advance has been made, for if there is a denial of the offence an investigation is granted.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Has the minister the Sutherland papers on his desk?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Would he be kind enough to show me the papers?

Mr. MONK. I will send them over to my hon. friend.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). The minister has been good enough to promise that an investigation will be held into the case of Mr. Kennedy. Now, Mr. Kennedy is no doubt at home attending to his business and some fine morning the investigator will turn up and Mr. Kennedy will not have an opportunity of knowing what the charges are.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Kennedy will be given the charges against him whenever he asks for them, and I suppose when the investigator holds his investigation Mr. Kennedy will have these charges before him.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I understand that this man will give Mr. Kennedy due notice that he will investigate certain specific charges.

Mr. MONK. Certainly.

Mr. MACDONALD. There is a matter of some importance to my constituency and to the whole province of Nova Scotia, to which I would direct the attention of the minister. I speak of the proposition for the deepening of the East river in Pictou county to the town of New Glasgow. Some years ago a very important deputation representing the business interests of that community, which is one of the most advanced industrial centres in the maritime provinces, came to the then Minister of Public Works and sought the aid of the government to deepen this river with a view of enabling New Glasgow to have water connection for larger steamers which would bring natural products in

and manufactured products out. As the result of the representations made by that delegation, the then minister had the suction dredge 'Northumberland' built and it has been working there ever since and has done splendid work. One of the difficulties experienced in government dredging in the maritime provinces is the expense of carrying away the dredged material to deep water, but the construction of the 'Northumberland' obviated this expense, and she is probably the best investment in dredges that the government has ever made. A large amount of dredging has been done by the 'Northumberland' during the last three years and the late minister had in contemplation the continuance of the operations by the removal of rock in a narrow part of the river. The late minister placed in the estimates last year a preliminary vote of $25,000 to let a contract for the removal of the rock which cannot be removed by the dredge. That vote, unfortunately, has not been repeated in the main estimates. I would say to the minister that of all the expenditures which are being made in the maritime provinces none will open up greater commercial possibilities than the completion of this work. I know that the attention of the minister has been already called to the matter, and with the same emphasis that I pressed the matter on the attention of the late government I press it on his attention now. The completion of this work will be of immense advantage to the industrial community there and incidentally to the whole country. Before the supplementary estimates are brought down I hope the minister will familiarize himself with the details and if he does I have no doubt he will place a vote in the estimates for the prosecution of this work to completion.

Mr. MONK. I have given some consideration to the completion of this work on the East river and it commends itself favourably to me. The channel needs deepening and straightening for seven miles, four miles of which has been already done and in the expectation of its completion large industries have been erected at Trenton about a mile and a-half from where the present work ends. I think the whole work when fully completed will cost considerably over $300,000. I have a great desire to continue the work this year, at any rate as far as Trenton. The dredge has been constructed specially for that purpose, but she cannot of course do the rock-work, and that will entail an expenditure of $25,000 or more. The work is a necessary one. I will endeavour to have it continued this year if possible, at any rate for that mile and a half which would enable vessels to go to Trenton. I will do my best in that regard.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). There is an important matter to which I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). I refer to the dredging of Antigonish harbour. Instructions were given a year ago or more to have a survey made of that harbour. I am not sure whether the local engineer's report has been received by the department. It had not, a very short time ago. I may say, however, that I received a report from the Department of Mines a few days ago, and read therein a very interesting statement from Mr. Jameson, an engineer of Nova Scotia, concerning the immense deposits of gypsum at the mouth of the Lower South river and along the north side of Antigonish harbour. For this gypsum there is a ready market in the United States and in Canada. And all that is necessary to ensure the development of these deposits is to have the harbour dredged. The development of this industry is prevented because the railway freight rates are too high if the gypsum has to be shipped from Antigonish or South River to Mulgrave by the I.C.R. and then by steamer from the Straits of Canso. Mr. Jameson pointed out that if Antigonish harbour were dredged, this property, which is very valuable and for which there are good prospects of development if facilities were given for shipping, would mean the establishment of an industry of great benefit to that locality. I call attention to this so that the minister may, when the report comes in from his engineer, make some provision for the dredging. No doubt he will be making up his dredging estimates in a short time, and I would draw his attention to this work in particular. I desire to also ask the hon. minister if he has brought down the papers in connection with the dismissal of Captain Decoste, which were ordered by this House a fortnight ago?

Mr. MONK. I brought those papers down to-day. As regards the harbour at Antigonish, I shall give my hon. friend's observations every possible consideration. The demands for public works are of course very great, and it is difficult to satisfy them all, however reasonable they be. The estimates for dredging are very considerable, and the government would not be justified in granting all the demands until we have occasion to go into the organization of our dredging and see what improvements can be made, but I shall give careful consideration to my hon. friend's request.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am very much obliged to the hon. minister for the informa-

tion I have received from the return he has handed me. No doubt he intended that I should make use of the documents, as they are public property. I find that the charge against this man is as follows:

Canso, Nov. 6, 1911.

To the Hon. L. P. Pelletier, M.P.,
Postmaster General.

I hereby make application for the position of janitor of the post office at Canso, N.S., now held by Roderick Sutherland. Mr. Sutherland has been an active Liberal partisan, and was a worker for the Liberal candidate at the recent as well as previous elections. I beg respectfully to ask for his dismissal.

Yours truly,
GEORGE A. PYCHE.

Charles Lohnes, President,
Liberal-Conservative Association.
J. J. McKENZIE, Secy.

Hon. L. P. Pelletier, M.P.,
Postmaster General, Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to recommend the above name, George A. Pyche, as a fit and capable man for the position of janitor of post office at Canso, N.S.

G. A. R. ROWLINGS,
Liberal-Conservative Candidate for Guysborough county.

I wish also to read a letter dated Nov.8, 1911, from Sydney, N. S., written by Mr. Rowlings:

To the Hon. L. P. Pelletier, M.P.,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—The inclosed statement of Mr. Pyche as to Mr. Roderick Sutherland, who holds the position of janitor in the post office at Canso, N.S. You will note that this statement is supported by the officers of the Conservative Association at Canso. I beg to say that Mr. Pyche is a reliable person and that his statement as to Sutherland may be relied upon in the premises.

Yours very truly,
G. A. R. ROWLINGS,
Liberal-Conservative candidate,
Guysborough Co.,
September, 1911, election.

I wish to point out to the hon minister, in the first place, that the man who made the complaint against Mr. Sutherland is the one who is applying for his job. Mr. Lohnes does not make any complaint, or Mr. Rowlings, although they penned their names to the complaint made by Mr. Pyche. The very first thing which Mr. Pyche writes is that he is applying to be appointed to the position of janitor at the post office in Canso. He does this before he says anything about Sutherland's conduct. Evidently he found it necessary in some ways to get rid of Sutherland before he got in himself, and so he accuses him of being a political partisan. I submit that this is a very weak case. I understood the hon. minister to say that he required a certificate of some kind, either from the defeated or the elected candidate, but in this case we have not any such evidence. We have not even got Mr. Rowlings' certificate, who was the defeated candidate. He speaks of Pyche as a reliable man, but does not venture to say that Sutherland was guilty of anything at all himself. I submit that that is altogether too weak a case for a minister to act on without investigation. On a statement given by the applicant for the place, he gave this caretaker and his family five days to get out from their residence in the post office, at the beginning of winter. He turned this man and his family out on the street without even asking for any evidence from Mr. Pyche as to what he was guilty of. Mr. Sutherland was given no investigation at all. He should have been told at least what he was charged with. It is very easy to make a general statement that this man was an active partisan, but surely the minister ought to insist on having something more. I question whether Pyche or any one else could point to any offence which Sutherland has committed. I know Mr. Sutherland very well. I know that he is an inoffensive, quiet man. I have no doubt that he voted for me, but I would be surprised if Pyche or any one else could prove an offence against him of any kind. The minister said that we have made some progress since 1896. I do not think we have. The best argument my hon. friend has is this: You were rotten in 1896 and we are going to be rotten now. That is the only argument he has given us ever since we started to discuss this question. I drew the attention of my hon. friend before to the fact that we expected something better after 14 years of promises by my right hon. friend the leader of the government. The very first appearance of the right hon. gentleman in public life in this country, his first speech in this House, had to do with this question of Civil Service reform, and he made a very broad and generous speech. No doubt the attitude of the First Minister at that date has had a good deal to do with the fact that officials thought they were at liberty to be a little freer than they were before, because the right hon. gentleman said on that occasion —I have already quoted his deliverance in this House—that he would not only permit an officer of the government to vote against the government that employed him, but would permit him to speak on the platform at public meetings, provided he did so in a gentlemanly way and was not offensive.

I have no doubt that many men serving the government throughout the country, knowing that that was the attitude taken by the right hon. leader of the government, felt that they were at liberty not only to vote but to do more. It strikes me that he has misled a good many men by taking

that attitude. Not only on that occasion, but in the numerous manifestos which he has issued in the various elections that have taken place since 1896, he has pledged himself to Civil Service reform—that he would appoint officers not for partisan considerations, but on merit, that politics was to have nothing to do with it. These were the principles on which he received the votes of the people; and after 14 years of his preaching that kind of doctrine throughout Canada, we are now to be told that we are to be guided by the old principles that we acted on 14 or 15 years ago. It seems to me that we ought to have made some progress since that time, but I do not think we have made any. I submit that under the circumstances, Mr. Sutherland is entitled to an investigation. There is no evidence in that letter on which any man in a British country ought to be convicted, and the minister, if he wants to do what is fair and right, will give this man an investigation, and if there is no proof of any active partisanship on his part, he will put him back in the place from which he was dismissed.

Mr. MONK. I stated that I thought there had been some progress, and I believe there has been. In 1896, men were dismissed without any complaint, almost without the intervention of the minister. There are cases recorded in 'Hansard' in which Mr. Blair will be found to have stated that dismissals had taken place before the matters had come to his knowledge. There was also in 1896 a refusal to grant any investigation. I mentioned at that time a few cases that were familiar to me. I will just refer to two as examples. Here is a question which I put, which will be found on page 2410 of 'Hansard' of 1897:

1. How long has Joseph Sauvé, lately bridgemaster No. 5 bridge, Côte St. Paul, Lacnine canal, been in the employ of the government?
2. Why was he dismissed on the 30th April last?
3. Was there any complaint against him, and by whom?
4. Who was named bridgemaster in his place, and by whom was the new nominee recommended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Joseph Sauvé, lately bridgemaster, bridge No. 5, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, has been employed during the season of navigation since the 1st of May, 1878. His services were dispensed with at the request and on the representations of the members of parliament for Montreal district; the department did not receive any written complaint against Sauvé. Joseph Archbierre was appointed bridgemaster in place of Joseph Sauvé.

Here is another one:

1. How long has Joseph Deschamps, lately lockmaster, No. 4 lock, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, been in the employ of the government?
2. Why was he dismissed on the 30th of April last?
3. Was there any complaint against him, and by whom?
4. Has he been replaced by one Adolphe Fichaud, of St. Henri, brother-in-law of the member for Hochelaga?
5. Who recommended the new lockmaster for nomination?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Joseph Deschamps, lately lockmaster at lock 4, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, has been employed during the season of navigation since the 1st June, 1873. His services were dispensed with at the request and on the representation of the members of parliament for Montreal district, no written complaint was lodged in the department. Adolphe Fichaud was appointed lockmaster in his place.

The book is full of such declarations. I could give my hon. friend one statement of Mr. Blair in which he took the ground that the government considered that public employees occupied their positions during pleasure, and that the government was not obliged to communicate to parliament confidential representations made to it in regard to those employees. Although this case is not as strong a one as I have seen, there is a direct, open, public denunciation by a man known in the place, and I am informed, although I do not know him, that he is not such a peaceable man as my hon. friend says, but a very strong partisan, and that would be established by an investigation. If my hon. friend wishes for an investigation, it will take place.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish the minister to note that the dismissal he has cited was at the instance of the members of parliament from the Montreal district. I would say that was a very strong case. If any official is so offensive that he is indicted by a number of members of parliament, he should surely be turned out of office. I would not complain if a member of parliament stated on his honour that Mr. Sutherland had been guilty of anything.

Mr. MONK. Would my hon. friend have found it a very good answer if I had said that this man had been dismissed on the request of the members of parliament from Nova Scotia?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, if the members from Nova Scotia, or any one of them, will father this thing and accept the responsibility for it and say they are prepared to defend it on the floor of parliament, that is all I would ask. But that is not what we have got. We have an office-seeker, a man who is looking for the job, simply making the statement that this man was an active Liberal.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am a little surprised at the attitude of the hon. gentlemen opposite regarding dismissals, in view of their record since 1896. Why, Sir, at one time

200 men were dismissed in the province of Manitoba in one day. There was no investigation. When the man came back and asked why they were dismissed, they were told they were not wanted; that is all the satisfaction they got. The man who represented Selkirk at that time, Mr. Macdonell, after having been a party to some outrageous dismissals, stated on the floor of the House that he believed that the policy of the government was a good policy—to the victors belong the spoils.

That is the language he used in this House, and that it was cheered by hon. members opposite. I do not take that position; the party in power has not taken that position. But when officials become active partisans during the campaign, hon. gentlemen opposite ought not to complain if this government dismisses them.

Mr. CARROLL. What has been the wail of the hon. gentlemans' precious leader for the past fifteen years in regard to this matter?

Mr. BRADBURY. It is well enough for hon. gentlemen opposite to try to hide behind what has been said on this side, but they must be prepared to take the medicine they have given their opponents for fifteen years. The hon. member for Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) in reading these letters said that nobody had asked for this man's dismissal except the man who wanted the position. And he read the letter from the defeated candidate. I think that letter is a complete indorsation of the charge made by Mr. Pyche.

Here is the letter, it speaks for itself, and shows that the hon. member for Guysborough has not treated the House fairly:

To the Hon. L. P. Pelletier, M.P.,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—The inclosed statement of Mr. Pyche as to Mr. Roderick Sutherland, who holds the position of janitor in the post office at Canso, N.S. You will note that this statement is supported by the officers of the Conservative Association at Canso. I beg to say that Mr. Pyche is a reliable person and that his statement as to Sutherland may be relied upon in the premises.

Yours very truly,
G. A. R. ROWLINGS,
Liberal-Conservative candidate,
Guysborough Co.,
September, 1911, election.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The defeated candidate makes no statement of his own; he simply says that the other man's statement may be relied upon.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is only splitting hairs; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) knows that it is quibbling. The charge is made by one man, and the defeated candidate endorses that charge by telling the minister that the man who makes it can be relied upon in the statement he makes regarding Sutherland. So, I submit this official has been dismissed on the recommendation of the defeated candidate who had the evidence. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) himself was willing that an official should be dismissed on the word of a member of this House, because the member took the responsibility. But if a candidate has been defeated through the work of partisan officials and writes a letter taking the full responsibility of asking for their dismissal, I hold that the hon. minister is justified in making that dismissal. The member for Guysborough dares not disagree with this. I am not in sympathy with some of the investigations the government are giving. They are showing too much consideration for hon. gentlemen opposite. For fifteen years there was a complete weeding out of Conservatives occupying positions in the public service from the Atlantic to the Pacific their places being filled with Liberals. And now, because these men are being removed for partisanship, hon. gentlemen opposite raise a howl to save them. For my part, I hope the government will have courage enough and will be fair enough to their friends to punish every official who has been guilty of partisanship.

Mr. SINCLAIR. In what I said I raised two points in regard to this case. The first was that there was no evidence against Mr. Sutherland, except the evidence of an interested witness which would not be taken in any court of justice in any British or other civilized country. The sole evidence is that of a witness who is interested so much that if he does not succeed in this application he will be out of a job. The defeated candidate, and these other gentlemen who have put their names down, do not venture to say that they know anything about the case. The other point I raised was with regard to the attitude of the leader of the hon. gentlemen opposite for fourteen years on this matter, and the results of it all to-day. And I submit that neither of these points has been answered.

Mr. PELLETIER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) consider it sufficient ground for the dismissal of an officer that a member of the House had written saying that he had been credibly informed that the official was an offensive partisan?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will produce the record of a case in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair), did that himself.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think the hon. minister can do it.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will do it as soon as you like.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Do it now.

Mr. PELLETIER. The case is that of the postmaster at East Roman Valley.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Do it now.

Mr. PELLETIER. Do these hon. gentlemen wish me to go to the department now and get the files? I do not know how it is in Red Deer, but in Ottawa the department is closed at five o'clock. But I have given the name of the post office—that of East Roman Valley.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is the only official with whose dismissal I had anything to do during the eight years I have been in this House. If the Postmaster General will bring down all the papers, he will find that there was proof of the statements made. I hope he will be fair enough to bring the whole record, including the declarations and affidavits. He will find that the action was taken, not on what I said, but on the proof that was given.

Mr. PELLETIER. The hon. gentleman asked for the dismissal of the postmaster, and a petition was filed, and was referred to him, and the hon. gentleman wrote that he had been informed that the official had done this or that, and on his letter the man's head was cut off.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I have not hitherto taken part in this debate on dismissals, but I have been compelled to listen to what seems to me an idle, and useless discussion intended to be in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite. I might, if I chose, give cases of dismissal by the late government in the riding of West Kent, which I had, at one time, the honour of representing in this House. Dismissals were made in that riding, not by the dozen but forty or fifty of them. I have in mind, particularly, one case, Mr. Dunn, the janitor of a post office. Concerning this gentleman I can give my word of honour that he had not the faintest idea of entering into politics for either side. He had a crippled son depending on him for support. Yet he was dismissed practically at a day's notice. This dismissal was made at the instance of Mr. Campbell, who formerly represented Kent. I could take up the time of the House for the next two hours in giving facts about other dismissals by hon. gentlemen opposite after their accession to power in 1896.

As representing Comox-Atlin, the first Conservative who has ever represented that constituency, I would say that the officials throughout the length and breadth of that great constituency are and were controlled by a Liberal machine. They acted as returning officers, stumped the country and used every means possible to defeat me in that riding. Yet I have shown sympathy for these officials for I know that the late government held the club over them in many cases and compelled them to act in this way, and that they would not have acted in this way if the club had not been held over them. I have listened with disgust to our friends opposite. If they have any regard for the remaining officials throughout the different constituencies, they will discontinue this discussion. If not, I shall make many recommendations for dismissals of Liberal appointees in the great constituency of Comox-Atlin.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What is the minister's decision; will he give an investigation in the case of Mr. Sutherland?

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will give some good grounds for holding an investigation it will be granted.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What grounds?

Mr. MONK. I would like him to give an allegation that he has not meddled in politics and is not guilty of these offences.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Do I understand that the minister requires a letter signed by Mr. Sutherland that he has not meddled in politics or is not guilty of being an active partisan ? I cannot undertake to sign a letter about him, I have not got much knowledge.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend told me there was absolutely no ground for his dismissal. If my hon. friend has no objection to putting that on record in the department it will receive consideration.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am informed there is no reason for his dismissal.

Mr. CHISHOLM. (Antigonish). It seems to me that the attack on the government is more severe from that side than from this. The hon. members opposite recognize that the government are weak-kneed and vacillating and have not risen to the high ideals they expressed while in opposition. What we complain of is that we cannot get anything definite from the minister or from his government. If he is going to act on the principle that to the victors belong the spoils, as hon. gentlemen opposite advocate, we would like to know that. If hon. gentlemen would say:- We are going to make places for our friends wherever we can find places, and will decapitate every Liberal if we can find any excuse whatever for doing so, we are not going to be concerned about nice distinctions but we are going to take the animal by the horns and turn out a Liberal wherever there is a chance to do so and put in a Conservative. If they would say that we would know where we are at. What we object to is the professions of honesty and sympathy and fair play which hon. gentlemen opposite and the ministers make—professions

which conduct does not justify. What does it all mean? Suppose the Liberals were wrong in 1896 and were guilty of injustice, is that a reason why the Conservative party of to day should continue in that wrongful course? If so, let them say so. They have put themselves on record as being opposed to wholesale dismissals. They have professed higher ideals than that. Why do they now say, we will first dismiss the man if anybody makes what appears to be a charge against him and then will try him and if an injustice has been done, we will reinstate him. Let me say, very few of those who have been dismissed will be reinstated, investigation or no investigation. I happened to get the papers in connection with Captain Peter Decoste. I do not find that the defeated candidate made any charge against him of offensive partisanship. I do not find that any representation came from the county to which Decoste belongs. I do find letters from T. Gallant, and others asking that Decoste be dismissed and Captain Daniel Gillies of Port Hawkesbury be appointed. There is a sort of stereotyped letter signed by different parties asking for this change. These men were frankly acting on the principle laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite. They were manly about it, they said we want Decoste fired to make a place for Gillies a good Conservative, dismissed in 1896. There is not a hint or insinuation of any kind against Decoste. It is not alleged that he was an offensive partisan and it is not stated whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative, but all through the letters runs the word: 'We want Captain Decoste out of the way in order to make a place for Gillies'. What about Gillies? They, the minister's advisers in this matter say that he was dismissed in 1896 for absolutely no reason except that he favoured the Conservative party. In other words, they say he was a Conservative partisan in 1896 and yet they are going to replace this partisan. I do not see the difference whether a partisan is a Liberal or a Conservative if partisanship is to be a ground for dismissal. They asked that Gillies take the place of Decoste against whom no charge is made, for no other reason than because Gillies was a Conservative partisan. It is stated in one letter that he was dismissed because he was a Conservative and for no other reason. That is the letter of William Macdonald, President of the Pictou Conservative Club. There is also a letter from the Conservative Club of Inverness. They allege that Gillies was dismissed because of partisanship. As a matter of fact, he was continued in the service after 1896. He was mate on one of the dredges, I think the 'George Mackenzie', and was continued right up to the time of the last elections and afterwards. As a matter of fact, Captain Gillies was working on the government dredge 'George Mackenzie' the greater portion of the time the late liberal government was in power and on the eve of the elections. I have nothing against him. So far as I know he is a competent man and a good seaman, but he was rather unfortunate in his experience as a Captain. As I pointed out the other evening, he lost one of the dredges with its equipment and under his control there was a great deal of damage by an accident in another case, $9,000 to $12,000, and since his appointment on October 24, he ran the dredge 'Cape Breton' ashore. Or some accident occurred to the dredge under his charge at a serious loss to the country. It may be that this was simply his misfortune. One man who writes to the minister as shown by the correspondence brought down on this subject says that Captain Decoste has had no experience. That man did not know what he was talking about. Captain Decoste is a navigator of 25 years experience, holding the most complimentary certificates. He has had experience in the command of dredges and tug boats and is absolutely competent in every respect. No one who knows the facts or values the truth, will insinuate that he has not had experience and is not a competent and capable official. Why does not the minister come down clearly and explicitly and say: I dismissed Decoste because I wanted a place for Gillies who is no better than Decoste as far as the records show as an official but who is a good tory as it is represented to me and deserves well of our party.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Will the hon. member read the letter purporting to be from the Conservative Association of Inverness?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Yes. It would seem that there was concerted action and they did not lose very much time. We have letters dated October 12, October 16 and October 24. The president of the Conservative Association writes as follows:

Inverness, C.B., Oct. 12, 1911.

Hon. F. D. Monk,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa P.O.

Dear Sir,—The Liberal-Conservative Association of the county of Inverness, C.B., strongly recommend the dismissal of Capt. Decoste, of the dredge 'Cape Breton,' now in Cape Breton waters, and the appointment in his stead of Capt. Daniel Gillies, of Port Hawkesbury, C.B. Immediately after the coming into power of the Liberal government in 1896, Capt. Gillies, a man of many years experience, was summarily dismissed without any alleged cause ——

That is not true as I am informed.

—and Capt. Decoste, a man of no experience whatever——

That is absolutely false——

—appointed in his stead. We feel that justice requires the immediate appointment of Capt. Gillies to this command.

Very respectfully yours,
The Inverness, C.B., Liberal-Conservative Association.
(Sgd.) D. M. CHISHOLM, President.
(Sgd.) ANGUS R. McDOUGALL, Secretary.

Mr. BOYCE. I have not heretofore said anything in this House in regard to the question of dismissals. We have listened to a great many complaints from hon. gentlemen opposite, and I must confess that their cant and hypocrisy are absolutely beyond belief. Having been a member of this House for the short period of only eight years, I glance at the benches opposite and I see, from my hon. friend the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lemieux) down, the faces of hon. gentlemen who, when they occupied seats on this side of the House, stood up and, time after time, voted to retain in their offices men who were guilty of the most flagrant partisan acts and worse. I speak about the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Only for a month.

Mr. BOYCE. Yes, only for one month and some people think that a month too long.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is longer than being made Solicitor General in the press.

Mr. BOYCE. That is perfectly true and while my hon. friend occupied the office of Solicitor General I do not know that he was regarded as a shining light.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was there anyway.

Mr. BOYCE. What I was going to refer to was the manner in which the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries hurled his invectives at my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) last night in regard to what he termed the heartless dismissal of the postmaster at Sudbury.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman has not read 'Hansard,' or if he has read 'Hansard,' he does not understand French. There was no question of the dismissal of a postmaster at Sudbury.

Mr. BOYCE. I understood my hon. friend's statement. My hon. friend referred to the fact that there had been great numbers of the French Canadian race at Sudbury who had been deprived of their offices.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, my hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. PELLETIER. It can be explained. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) did not refer particularly to Sudbury, but he spoke about French Canadians being dismissed everywhere.

Mr. BOYCE. I had Sudbury in my mind and I will give my hon. friend, who is so solicitous for the French Canadian race when his party is in opposition, the facts as regards Sudbury. There was a postmaster dismissed at Sudbury, that gentleman was of the French Canadian race and he was dismissed from his office just as soon as hon. gentlemen opposite came to occupy the government benches after the election of 1896. Why was he dismissed? He was put out into the cold world, as my hon. friend said last night, with a family of eight children, a newly made widower without the present means of support, without investigation and for a practically unknown cause. When my hon. friend refers to the heartlessness of treating the French Canadian race in that way and to giving the succession of office to that race let me remind him that Mr. Fournier, who was dismissed at Sudbury, was succeeded by a gentleman of the name of Kelly, who, I do not think, belonged to the French Canadian race.

Mr. PROULX. Was he dismissed for partisanship?

Mr. BOYCE. There was no cause alleged.

Mr. PROULX. I understand that he was dismissed for some other reason.

Mr. BOYCE. If you will wait a moment you will hear of something more that will interest you and something in connection with your own vote. Let me further remind the hon. gentleman, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, of something in regard to the postmaster at Copper Cliff which was brought to the hon. gentleman's attention after he became Postmaster General. I see he recollects it right well. There was a petition signed by about 500 people of the town of Copper Cliff complaining of the wretched condition and mismanagement of the Copper Cliff post office.

Mr LEMIEUX. Was it a political offence?

Mr. BOYCE. They informed the Postmaster General that this postmaster had been away from his office for two years. Did the hon. gentleman take any action? He promised consideration and——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was it Kelly?

Mr. BOYCE. No, his name was not Kelly. I will tell the hon. gentleman his name because the name is written upon the records of the court. I pointed out upon the floor of this House to my hon. friend, who then occupied the position of

Postmaster General—and I had the record then in my hand—that W. C. Kilpatrick, the postmaster at Copper Cliff, had been found guilty and reported for corrupt practices in the election court in the famous 'Minnie M.' case at the Soo. I invited my hon. friend the Postmaster General, to look into this matter and to divest himself of the valued services of this gentleman. Did he do so? A year went by and I drew it to my hon. friend's attention again and he simply said that he would give it further consideration. Until the time that the hon. gentleman's party went out of power Mr. W. C. Kilpatrick was postmaster at Copper Cliff.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was there any deficiency in the office? Was the office well administered?

Mr. BOYCE. He was away for two years.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He had a deputy.

Mr. BOYCE. I have told my hon. friend —it is on record in the Post Office Department to-day and it is written on the pages of 'Hansard'—that he received a petition signed by about 500 residents complaining of the shameful and disgraceful service of the office and of the absence of the postmaster for two years, and drawing the fact to his attention that this man had been reported by the judges of the court of law for corrupt practices in an election. Yet, notwithstanding all this, he did nothing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There was never any charge of mal-administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, not against Mr. Kilpatrick. I remember the case perfectly well. I never made a dismissal while I was Postmaster General—never one dismissal.

Mr. PELLETIER. What?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) knows very well a friend of his, a man occupying a very high position in Quebec who had been for months and even years without going to his office. I was asked to dismiss him. The office was well managed.

Mr. PELLETIER. Who was that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Paquet, of Quebec. I never dismissed him.

Mr. PELLETIER. Does the hon. member say that he has not dismissed postmasters?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I dismissed one on the recommendation of Mr. Sifton on the principle of accepting a member's word. Mr. Sifton promised to defend my action if it were questioned in the House, and when Mr. Lake brought the matter up in the House, I looked in vain for Mr. Sifton, and I saw him in number 16. I reminded him that he had given his word of honour that he would defend the case, and Mr. Sifton refused to come into the House.

Mr. CROTHERS. Did you reinstate him?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. CROTHERS. Why not?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Because Mr. Sifton maintained what he had written in his letter, that the man was guilty of partisanship. Other than that I never dismissed a postmaster for political partisanship.

Mr. MONK. Sir William Mulock had put them all out before you got there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Minister of Public Works comes with his classical three cases in the county of Jacques Cartier in 1896. He stated time and again that we had dismissed the employees by hundreds in that county in 1896. Well, he has dismissed hundred of poor labourers in his department since the 21st September. In fact he has become quite bloodthirsty in his methods. Like Marat, who during the terror in France ruled Paris for a few months, he wants thousands of heads to purify the country. The Minister of Public Works has dismissed day labourers by the hundred.

Mr. MONK. The hon. member knows that is not the case.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He has dismissed hundreds of day labourers since the 21st of September, and finally when he saw that public opinion and the English press of Canada, the Toronto 'Telegram,' the Toronto 'Star,' the Montreal 'Gazette,' put him to shame, he has instituted a legal investigation and he has appointed a relative of his, Mr. Chauvin, to preside over the investigation.

Mr. MONK. The hon. member is absolutely mistaken. There are no dismissals in my department. I have appointed no relative of mine to the position of investigator, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is not Mr. Chauvin your relative?

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the minister say that Mr. Chauvin is not his relative?

Mr. MONK. Certainly he is not.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, the minister deserves to be one of the famous French terrrorists, he can deny anything, even his own blood.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. CROTHERS. I submit that is not a parliamentary expression and that the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) should retract.

Mr. MONK. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers), but I can assure him I can take charge of that myself.

Mr. BOYCE. Here we have the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), admitting that he took the word of Mr. Sifton, then a member of the Liberal party with him, to dismiss a postmaster on the ground of political partisanship, but when I, a member of the opposition on my responsibility as a member, told him that the postmaster at Copper Cliff who was a Liberal had been found guilty of political partisanship by the highest court, he sat there and refused to take action. The hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), is guilty of cant and hypocrisy of the worst description when on the mere statement of a member of his own party he dismissed a Tory postmaster, and at the same time refused to dismiss a Liberal postmaster in the face of a petition signed by 500 residents of the community, complaining of the miserable incompetency of the postmaster, of his absence for two years, and of the shameful condition in which that office was run. I told him that the highest election court in Ontario had found that postmaster guilty of corrupt practices, and the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), would not take that as sufficient evidence of political partisanship. Does the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), remember the case of Richard Wagner who was found guilty by the court of theft from poor immigrants coming to this country, whom he was appointed by the government to care for, and who having served his term in jail, was promoted to a high place by the Liberal government; does the hon. member recollect that he sat in this House and supported the promotion of this man in the service. All these things are written in the pages of 'Hansard,' and it is idle for the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), to indulge in pyrotechnic displays and pretend at righteous indignation when the records are so black against him. Does he recollect the case of the postmaster at Thessalon, and does he remember that he declined to take action in that case?

Mr. LEMIEUX. What was that case?

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. member has a poor memory for that case, but he can remember the poor Tory postmaster whom he dismissed on the recommendation of Mr. Sifton. I will tell him what the Thessalon case is. On the report of the post office inspector, the postmaster at Thessalon was found guilty of embezzlement, and the Postmaster General ordered his dismissal, but the postmaster at Thessalon was not dismissed. Let him look at the file in that case.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I want the file.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. member can have the file, and he can see all the facts about the case in the pages of 'Hansard' for 1905, 1906, 1907, and 1908.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What are the facts?

Mr. BOYCE. I have only got to the fact that the man had been found guilty of embezzlement and an order was given for his dismissal, and he was not dismissed and is there now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He was dismissed and his daughter was appointed.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I accepted his correction a few moments ago and he must accept mine now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am aware of the facts.

Mr. BOYCE. His daughter was not appointed but he was reappointed. His dismissal was not effected and he is there now, as postmaster of Thessalon, and I asked my hon. friend to take the matter up and he did not.

Mr. PELLETIER. Better write to me about it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Look at the file.

Mr. BOYCE. You can see the file and you can see the whole thing at a glance, and the House can judge what a miserable and pitiable position was taken by the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) in his attempt to defend that man. My hon. friend had the matter brought to his attention when he was Postmaster General but he did nothing. Why? Because the postmaster was shown to have been, at the time the fiat was issued to dismiss him, politically active in a partisan manner, very active in the provincial and Dominion elections, and therefore was kept in his place in spite of his embezzlement and misconduct, and in spite of the report of the inspector and the fiat of the Postmaster General.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would ask my hon. friend to put the case in the hands of the present Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). Let him take the file, and I will accept his verdict. My hon. friend knows that I would never have kept a thief as an officer in the postal service.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may remind hon. members that this debate is completely out of order.

Mr. BOYCE. By whom was it started. I am merely answering my hon. friend. In this connection, I want to tell him that he does not have to accept the verdict of the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) but by the rules of this House he should accept my statement.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would accept the decision of the Postmaster General on the case.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule requires that remarks in committee must be strictly revelant to the item under consideration. The item is Anderson Cove, breakwater extension.

Mr. BOYCE. With all due respect to your ruling, Sir, I think it might have been made a little earlier, because my hon. friends from Guysborough and Antigonish and Rouville have all been speaking about dismissals and the hon. member for Rouville waxed specially eloquent.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I wish to understand your ruling, Mr. Chairman. Is it irregular on the estimates to discuss at all the question of dismissal?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Not at all but we cannot discuss matters connected with the Post Office Department on an item for a breakwater.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Is it out of order on breakwaters to discuss any dismissals except those connected with the breakwater?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is the rule.

Arichat—retaining wall to protect government property, $600.

Mr. KYTE. Before that is carried I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works if he has any report with reference to the proposed construction of a breakwater at Charles Forest's cove in the county of Richmond, Nova Scotia. A sum was provided for the construction of that work in the estimates a year ago and tenders were called for, but I understand the contract was not awarded. A few days ago I put the following question to the hon. minister:

1. Has the contract for the construction of the breakwater at Charles Forest's Cove, Richmond county, N.S., been awarded?
2. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the work during the present year?
3. Have the deposit cheques of the unsuccessful tenderers been returned?

To which the minister replied:

1. No.
2. No; no amount has been provided therefor in next year's estimates.
3. All security cheques have been returned.

And I asked further whether the contract for the construction of the breakwater at Port Richmond had been awarded and whether it was the intention of the government to proceed with the work during the present year to which the minister replied:—

No; no amount has been provided therefor in this year's estimates.

Mr. BOYCE.

Before the item was put in last year's estimates, there was a report from the engineer of the department of Public Works, which no doubt justified the then minister in providing for the construction of this work. What additional information has the hon. minister had to justify him in dropping that item this year?

Mr. MONK. We very often have reports from our district engineers that certain works are useful, but we do not always find it possible to carry them out. In this instance we had a second report from the engineer of the district to the effect that the work was not of an urgent nature. As it is not urgent, I cannot give any promise that it will be carried out next year.

Mr. KYTE. How is it that the hon. gentleman selected this particular work to be the subject of a supplementary report from the government engineer?

Mr. MONK. I do not think that report came at my request or in my time. I did not ask for it.

Mr. KYTE. Has the hon. minister made reference to a report of last year previous to the item being placed in the estimates?

Mr. MONK. I think it was a report of last year. I can show it to my hon. friend if he wants to see it.

Mr. KYTE. Will my hon. friend be good enough to have that report when the estimates are next under consideration, and any correspondence he may have had with any parties with reference to that work?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend had better move for a return because I cannot bring all the reports down here.

Mr. KNOWLES. I wish to draw the hon. minister's attention to an announcement in the morning edition of the Moosejaw 'News' a Conservative paper. I wish to ask him if the announcement is correct. It has to do with the erection of an armoury in that city.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman's question is not relevant to the matter under discussion.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will send me the paper, I will give him the information.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would like to have it in 'Hansard.' The hon. minister might make a note of the question, and give the information on another occasion.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the necessity of extending the breakwater at Charlos Cove in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. That work was com-

menced some years ago, and is not yet completed. It is intended to afford protection for fishing boats, and is very much required. As it stands to-day, it is not of very much use, because it is not carried far enough into the harbour to afford proper protection. I mention it in the hope that the minister can see his way, if not this year, then next year, to make the necessary provision for extending that breakwater, so that the money that has already been spent upon it will not be unremunerative.

Mr. MONK. I will make a note of my hon. friend's request.

Blue Rocks Island, breakwater, $500.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I observe in the estimates for last year an item for Bayfield breakwater, $15,000. Of this $6,250 was voted before the dissolution of the last parliament, and the other $8,750 was voted since the present government came into power. I wish to ask the minister why this item has been dropped in the estimates of this year. This is a very urgent work. It was begun many years ago, and considerable money has been expended to make that a safe harbour. The longer the work is delayed the more inconvenience the people will suffer and the greater will be the liability of the harbour to fill with sand, necessitating more dredging.

Mr. MONK. The government did not see its way clear, in view of all the expenditures which it has to make to continue the work referred to by my hon. friend. But I will make a note of it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). On whose recommendation was the work discontinued? Did the engineer report that it was not urgent?

Mr. MONK. No, I do not think so.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Did the minister take the advice of anybody in respect of the work? What information did he get to justify him in dropping this item? To my mind it is very important that this work should go on, otherwise the money expended on it already is liable to be wasted.

Mr. MONK. We have to provide for important works this year in our large national ports in order properly to equip them for the trade and to keep the trade in Canada, and we found that we could not continue at this juncture the work which my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What special works are there at the national ports this year?

Mr. MONK. We have considerable works at all our ocean ports in conformity with the report of the Transportation Commission. We are undertaking considerable works at St. John, some at Halifax, and we hope to undertake some at Quebec. We have had urgent demands from the ports on the Pacific, and it is absolutely necessary for us to do some work there.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I do not minimize the importance of the ports to which the hon. minister has referred. But these small ports, insignificant as they may appear to him, are of great importance to the people who live in proximity to them. The exports at Bayfield for 1910, consisting of cattle, sheep, horses and agricultural products, amounted to $25,950, and the imports amounted to a considerable sum also. This information I take from a copy of a report made by the resident engineer of the Public Works Department at Antigonish a couple of years ago. It is from this port that the farmers of Antigonish county, and some from Guysborough county, ship their cattle and agricultural products to Newfoundland, and unless it is made available, they will have to ship by rail to Mulgrave, a distance of forty or fifty miles from Antigonish, and load their cattle on vessels there. Bayfield should not have been dropped out of sight without some reason. The minister should have consulted his engineer as to whether this was a port which he could neglect for a year or two without anybody suffering. I find that practically every item which was in the estimates of last year for the county of Antigonish, and provided for by the late government, has been dropped this year. The minister's own engineers reported that these works were necessary and proper. It happened that during the election campaign last fall, when a part of this money was available, it was not expended. In the first place an election was on, which might be considered good reason why public expenditures should not be made, it was not deemed advisable to go on with the work unless the whole of the money required for it was available. I say it is not fair to the county of Antigonish to be penalized because of the money that was voted, five-twelfths of the total amount was not used. I urge on the minister to remember this port of Bayfield when the supplementary estimates are being prepared, and to see that the extension of the breakwater goes on. I may tell him frankly that, as far as political reasons go, it would suit me if the work did not go on at all; but I look to the larger interests of the community, and in this matter politics should not count at all. It is my duty as the representative of the county to call attention to this important work and to urge the minister to provide for it in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. MONK. I will give my hon. friend's observations every consideration. He must not imagine that political considerations move us in these matters. My own county

has had none of the public works that I have asked for.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the wharf at Point Claire?

Mr. MONK. I owe that to a different man from what you are.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I rise to a point of order. This is not the language for this House.

Mr. MONK. It is the language that suits you.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am asking the hon. gentleman a courteous question. And I wish him to apologize now.

Mr. MONK. Oh, indeed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. And I will ask the chairman's decision.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The language, as I understand it, is not in accordance with the rules, and I hope the hon. minister will explain or apologize. At the same time, I will make the remark that the debate has been conducted from the beginning with too much of such language from one side as well as from the other.

Mr. MONK. I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, absolutely. Let me say to my hon. friend (Mr. Chisholm, Antigonish), that I will give the matter consideration. The work has been begun. I was stating a moment ago that I had been asked for post offices and other works in my own constituency under circumstances which seem to give justification for the demand. But the government have not been able to meet all demands. I will read in 'Hansard' what my hon. friend has said and will ask a report from the engineers.

Mr. CHISHOLM. (Antigonish). I have no doubt that when the report is made the hon. minister will see that the work is necessary.

Mr. KYTE. I would like to ask as to the work to be carried on at Little Anse. The contract was awarded last September, but I do not see an item in the estimates now before us. I presume that in cases in which a contract has been given the money will be provided for in the supplementary estimates. I should be glad if the minister could tell me that my understanding of the matter is correct.

Mr. MONK. I cannot say from memory whether the contract was awarded or not. But where a contract has been awarded and the work begun, the money will have to be provided whatever may be the opinion of the government.

Mr. KYTE. The work was not actually commenced, but I am given to understand that the contract is in existence.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the policy of the minister in regard to advertising for tenders in connection with these works?

Mr. MONK. Where the work is to cost over $5,000, tenders are usually called for. But where the district engineer reports that the work can be done better by day work, that plan is followed. In the case of breakwaters even it is sometimes found better to deliver the material during the autumn and winter and to complete the work in the spring.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work is sometimes more economically carried on in that way.

Mr. KYTE. I have a question to ask also with regard to an item in last year's estimates for a breakwater at Port Richmond. I asked the minister a question with regard to this a few days ago. I was told that the contract was not awarded, and in answer to the question: Is it the intention of the government to proceed this year? I received the answer: No; no amount is provided in next year's supplementary estimates. I would like to know if any report has been received by the department within the last few months having reference to the importance or otherwise of this undertaking?

Mr. MONK. I understand that we had a report, but I do not now believe that there was any allegation of urgency. If my hon. friend wishes to see the report, we will get it for him. The hon. gentleman must remember that I am not the supreme arbiter in these works. The officers make suggestions, and I bring my estimates to the government. But it is the government that finally decides on the estimates.

Mr. SINCLAIR. There is a similar case in Guysborough county, at New Harbour. The sum of $10,000 was provided in the estimates passed before the holidays for the extension of the breakwater there. And if I recollect rightly, tenders were advertised for, though I am not certain of that. It is a very important work. Prior to the erection of the present breakwater it was difficult to carry on fishing at all on that stormy part of the coast. But after the breakwater was built, a number of fishermen collected and built houses, and a thriving fishing village has grown up along that breakwater. The number of fishermen increased so rapidly that the breakwater was soon too small to shelter all their boats in a storm. I visited the place last year. There were about thirty boats there, only about half of which could get in behind the breakwater whilst the rest had to seek shelter elsewhere. I think the minister will find that the engineers were favourable to the extension, and that $10,000 was placed in the estimates for that

purpose. But I noticed it was not in the present estimates and I trust it will not be forgotten. If the amount is not re-voted in the supplementary estimates the work cannot be gone on with this year.

Mr. MONK. I will give this matter full consideration. A number of large items for Nova Scotia as well as for other provinces, and in many constituencies irrespective of politics were cut out. The Minister of Public Works must bring his report to council where the whole thing is considered by his colleagues. As I have said, a number of reductions were made in the estimates I brought down—very properly, no doubt. We had estimates for dredging that we had to reduce by half. Those whose demands are not satisfied must not lay the blame wholly on the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understand that. But this is the most important expenditure on that coast for a hundred miles. While other works might be dropped without great injury, this certainly should not be dropped.

Mr. MONK. I will consider it. But I notice a tendency on the part of members of the House to regard as the most important in the Dominion, the work that has been left out. It does not matter who the member is, that is what they tell us. It shows a praiseworthy zeal.

Mr. CARROLL. What is this extra amount at Burke's Head, northern Cape Breton, required for?

Mr. MONK. That is to complete a contract, to continue the breakwater now under contract at Burke's Head, as petitioned for by the residents.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There would seem to be a printing or clerical error here as the amount of the revote is stated to be larger than the vote now taken.

Mr. MONK. That must be an error made in the Finance Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume the experience of the minister has been not unlike that of previous ministers that it is easier to get through council items which pertain to counties where my hon. friend has supporters than where he has opponents.

Mr. MONK. Sometimes it is. But I must say to my hon. friend with absolute sincerity that there are cases where counties are represented by our own friends where it is very difficult to get what is thought sufficient.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Still my hon. friend used to condemn that very strongly. He used the words 'that there should be no question of party favour so far as public works are concerned.'

Mr. MONK. I think there ought not to be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is an excellent fighter and I suppose would present that very strongly to his colleagues and have that principle applied absolutely in reference to these estimates.

Mr. MONK I would like to.

Mr. STANFIELD. Look at the difference between Pictou and Yarmouth.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). It is pleasant to hear the minister admit that politicians may have had some influence on the government in the allotment of these works, but we are glad to hear of his desire not to have politics enter into such matters because we all know that he is eminently fair and magnanimous. However evil associations have undoubtedly influenced him. When I look at the long list of items dropped in the county of Antigonish then I must conclude that the minister felt that other counties had a stronger claim upon him and upon the consideration of the government and therefore those good Conservative friends in these various districts who have been expecting these works begun by the late administration to go on will have to take the stone instead of the bread and will have to be content with nothing this session. I admit that in new work the minister may have good reasons for delaying undertakings until some more opportune time when the 'hungry horde' is first satisfied, but when you have works already begun and practically completed, it would surely be a wise policy to spend the small amount of money required to complete them. The amounts for these little places in Nova Scotia amount in the aggregate to trifling sums in comparison with the large expenditures on other matters. The minister should be a little more generous in preparing his estimates in reference to these small matters. In the estimate for last year we found a number of works that were not new but works on which a small amount had been expended from year to year to maintain them and improve and make them more useful and these have been dropped. I shall read some of them. I have mentioned Bayfield where $15,000 was voted last year, none of which was utilized because as I said before, only five twelfths of the appropriation was available. At Breen's Pond some work was done but it is not of much practical use without a slight extension. I have no doubt there is a report from the engineer that a slight extension would be required to give the

fishermen enough water. It would not cost much to continue this work and thus afford a very much needed accommodation. At Cribbin's Point a small amount, $1,000, required to complete repairs to the wharf has been dropped. At Delorey's Beach a small amount was voted to carry on a contract for the erection of a breakwater to cost $14,000. The necessity of the work was clearly pointed out in the report of the engineer. But this is left where the present government found it. At Livingstone's Cove there is a provision of $2,000, the second item in Antigonish county that has not been dropped. At McNair's Cove for the extension and repairs to the breakwater wharf there was a vote of $5,400 but that has been dropped. This is an important port at which the subsidized steamer between Pictou, Antigonish and Inverness calls, and there is quite a good deal of fishing and trading done there, and the extension is a real necessity. Not even the appropriation made by the late government is however now available for improvments there. At Malignant Cove $1,341 was to be expended to complete the extension of the channel piers, but that has been dropped. The piers that are there will simply be wiped out before the fall storms are over. At McAra's Brook $991 was to be expended but this has been dropped. At Southlake, $4,000 was to be spent. Some money has been spent there since the change of government, some stones and material provided.

What are they going to do with all the stone which the faithful have hauled there since September 21? This really is an important work and I cannot understand how this item was dropped from the estimates by the minister. It would only have cost $2,000 or $3,000, I would have supposed, to have extended the piers so as to give plenty of water for the fishing boats and for the steamer that calls there at times, and also to save the opening or channel in the beach from filling in. As far as the South Lake work is concerned, I cannot understand why the minister has dropped it out of the estimates. I would ask him to state whether he proposes to have an item in the Supplementary Estimates for it. It is rather significant that in the whole county there are only two items. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) referred to Yarmouth and Digby, and I would ask the minister to institute a comparison and to observe the contrast. I looked over some of the counties represented by Conservatives, and I found that they are fairly well treated. I am not at all insinuating that they are treated too generously or that they are getting appropriations and advantages that they ought not to get, but I cannot understand the minister, finding these items in the old estimates and having no report from the engineer which would justify him in dropping them, no evidence to show that the work is not as necessary or urgent to-day as two years ago, dropping these votes without consulting somebody. If he does not choose to consult the representative of the county, he could consult those who give him advice in some other matters, for instance those who give him advice in the matter of dismissals. I would urge with respect to the items that I have referred to, that he make provision for them in the Supplmentary Estimates. All I ask is that he shall procure a report from the engineer and I am quite satisfied that the engineer will tell him that these works are just as urgent as they were a year or two ago and that they should be completed at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend must not imagine that a minister must have the authority of the district engineer to enable him to go on with the work. The minister decides that himself from what he knows the government will authorize him to spend in a locality. The minister has a certain sum which he knows he can spend and he is obliged to divide it as equitably as possible. I did not follow all that my hon. friend has said, but he spoke about McAra's Brook—

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). McNair's Cove.

Mr. MONK. Not McAra's Brook?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). No. I referred to McAra's Brook as one of the items that had been dropped.

Mr. MONK. Was that an urgent work?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I would not say that it was a particularly urgent work, but it is as urgent as it was a year ago. It would be a great convenience to the fishermen and the amount is very small.

Mr. MONK. The district engineer says in his report:

> Application was made to Mr. Chisholm, M.P., for the name of a foreman to expend the amount voted, but as no name was given the work was not undertaken.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). If a request of that kind was made on the eve of the election certainly I did not name any foreman because there was only five-twelfths of the grant available and the engineer was not desirous of going ahead with the work unless the whole sum was available. It would be a very unfortunate thing if, after an expenditure of five-twelfths had been incurred, no more work could be done for want of further funds

because the work which had been begun would be carried out to sea. I have no doubt that I did not make any recommendation on the eve of the election. I know that after the election the work was going on and and I was not asked to name a foreman. I know nothing at all as to who the foreman is, but I know money was expended then. The place was of sufficient importance after the 21st of September to justify the expenditure of what money was available.

Mr. MONK. It is impossible to suppose that a government coming into power would absolutely take all the estimates or all the works of improvement of the preceding government. There must be differences of opinion and these differences come out in the estimates.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). The minister refers to McAra's Brook. I do recall that there was a request made for a foreman down there but it happened that there was no road, no means for the public to get from the main road down to this wharf, although the wharf had been begun under the late Conservative administration. I refused to recommend a foreman until such time as the road was obtained.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to ask the minister if he takes the advice of the defeated candidate on his own side with regard to the requirements of constituencies as to wharves, breakwaters, and improvements of that kind.

Mr. MONK. We are glad to get advice but we are guided largely by the district engineer. We receive representations from all who make them.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). At an earlier date in the session I made inquiry of the Minister of Public Works regarding an expenditure of public money at Chester in the county of Lunenburg, and this is an instance in which the minister has allowed himself to be moved by improper influences. This is a public work, what is known as Chester canal and it is a cutting between the front and back of the harbour forming a small boat channel. The canal was supposed to facilitate the passage of boats from one harbour to another a distance of only a few feet. The expenditure of this money was commenced in the month of September, after the Dominion election. The provincial by-elections took place in Lunenburg and polling day was the 15th November. Two or three days, or possibly a week before polling day, on instructions from the department, work ceased and I have not the slightest doubt in the world that this was done upon representations of influential supporters of the Conservative party in Lunenburg that the continuance of this work during this particular period would operate against the Conservative candidate in the election. The work was stopped notwithstanding the fact that only $200 or $300 remained to be expended. That, in the first place, was small politics. Since then nothing has been done. At that time some money was due the men who were working on the canal for wages and up to this day they have not received all their claims. I do not propose to waste very much time over this, but I would like the minister to take it up. It is a case he cannot defend as the administration of his department. There was absolutely no excuse for the cessation of the work and there should not be any delay in the completion of it and the payment of such sums of money as are due the men for wages.

Mr. MONK. When I came to office I found a great many useless works being carried on and a very large number of men employed for whose services there was no necessity. When I saw the condition of things I gave a general order to stop, and it may be that in some cases the order operated unjustly. I will have much pleasure in looking into the work to which my hon. friend has referred. There is no doubt room for improvement in the harbour of Chester Cove, but I think the opinion of the sitting member is that the dredging as projected is not sufficiently deep. I will have a special report made by the District Engineer to see if anything can be done.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Some reason had to be given for stopping the work, I suppose, but in my opinion the work as contemplated is sufficient for the place. I trust the minister will at once take steps to pay these men for the work they performed last November?

Mr. KYTE. There were three items in the former estimates and omitted from these estimates which were for works of quite an important character, and I trust the minister will restore these votes in the supplementary estimates. I refer to the breakwater at Petit de Grat, the repairs to Poulamond wharf, and the improvement at Little harbour. The breakwater at Petit de Grat is in great disrepair and to preserve it money should be expended upon it at once. The Poulamond wharf is absolutely unsafe for handling freight, and vehicles cannot trust themselves upon the rotten covering. These are important works in the locality and a little money expended now would put them in repair. With respect to the Little harbour improvements a foreman was appointed last year and the lumber was purchased and conveyed to the site of the work. If the work is not

proceeded with this year that timber will be useless and considerable loss will be entailed on the department. I trust the minister will provide for these works in his supplementary estimates.

Mr. MONK. I will give the request of the hon. member consideration. I am told that the lumber can be stored and used in the work later. There appear to be very few constituencies in which I have given full satisfaction as regards expenditure. We can only do the best we can.

Mr. KYTE I am not criticising the action of the minister; I am simply calling his attention to these important works the repairing of which will not be costly. I may tell the minister that there are no facilities there for storing the timber and there is a chance of it being lost during storms, it is difficult to secure it in its present position.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister told us he found a great many useless works going on when he entered the department.

Mr. MONK. I found a great number of works going on under conditions of extravagant expenditure. I did not say useless works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I was going to ask him if he could assure the committee that the works in Nova Scotia, for which he is now asking us to vote money are of a useful character, and if not, which of them can be dispensed with.

Mr. MONK. I do not know that any of these works can be called useless works, but there are some more urgent than others. There are port improvements that are far more urgent than some of these small works, but that does not mean that the smaller works are useless. We are threatened at the present time with the loss of very valuable trade because our principal ports are not properly equipped, and I believe we could more or less delay some of the smaller works, unless they are absolutely urgent, so as to equip our great ports to enable us to keep trade in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman makes careful inquiry he will find there is a great deal of merit in everyone of these public works which were provided for in the estimates last year.

Mr. MONK. There were some useful works on which a great many men were employed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And in many cases it is better to employ a considerable number of men so as to hurry the work along. I have no doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will follow my good example, and will find that at proper times he can employ a considerable number of men to hurry along a public work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If there is any extravagant expenditure connected with any of these public works the minister has the power to stop it, and he should do so. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), has on many occasions in the past delivered speeches urging that the recommendations of the transportation commission should be carried out by the government. Does he intend to pursue that policy now that he is in office? If I remember well, the commissioners reported in favour of the nationalization of certain of our ports. Is my hon. friend going to select the national ports, and to declare his policy on the subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will pardon me, but I must again remind him of the rule restricting debate to the item under consideration.

Mr. CARROLL. There were a good many items last year for public works in South Cape Breton, Nova Scotia. There were a number of little breakwaters for which appropriations were made and for which we had voted five-twelfths of the estimates before the holidays. None of these are of great national importance, but each one is very materially important to the particular locality interested. For example, there was an appropriation of $1,000 for a wharf at Albert Bridge. Albert Bridge is on the Mira river, about 30 miles from a railway station and the river is the only means, outside of trucking 25 miles to the railway station, by which the inhabitants can send out their products to the Louisburg and Sydney Railway. This is only a small country place, and it is almost impossible for the people there to get their products out or bring merchandise in unless they have a wharf. Last year this riding was represented by a Conservative—a good man and a friend of my own— and he says he impressed on the government of that day the necessity of voting some money to build a wharf at that bridge. The House voted that amount but now I find the item dropped. I have the same thing to say concerning Gabarous Harbour. There was an estimate of $5,000 altogether for some extensions or protection work at that harbur. There was also an item for a wharf at Marion Bridge on the Mira river which is further up the river by about ten miles than the wharf at Albert Bridge. That also has been dropped. That is a large country district, and at present the people there have to wade into the water to meet a little steamer before they can put anything on board it. That is a great hardship, and I do not think the district engineer could have reported against either of those two

works at Marion Bridge or Albert Bridge. There was also an appropriation of $17,000 voted for a wharf at Mainadieu. In fact every item voted for that constituency has been dropped except a paltry $3,000 for completing construction work at Cow Bay and $5,000 for buying a sand bar at Sydney Harbour. The first vote that came down for Sydney Harbour was $25,000 but now that vote is reduced to $5,000. These are only small works and it was partially through the efforts of the former representative of that county that these items were put in the estimates and a part of them voted. It was really a hardship on these people that all these moneys should not be spent. Why they should have been dropped is something I cannot understand, and I am drawing to the attention of the hon. minister the necessity of going on with these works, and I trust that he will take the matter up. If these works could be attended at once especially those two little works on the Mira river, the hon. minister would be confering a great benefit on that locality.

Mr. MONK. I shall certainly give my hon. friend's remarks every consideration. In the case of Main-a-dieu, I brought an estimate down but the government did not accept it, as it threw out many estimates I endeavoured to have accepted. With regard to Gabarous harbour, I find a note in the report to the effect that on August the 7th instructions were given to proceed with the expenditure of the amount authorized, and to consult Dr. Arthur Kendall about the appointment of a foreman. Dr. Kendall was written to on August 8, but he did not reply, and consequently no further action was taken. I shall, however, make a note of my hon. friend's request.

Mr. CARROLL. With reference to Gabarous harbour my answer is exactly what was given by my hon. friend from Antigonish. Dr. Kendall did consult me at the time, but only a part of the amount appropriated had been voted, and as there was an election on, we did not think it a proper time to go on with the expenditure on public works, because that would look like vote catching. Dr. Arthur Kendall is not responsible for the foreman not having been appointed, but myself. We were both consulted, but we thought there was no use appointing a foreman then as the House would meet in a few months, and we thought it was of no avail to appoint a foreman at that time in order to expend five-twelfths of the estimate when the estimate itself was so small.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). A condition of affairs prevails, to some slight extent at least, in Nova Scotia, and possibly in other provinces, by reason of the fact that a few years ago or more, votes were passed by parliament and tenders asked for, and in some cases the lowest tender accepted, and the works have not been gone on with or the deposits refunded. The result is that in many cases the department now holds the moneys deposited by successful tenderers, and probably will hold them for a year or more, or possibly may not proceed with the work. I would like to suggest that in such cases the deposits of the lowest tenderers, which are still with the department, should be returned to the successful tenderer upon the understanding that should the department later on decide to proceed with the works, these tenderers would be asked to refund their deposits. That would be only fair, or else the department should allow interest on these deposits.

Mr. MONK. That would be fair enough, but we might decide to call for new tenders and not have accepted the first tender.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am referring to cases where the lowest tender was accepted. I know of three cases in Nova Scotia in which, before the present government came into power contracts were awarded in each case to the lowest tenderer, but the moneys for these works were not voted until 1912-13; and prominent friends of the government have approached the successful tenderers offering them a sum of money to assign to them their contracts. This is a very objectionable practice and places these persons in a very uncomfortable position. It makes them feel that influences are at work which will actually prevent them making contracts with the government; and if they had an understanding with such persons in the meantime, it would be an obstacle.

Mr. MONK. I would be obliged to my hon. friend if he would give me the facts of these cases. I know nothing of them.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I think the constituency which I have the honour to represent occupies a unique position in this regard, that whereas in the supplementary estimates brought down last year there were 14 or 15 works in that county provided for, in the present estimates there is just one item for a work in Inverness county. Will the minister be good enough to tell me what is being done in regard to that very important work, the Port Hood breakwater and harbour extension?

Mr. MONK. That is a work that has been going on for some time. It is under consideration. It is an important work, and we will endeavour to follow it up. But my hon. friend must not be too disappointed if a great many of these estimates have been struck out by the government. In the province of Ontario, notably on the Great Lakes, the estimates of the previous government have been cut in two.

I have been the object of very much reproach as to that. The present government has had to make large expenditures which I suppose were not foreseen by the previous government, and we have been cutting down expenses everywhere. We have cut off almost a million for dredging in the eastern provinces. In many Conservative constituencies the estimates of the previous government have been cut down. My hon. friend must not think that he is specially unfortunate.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I may point out to the minister that $115,000 has been spent on this work. The object is of course to close the northern entrance to the harbour by an erection of a breakwater. If this work is delayed, the harbour, which before the work was commenced was in fairly good condition, will be absolutely spoiled, for the reason that as the approaches from either sides are being built the entrance is narrowed and the consequence is to increase the force of the current resulting in the formation of sand hills, in the harbour. If the minister has a report from his engineer as to the actual condition of that harbour at present he will find that it is of the greatest importance that the work should be continued with as much expedition as possible. If it is left for a couple of years without the northern entrance being closed, it will become so filled with sand as to be of no use at all. This is the point to which I do not think the minister's attention has been called?

Mr. MONK. I will get a special report upon it.

Cole harbour—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Does the minister intend to go on with that work this year?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Cow Bay (Port Morien)—completing protection works and general repairs, $3,000.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it the intention of the minister to do this by contract or by day work?

Mr. MONK. I have not decided that point.

Mr. CARROLL. In years gone by it was done by day work. I would recommend the minister, if it is to be done in that way, to be careful as to who superintends the work. If he will get a report from the engineer, he will find that that is very important and requires some technical skill.

Devil's island—extension of breakwater, $25,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Has the contract been awarded?

Mr. MONK. It is before the government at this moment.

Gillis Point (East)—construction of wharf, $1,200.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Where is that?

Mr. MONK. It is a small settlement on the shore of the Little Bras d'Or lake.

Inverness—harbour improvements, $5,300.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). What is the intention of the minister with regard to this important work? Is it the intention to have an additional vote in the supplementaries?

Mr. MONK. Yes, we intend to ask an additional vote.

Melford—construction of wharf, $5,700.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What is being done with regard to this? My recollection was that the contract was awarded last autumn but that afterwards the contractor was told not to proceed with the work. Does the minister intend to go on with the work? And what is the present state of progress with regard to it?

Mr. MONK. There is some dispute as to the site. Tenders have been received in answer to public advertisement. This wharf will be convenient both for Melford and for the country north and south.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Where is the wharf to be built?

Mr. MONK. I understand the site is still under consideration and has not been absolutely decided.

Yarmouth harbour—improvements, $100,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like to have this vote and the general vote for harbours and rivers stand, and I should be glad if the Minister of Public Works would not take them up until the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) and the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Law) are in the House.

Mr. MONK. I would not like to keep the Yarmouth vote back. Is not my hon. friend in favour of that improvement?

Mr MACLEAN (Halifax). There will be no delay.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS, &c.

Mr. MONK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN. (Halifax). I would remind the Minister of Customs that I asked for two returns some days ago which have not yet been brought down. One has

reference to the dismissal of Eugene Baldwin, Customs officer at Coaticooke, and another to the change in the regulations concerning the duty on lobster twine.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think I laid that return about the lobster twine on the table. The other return has been delayed pending the receipt of another copy of the newspaper.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I have a dozen, I shall dispense with that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then I shall bring down the return on Monday.

Mr. STANFIELD. I moved for a return from the Railway Department two years ago and only one half of it has been brought down. I have mentioned the matter several times and I would like to have it completed.

Mr. LEMIEUX.. Has any decision been arrived at by the Department of Marine and Fisheries as regards the retention of the Harbour Commissioners in Montreal?

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman is out of order because there is a question dealing with that matter on the order paper to be answered in due course.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am desired by the member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) to call the attention of the government to the fact that Mr. W. H. Downey, the deputy returning officer for the constituency of Kings-Albert I presume, because the letter is from Harvey Bank in Albert county, has not yet received the election expenses which are due him by the government. He says he filled in the blank form as required to be signed but when the remittance was made the returning officer said that a part of the amount was with held without information. The amount, although small, is of importance to him, and I wish the Secretary of State would look into the matter for my hon. friend.

Mr. ROCHE. Those accounts are looked after by the Auditor General.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) inform the House when the writ for South Renfrew will issue?

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 29, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

LORD'S DAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. VERVILLE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 85) to amend the Lord's Day Act. He said: The amendment is with respect to musicians who have been more than once prosecuted for having played on Sunday at funerals and public parades and so forth. They would like this disability to be removed. This Bill also provides to give a day's holiday to waiters and waitresses working in restaurants and hotels.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MACDONELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 86) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill simply provides to add to the powers of the Railway Commission by giving it jurisdiction over the length of sections and number of men required to do work on a section. The Railway Commission supposed it had such power and had dealt with matters of that kind, but, on appeal it was found that the Act does not give it such jurisdiction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Mr. MACDONELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 87) to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act of 1907. He said: This Act at presents prohibits a strike or lockout pending negotiations where there is a labour dispute. There is an additional subsection preventing any one from aiding or assisting an employer or employee during that period. The courts have construed that section to prohibit any aid or assistance being given to the men by any labour union during that time. They have held that where the strike condition exists, but the strike has not been declared and the conciliation board has not reported, it is unlawful for anybody to give assistance to the striker or a man prepared to strike. That would prevent the ordinary benefits payable by labour unions from being distributed to the men during that time. I do not believe that the Act was ever intended to bear that meaning. Such an interpretation would prevent any one from giving charity to a striking employee. The amendment makes it permissible for the funds of a benefit society or a trade union to be paid to its members during that period without incurring liability and laying itself open to the penalities of a criminal offence.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE WRIT FOR SOUTH RENFREW.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask my right hon. friend who leads the govern-

ment, if the writ for South Renfrew has been issued.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). No, it has not. There is some difficulty with regard to the lists. Some of the lists of 1911 may be used under the law, but others cannot, at present. I cannot give the exact date but a little delay is necessary in order that all of the lists may be used.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The vacancy in South Renfrew occurred on the 7th of December and the elections in Ontario took place on the 11th of December or four days later. There can be no reason why the lists which were good enough for the Ontario election, should not be good enough now.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not prepared to admit that. I do not know that the new lists were ready at the time the Ontario elections were held.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The right hon. gentleman may presume that.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not presume anything, but look to the facts. My hon. colleague, the Secretary of State, (Mr. Roche), to whom I applied for information, informed me that a portion of the lists are ready and can be used, but that another portion could not be used under the law which requires that they shall be prepared or returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at least sixty days before nomination day. That is the difficulty at present.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. According to the law, when an election takes place the list in force on nomination day shall be in force sixty days after.

Mr. BORDEN. The result would be that the election would be held, in some parts of the county on the lists of 1910 and in others on the lists of 1911, so that in some districts a number of men entitled to vote would not be able to do so because the old lists were used.

Mr. HENDERSON. I might observe to the right hon. the leader of the opposition that there has been no election in South Renfrew for the Ontario House lately. Consequently no lists were used.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say they were, but that they would have been used had there been an election.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The objection raised is a very reasonable one. There is no general election——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman to order. This matter cannot be discussed at this stage.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

THE ONTARIO AND MINNESOTA PULP AND PAPER COMPANY.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Public Works regarding the Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company. I understand that last year the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) issued an order to prevent this company from establishing grinding machines on the Canadian side, by which the Canadian pulp wood would be ground up and shot into a sluiceway and run across to the American side, there to be manufactured into pulp and then into paper. My information is that within the last couple of months, this company has applied to the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) for permission to put their grinders in and take the ground wood across to the American side. Is it correct that my hon. friend has waived the rule made last year?

Mr. MONK. That report is not correct. There has been an application recently for the ratification of the order to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, but I have not yet been able to look into the matter. No decision has been arrived at..

Mr. TURRIFF. I would ask my hon. friend not to take action in the matter without first giving the town of Fort Francis an opportunity to be heard.

ANNEXATION OF UNGAVA.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I see a despatch in the Montreal 'Star' of Saturday headed 'Annexation of Ungava Again up for Settlement', which states that correspondence has been exchanged between the Prime Minister of Quebec and the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada. Would the right hon. gentleman inform the House whether it is true or not?

Mr. BORDEN. Correspondence was exchanged, I believe, before the present government came into power.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not since?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, we have been reminded of that correspondence and asked to give it consideration.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—PROPOSED COMMISSION.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I see it stated in the press that a commission has been appointed to deal with matters relating to the construction of the National Transcontinental railway. I desire to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether the statement in the press as to the appointment of these commissioners is correct?

Mr. BORDEN. I have not seen the statement and so cannot answer the question. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) is unfortunately absent to-day; but he will be in his place to-morrow and will be able to give information to my hon. friend with regard to the matter to which he refers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Would the Prime Minister please call the attention of his colleague to the fact that I have asked the question, and, if the statement to which I have referred is correct, ask him to bring down whatever papers there may be in connection with the matter?

Mr. BORDEN. I will direct his attention to it.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I desire to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) whether an announcement is to be made at an early day as to the extension of the rural mail delivery. I understand that there is some question of extending it so that all the roads in a settled municipality may have it. I would ask the Postmaster General if that is likely to be announced, and if so when?

Mr. PELLETIER. It is not so much a question of extension, but of the making of a well-arranged plan by mapping out each county and not working at random as at present. The question is under consideration.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Will it be announced?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes, in due course.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will it be free rural mail delivery?

Mr. PELLETIER. We will speak about that later.

SOUTH AFRICAN VETERANS' BOUNTY.

Mr. KNOWLES. I desire to renew my question to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) whether he can accord us any information as to when we shall likely be made aware of what will be in his Bill in regard to South African volunteers' bounty extension?

Mr. ROGERS. I will have the Bill prepared in a very few days.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 11) respecting the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company, and to change its name to The Canadian Mortgage Investment Company—Sir Edmund Osler.

Bill (No. 13) to incorporate the Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Company—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Vancouver Life Insurance Company of Vancouver, British Columbia.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Union Bank of Canada.—Mr. Barker.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Dominion Trust Company Limited, and to change its name to Dominion Trust Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MR. J. H. BERGERON.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has Mr. J. G. H. Bergeron been appointed a commissioner of inquiry in the district of Montreal?
2. If so, by what minister was he appointed?
3. What salary does he receive in this inquiry?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries; The Postmaster General; by order in council with respect to the Department of Customs.
3. Remuneration not to exceed $15 for each full day's attendance, and reasonable moving and living expenses, and with respect to the Post Department, $15 per diem in addition to actual travelling expenses and $3 per diem for living expenses.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

*Mr. AMES:

Is it the intention of the government to continue the present Harbour Commissioners for the port of Montreal in office for the current year?

Mr. HAZEN:

The government has no intention, at present, of making any change in the Montreal Harbour Commission. The powers of the commissioners already appointed to inquire into the public depart-

ments will be extended to include the affairs and operations of the Montreal Harbour Commission. It is the desire of the members of the Harbour Commission that this should be done, and such investigation will take place without unnecessary delay.

INQUIRIES INTO CONDUCT OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

*Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. Has Mr. Lawrence Stafford, advocate, of Quebec, been appointed by the government to hold inquiries relating to the conduct of public officers? If so, what is his emolument?
2. Has Mr. L. Omer Beaulieu, advocate, of Quebec, been appointed by the government to hold inquiries relating to the conduct of public officers? If so, what is his emolument?
3. Has Mr. Emil Gelley, advocate, of Quebec, been appointed by the government to hold inquiries relating to the conduct of public officers, and especially of the Intercolonial? If so, what is his emolument?
4. Has Mr. Maurice Rousseau, advocate, been charged to represent the government in certain inquiries relating to the conduct of public officers in the district of Quebec? If so, what is his emolument?
5. Has Mr. Honore Grenier, advocate, of Quebec, been charged to represent the government in certain inquiries relating to the conduct of public officers in the district of Quebec? If so, what is his emolument?
6. Has Mr. William Flynn, advocate been appointed inquiring commissioner or advocate of the government in certain inquiries relating to the conduct of public officers in the district of Quebec and especially in the county of Gaspé? If so, what is his emolument?
7. Has Mr. Ernest Taschereau, advocate, of Quebec, been appointed inquiring commissioner or police magistrate in reference to the National Transcontinental railway? If so, what is his emolument?
8. Has Mr. L. J. Blondin, advocate, of Trois Rivières, been appointed to hold inquiries or to represent the government in some inquiries relating to the conduct of public officials? If so, what is his emolument?
9. Has Mr. L. P. Crépeau, advocate, of Arthabaska, been appointed to hold inquiries or to represent the government in some inquiries relating to public officers? If so, what is his emolument?
10. Are there any other advocates in the district of Quebec who have been charged to hold inquiries or to represent the government in them? If so, what are their names?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes, $10 per day in addition to actual travelling expenses, and $3 per day for living expenses.
2. Yes. Remuneration not to exceed $15 for each full day's attendance, and reasonable moving and living expenses.

Mr. HAZEN.

3. Yes. $15 per day and all reasonable moving and living expenses.
4. No.
5. No.
6. Yes. Post Office Department. $10 per day in addition to actual travelling expenses, and $3 per day for living expenses. Department of Marine and Fisheries, remuneration not to exceed $15 for each full day's attendance and reasonable moving and living expenses.
7. Yes. Appointed by order in council 16th December, 1911, a commissioner under Part III. of the Criminal Code, Quebec. There is no information respecting his emoluments.
8. $15 per day in addition to actual travelling expenses, and $3 per day for living expenses.
9. No.
10. Yes. Wm. L. Shurtliff, J. G. H. Bergeron, Napoleon U. Lacasse, Napoleon Garceau.

SESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

* Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the government's answer as to the dismissal of sessional employees, reported on page 586 of unrevised 'Hansard' of the present session, how many were dismissed by the Speaker and the Sergeant-at-arms respectively, and what were the dates of such dismissals?

Mr. BORDEN. One was discharged by order of Mr. Speaker, and twenty-eight were not re-engaged by the Sergeant-at-Arms, and one messenger resigned. The dates are as follows:

One sessional clerk discharged, November 10.
17 messengers, not re-engaged, November 15.
3 servants, not re-engaged, November 15.
7 pages, not re-engaged, November 1.
1 doorkeeper, not re-engaged, November 1.
1 messenger, resigned, November 18.

EXPENDITURE IN DIFFERENT PROVINCES.

Mr. CLEMENTS:

1. What has been the total expenditure by the Dominion government for the last ten years on wharfs, and public buildings, respectively, in the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and British Columbia, respectively?
2. What is the length of coast line in each of said provinces?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Total expenditure on public buildings and wharfs, piers, breakwaters, &c., (including construction, repairs, and maintenance):

	Public Buildings.	Wharfs, Piers, Breakwaters &c.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Nova Scotia	1,547,440.17	3,054,150.68	4,601,590.85
New Brunswick	897,555.93	2,381,247.43	3,278,803.36
Quebec	5,185,207.90	10,461,565.19	15,646,773.09
Ontario	16,021,273.21	5,910,460.88	21,931,734.09
British Columbia	1,958,080.07	1,080,405.12	3,038,485.19
Grand Total	25,609,557.28	22,887,829.30	48,497,386.58

2. New Brunswick, 600 miles. British Columbia, 5,000 miles. Nova Scotia, 1,600 miles. Quebec (to Quebec City) 1,600 miles. Ontario, (on James bay), 220 miles. All the above are approximate.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

* Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Is the order in council dated August 1, 1910, approving instructions relating to recruiting for the Naval Service of Canada still in force?
2. Have any circulars been issued by the Post Office Department authorizing certain postmasters to act as recruiting officers?
3. If so, is it the intention of the government to recall all such circulars?
4. Have any representations been made to the government since the 1st October, 1911, by any member thereof against the system of recruiting for the Naval Service of Canada then in force?
5. If so, what representations were made, and by whom?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes, on February 6, 1911, to the postmasters in 72 localities.
3. The matter has not been considered.
4 and 5. Questions irregular.

MR. MEDERIC PICOTTE.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has Mr. Mederic Picotte, a messenger of the House of Commons, been dismissed?
2. If so, at whose request, by whom has he been replaced and who recommended the appointment of his successor?
3. Did Mr. Joseph Morin, Advocate of Montreal, and unsuccessful candidate in L'Assomption, support the request for dismissal of Mr. Picotte?
4. What are the reasons alleged to justify Mr. Picotte's dismissal?
5. Was there an inquiry, and was the employee placed in a position to defend himself?
6. What is the delay in the notice given to Mr. Picotte to leave the service?
7. Does the government know that the accusations brought against Mr. Picotte of having taken part in the last electoral campaign are said to be false and foundationless, that the said Mederic Picotte, has given his solemn declaration in due form denying the accusations of partisanship brought against him and offering to furnish proof on oath of the truth of his defence?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. At the request of the member for Joliette. The vacancy was filled by the appointment of Mr. Henry Coffin. Mr. Coffin was recommended for employment by the member for Joliette.
3. Yes.
4. Active political partisanship.
5. Yes.
6. The delay was caused by giving time to the said Picotte to put in his defence.
7. In this instance the written declaration of the sitting member for Joliette was accepted. The government has nothing to do with this matter. It pertains solely to the House of Commons.

CUSTOMS REVENUE AT DUNNVILLE, ONTARIO.

Mr. LALOR:

1. What was the Customs revenue of the port of Dunnville, Ontario, for the year 1910 and 1911?
2. What was the Postal revenue for the town of Dunnville for the year 1910 and 1911?

Mr. ROCHE:

1.
Fiscal year ending March 31, 1910 .. .. $38,577 48
Fiscal year ending March 31, 1911 .. .. 50,410 14

2.
For the year 1910 .. .. .. 6,918 54
For the year 1911 .. .. .. 7,644 59

THE PRINTING BUREAU.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Have any increases in salaries been granted to any of the employees of the Printing Bureau since October 10, 1911?
2. If so, to whom, for what reason and on whose recommendation were such increases granted?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2.—To whom, for what reason, on whose recommendation:

W. O. O'Neil, under the 'scale' of proficiency, foreman.
O. Theriault " " "
E. X. Leclair " " "
J. O'Meara " " "
J. Millar " " "
A. Lepage " " "
G. J. Ward " " "
J. Butler " " "
L. Pelton " " "
T. Couvrette " " "
W. McGovern " " "
W. Archibald " " "
G. Sampson " " "
A. Smith " " "
F. Uhleman " " "
F. Mooney " " "
A. Lamont " " "
Miss V. Beaulne " " "
Miss G. Bate " " "
Miss C. Brisbois " " "
Miss E. Belleau " " "
Miss A. Brazeau " " "
Miss A. Morin " " "
Miss G. Waddell " " "
Miss R. A. Boily " " "
Miss A. Couturier " " "
Miss A. Lajoie " " "
Miss Y. Couturier " " "
Miss B. Groulx " " "
Miss C. Thomson " " "
Miss A. Gillam " " "
Miss A. Coursolle " " "
Miss E. P. Clement " " "
Miss C. Goulden " " "
Miss E. McGillicuddy " " "
Miss L. E. Larkin " " "
Miss E. Schinzel " " "
Miss M. A. Prudhomme " " "
Miss F. Granger " " "
Miss L. Dupuis " " "
Miss M. Hayes " " "
Miss K. Welch " " "
Miss S. Proulx " " "
Miss E. Villeneuve " " "
Miss M. Reilly " " "
John Thomson, proficiency King's Printer.
J. H. Foley, proficiency, King's Printer, and certificate from Civil Service Commissioners.
J. A. Langley " " "
C. B. Snelling " " "

MAIL CONTRACT AT NEUVILLE, QUE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has the contract for the carriage of the mails from the Canadian Northern railway station to the post office at Neuville, county of Portneuf, been cancelled?
2. If so, for what reason and at whose request?
3. When would this contract expire?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. No; a notice has been given, as provided for in the contract, that it will terminate on the 14th April next.
2. In the public interest on representations made by Mr. H. Grenier.
3. Contract will terminate at the expiration of the three months' notice above referred to.

POSTMISTRESS AT SAYABEC, QUE.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has Miss Boulay been appointed postmistress at Sayabec Station, county of Rimouski?
2. What was the revenue of that office for 1911?
3. Who recommended Miss Boulay to the Postmaster General?
4. Is Miss Boulay the daugher of the member for Rimouski?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. $907.07.
3. Mr. H. Boulay, M.P.
4. The Department has no information as to this.

WHARF AT ST. VALLIER, QUE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has the contract been awarded for the works to be done to the wharf at St. Vallier, county of Bellechasse?
2. If so, to whom and for what amount?
3. Who were the other tenderers, what was the amount of their tenders, respectively, and when was the said contract awarded?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2. Alexandre Duchesneau, $11,550.
3. (a) E. Boulanger & Fils, $11,570; Johnny Gallibois, $12,250; La Cie de Laiterie de St. Pierre, Co. Montmagny, $12,300; Theophile Beaumont, $12,350; Eugéne Bernatchez, $13,300; Misael Bernatchez, $14,000; Daniel James Smith, $15,784; J. S. Boivin, Onesime Poliquin, $16,950.
(b) Awarded by Order in Council 22nd December, 1911.

POSTMASTER AT ST. ADELAIDE DE PABOS, QUE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has an investigation been ordered against Robert Molloy, postmaster of St. Adelaide de Pabos county of Gaspé?
2. What are the charges brought against Mr. Molloy, and by whom?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. (a) Active partisanship.
(b) Dr. Gauthier, M.P.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. WHITE (Alberta):

1. Is the government aware that sites have been purchased and paid for by the Depart-

ment of Public Works at Vegreville, Alberta, and Lloydminister, Saskatchewan, for the erection of public buildings in those places?

2. Is the government aware that provision was made in the original estimates for 1911 and 1912 for the erection of such buildings, and that five-twelfths of the amount was voted by the last parliament at its last session?

3. Is the government aware that the estimates for 1912 and 1913, submitted to this parliament, did not contain any provision for the erection of public buildings at these points?

4. What are the intentions of the government with regard to public buildings at Vegreville and Lloydminister?

5 If it is not the intention of the government to proceed with the buildings, what are the government's intentions regarding the sites?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. The Government will proceed with these works as soon as circumstances permit.
5. To hold the sites for public purposes.

LA BANQUE DE ST. HYACINTHE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the government to investigate the circumstances of the liquidation of La Banque de St. Hyacinthe?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).—No.

MR. TANCREDE MARCIL.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has Tancrède Marcil, of Montreal, applied for a position in any of the departments? If so, to which department?

2. What is his position and his salary?

Mr. BORDEN. I cannot answer if Mr. Marcil has applied for a position in any department. If any particular department can be named further inquiry will be made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will allow it to stand until the hon. member is here?

Mr. BORDEN. It is no use allowing it to stand, as that is the only answer that can be given at the present time. I have made inquiries and I cannot find that Mr. Marcil has made application in any department. If any particular department is named more definite information can be obtained.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) can put another question.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received the following resolution passed unanimously by the Montreal Corn Exchange on Tuesday, January 23, 1911:

66½

Resolved, that, understanding that there is a movement on foot to induce the government to replace the present members of the Montreal Harbour Commission, the Montreal Corn Exchange Association hereby protests in the strongest possible manner against such action and records its high appreciation of the work of the three gentlemen who have done so much for the port since their appointment as commissioners on January 1, 1907.

That, in the opinion of the association, the removal of the present most capable commissioners under the present circumstances, while the work of modernizing the harbour is only partially completed, would be resented by the community of this city and of Canada generally.

2. What action does the honourable minister intend to take in this matter?

Mr. HAZEN. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not received such a resolution, but he was present when it was presented to the Prime Minister. In view of the answer I have given to question No. 2 on the order paper to-day it seems unnecessary to answer the second question of my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it true that a delegation composed of Messrs. Andrew Allan and R. W. Reford, of the Shipping Federation, Huntly Drummond, Vice-President of the Board of Trade, A. H. Harris, representing the Canadian Pacific Railway, William Wainright, Vice-President of the Grand Trunk, J. E. MacFarlane, of the Corn Exchange, and J. H. Sherrard, President of the Montreal Branch of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, met the Right Honourable Mr. Borden, Prime Minister, on Wednesday, January 24, 1912?

2. Did that delegation represent to the Prime Minister that the Montreal Harbour Commission is composed of high-class and competent men, whose work has been highly satisfactory, and that it would be a grievous error to make any change when the scheme for the national port is being so satisfactorily carried out?

3. Was any members of the House of Commons present at that interview?

4. If so, what is the name and constituency of said member or members?

5. Did said member or members ask for the dismissal of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners? If so, upon what grounds?

Mr. BORDEN. A delegation composed of the gentlemen mentioned, and, I think, of some other gentlemen, did meet the Prime Minister on Wednesday the 24th of January, 1912, and on that occasion gave to the Prime Minister strong commendation of the work which has been carried on by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the attention of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries been called to the following article published in the Montreal 'Star,' Wednesday, January 24, 1912:

THE MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

The commercial deputation which approaches the government to-day in support of our excellent and popular Harbour Commission, will speak for the intelligence, the enterprise and the future of Montreal. We have never before had so good a Harbour Commission. It is not partisan in any sense of the term. That is, indeed precisely the reason why certain elements of the community are demanding its decapitation. They insist that it shall be partisan, run in the interests of the party and not in the interests of the habour. It is not the trade of Montreal of which they are thinking but the sordid traffic in posts for persistent partisans.

The benefits which these three Harbour Commissioners have conferred on this city, and on the country as a whole, will not be properly appreciated until they are seen in the long perspective of the future. Still, they look very big even to-day in comparison with the puny efforts of the debating societies and the cumbersome organizations which had previously fiddled with this huge national problem. To sacrifice these successful commissioners to the fury of a victorious political horde, thinking only of the spoil and not at all of the prosperity of the city, would be an act of folly which we cannot believe the ministers are in any danger of committing.

Still, it is just as well that commercial and industrial Montreal, regardless of the party affiliation, should make its opinion known; and that the government should be put in possession of the stoutest defence against any 'camp-followers' who continue to cry 'blood' and 'boodle.'

2. Is it the intention of the government to accept the friendly advice of the Montreal 'Star'?

Mr. BORDEN. The attention of the Prime Minister has not been called to the article which is set forth.

Mr. HAZEN. May I be permitted to say the same thing so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The right hon. gentleman has not answered the entire question.

Mr. BORDEN. I think the answer to the question, as a whole, is a very fair one.

DISMISSAL OF EDWARD POULIN.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has Edward Poulin, an employee in the Customs Department at Quebec, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason and at whose request?
3. Has an inquiry been held in the matter?

Mr. REID (Grenville).

The services of Edward Poulin, Acting Preventive Officer of Customs at Quebec, have been dispensed with, as they were not required during the winter season.

This action was taken by the Department of Customs after inquiry into the matter by a Customs Inspector.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

IN RE SMUGGLING.

*Mr. BAKER:

1. Has the Minister of Customs taken cognizance of an article which appeared in the Montreal 'Star' of January 12, under the caption 'M.P's name is mentioned in a smuggling case?'
2. Are the statements as communicated to the Department of Customs substantially as alleged in the said newspaper article?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes.
2. Yes.

POSTMISTRESS AT ANSE A VALEAU.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any charge been made against Madame Proulx, postmistress at Anse à Valeau, county of Gaspé?
2. If so, has any investigation been ordered?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.

MOTION AGREED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence, representations, estimates, letters, telegrams and other documents received by the Right hon. Prime Minister, or by any member of the government, in any way relating to the subject of a car-ferry service between the province of Prince Edward Island and the mainland across the Straits of Northumberland, and the widening of the gauge of the Prince Edward Island Railway; and also as to the estimated cost of all such work.—Mr. Emmerson.

MARITIME PROVINCES IMMIGRATION.

Mr. E. N. RHODES (Cumberland) moved:

That, inasmuch as the immigration policy of the government and the several railway companies has for many years been almost entirely confined to the development of western Canada, and largely in consequence of this policy the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have not grown in equal degree with the rest of the Dominion, in the opinion of this House, in order to promote uniform progress and prosperity throughout Canada, the government should speedily inaugurate and carry out a policy of publicity and immigration designed to promote the more rapid development of the said provinces.

He said: Mr. Speaker, It is possible that hon. gentlemen representing constituencies in other provinces of the Dominion outside the maritime provinces will at first view regard this proposed resolution as provincial; as one asking special and undue treatment for a particular portion of Canada, at the expense of the remainder.

Upon investigation, however, it will, I believe, be found that the reverse is the case and should this resolution carry and be acted upon by this government, the result would be but a measure of justice—

long delayed—meted out to a section of the Dominion, which has made greater sacrifice in proportion to its wealth and members—to create and develop the Dominion of Canada—than will be found to be the case in any other portion of this broad Dominion.

And further, to my mind, one great cause of the tardy development of these provinces is that their people have been so unselfish so unprovincial and so patriotic; that, forgetting self, they have given unsparingly of their best to the development of this Dominion, whose very creation could not have come about, but for the courage and foresight displayed by their leading statesmen, who, in looking to the larger field, largely neglected the one at hand.

At the outset I wish to make it clear to the House that this resolution is not brought forward in any party spirit. Whether the policy of immigration approved by the government which went out of power on the 21st September was good or bad, or whether the policy of immigration pursued by previous governments was good or bad, that policy has been concurred in by hon. gentlemen representing constituencies in the maritime provinces—by their silence at least—and for that reason it is not for us to make any party capital out of the question at all. It is possible, of course, that the special attention which the west has received in recent years is due to the fact that it is only in recent years the west has commenced to develop very rapidly. In the first place I will examine briefly the conditions of population in the maritime provinces, and I will take in this respect the figures of the census of 1901 because the detailed information contained in the census of 1911 is not yet available. As given in the census of 1901 the population was as follows:

Population, census 1901, 893,953.

Nova Scotia..	459,574
New Brunswick	331,120
Prince Edward Island..	103,259

An analytical examination of the census of 1910, gives us the following result as to the race descent of the inhabitants of the maritime provinces in that year:

	Nova Scotia.	New Brunswick.	P.E. Island.
English..	159,735	104,682	24,043
Irish..	54,710	83,384	21,992
Scotch..	143,382	48,310	41,753
Others..	1,219	1,147	95
French..	45,161	79,979	13,866
German....	41,020	3,816	709
Dutch..	2,941	3,663	242
Scandinavian..	696	1,292	14
Russian	74	68	5
Austro-Hungarian	99	27	0
Italian..	285	60	12
Jewish..	449	395	17
Swiss..	1,004	37	0
Belgian..	62	26	5
Half-Breeds..	87	156	4
Indians	1,542	1,309	254
Chinese..	107	59	4
Negro	5,984	1,368	141
Various origins	492	355	47
Unspecified..	507	986	56
Totals	459,574	331,120	103,259

From this table it will be seen that a very large proportion of the population are of British descent. Still more suggestive perhaps are the figures showing their places of birth. For example of the 459,574 population of Nova Scotia, 452,786 were born on British territory. In New Brunswick out of a total population of 331,120, 324,084 were born on British territory. And in the province of Prince Edward Island, out of a total population of 103,259, 102,351 were born on British territory.

Perhaps even more striking are the figures showing the percentage of population of these provinces born in Canada. For instance in Nova Scotia, out of the total 459,574, 435,172 were born on Canadian soil. In other words all but 6,786 were born on British territory and all but 24,407 were born on Canadian territory. In New Brunswick out of a total population of 331,120, all but 7,036 are of British birth and all but 12,942 are of Canadian birth.

The same proportion is carried out, perhaps in a greater degree, in Prince Edward Island. Out of a total population in that province of 103,259, all but 908 are British born and all but 4,253 of Canadian birth.

Then, taking the total population of the maritime provinces, out of 893,953, all but 14,732 are of British birth and all but 46,597 were born in Canada.

These figures, when reduced to percentages, become still more startling. Of the total population of the maritime provinces born in British territory, 94·8 per cent were born in Canada, and 98·4 per cent. are of British birth.

Taking the figures showing the percentage of population born in each province, I find the following:—

Nova Scotia..	94·7	born in province.
New Brunswick	70·	" "
P. E. Island	93·5	" "
Mar. Provinces..	93·1	" "

My object in giving these figures in detail is twofold. In the first place, I wish to show how homogeneous is our population and in the second place to show to what a trifling degree that population has been affected by immigration. While these figures are taken from the census of 1901, I have no doubt that the percentage will be found approximately the same in the census of 1911 as soon as the complete figures of that census are available. There has never at any time been any considerable inflow of foreign settlers. Those designated as of French origin are the des-

cendants of those who were left behind after the expulsion of the Acadians in 1755, or of those of them who afterwards returned to the provinces. The Germans and Dutch are in the main the descendants of those who arrived as far back as 1750. The same may be said of the Swiss. The negroes are mainly the descendants of slave forefathers imported by early settlers. And the other nationalities, represented by a handful of each, are descendants of those who have drifted across the Atlantic one by one into a maritime ship-owning country.

In comparing the area of the maritime provinces with that of Great Britain, I do so in the first place for the purpose of drawing a comparison between the sparse population of the maritime provinces and the dense population of Great Britain, and in the second place because I believe the maritime provinces are perhaps the best situated portion of the Dominion for a certain class of immigrants from the British Isles. The area of these provinces is almost the same as that of England. England has an area of 50,903 square miles and the maritime provinces are 51,163 miles in extent. Compare then the dense population of England with the sparse population of these provinces. In England which is identical in size with these provinces, we find a population of 605 persons to the square mile, whereas in the maritime provinces there are only 17 to the square mile. Here are the figures in tabulated form:—

——	Area in Acres.	Area in Sq. Miles.	Population per square Mile.
England	32,578,178	50,903	605
Scotland	19,070,081	29,797	150
Ireland	20,327,947	31,762	140
Wales	4,749,301	7,421	213
Nova Scotia	13,483,671	21,068	22
New Brunswick	17,863,266	27,911	12
Prince Edward Island	1,397,991	2,184	47
The Maritime Provinces	.....	51,163	17

These figures show the great possibilities of these provinces. England with practically equal area has a population 16 to 17 times greater. Scotland, slightly larger than New Brunswick, has a population 12½ times larger. Yet in all respects the maritime provinces compare favourably with the United Kingdom.

Take for instance the question of climate. The south of England lies 6 degrees north of the south of Nova Scotia and 3 degrees north of the extreme north of New Brunswick, the most northerly of the maritime provinces. This makes a great difference in the distribution of light in the favour of the maritime provinces. And, but for the effect of ocean currents, would make a considerable difference in climate. The climate of England is undoubtedly more equable than that of any of the maritime provinces, but I submit we are ahead of Great Britain as regards moisture and the annual amount of sunshine. While the climate of Scotland does not compare favourably in any respect with that of the maritime provinces.

In natural wealth the maritime provinces are the equal in all respects of the divisions of the United Kingdom and the superior in many. Their soil in many parts is of unsurpassed fertility. Under a similar system of agriculture it would yield as largely as the richest fields even of England. This has been actually demonstrated in many localities. The average hay crop, even with indifferent cultivation, is as large as that of the United Kingdom. Wheat when adequately cultivated has been known to return 40 to 50 bushels to the acre in Nova Scotia. In some sections of that province—in early times—grain crops were grown on the same land, without the use of fertilizer of any kind, for over 30 years consecutively.

The fruit-growing capacity of many parts of the maritime provinces has been demonstrated conclusively by practical experiment. The apples of Nova Scotia have long been an important and increasing factor in the English market, and a large percentage of the total shipment from Canada to Great Britain comes from that province. To the growing of small fruits the maritime provinces are equally well adapted. For the production of root crops they are unsurpassed. Their resources in timber are well known, the total quantity exported from the province of Nova Scotia alone in the year 1910 being 214,368,493 feet. Notwithstanding the large cuts and great destruction by fire, these resources are still enormous, particularly in the province of New Brunswick.

The mineral wealth of the maritime provinces from present development, can safely

be said to be very great. The coal deposits of Nova Scotia in particular are practically inexhaustible, and new areas are being discovered every year. To show the advance that province has made in the development of these deposits I will give the figures of the total annual coal product of the province of Nova Scotia for three consecutive decades:

1890.. .. .. 1,984,000 tons.
1900.. .. .. 3,238,245 "
1910 (in round numbers) 5,000,000 "

And during the coming year it is expected that one company alone in the province of Nova Scotia, will produce, according to their own estimate, from 4,500,000 to 5,000,000 tons. Iron is only less abundant than coal, and limestone lies everywhere in close proximity to both. The tremendous growth in the steel industry is but an earnest of the future. Gypsum is found in lavish abundance. Gold mining has been a staple industry for half a century. Silver, copper, lead, manganese and tungsten have also been found. And in all probability it is but a matter of time when most, if not all these minerals will be found in economic quantities. Petroleum of excellent quality and undoubted quantity has recently been produced in the fields of Albert, New Brunswick, and natural gas in abundance is at present being produced there, some of the largest producing wells in the world having been tapped and their further production will follow with expanding markets. In this connection I wish to give credit to Mr. W. E. McLellan, of Halifax, to whose excellent article on the effect of immigration in the maritime provinces I have had recourse for some of the data and percentages that I have given. Another industry capable of great expansion in the province is that of the fisheries. It is a great source of industry and wealth to us at the present time, but the opportunities in this industry alone are practically illimitable. To show something of the capabilities of the province I have here a table showing the value of commodities of various kinds produced in the province of Nova Scotia in the year 1911, taken from the edition of January 1, of the Halifax 'Chronicle':

The Products of Nova Scotia in 1911 Yielded More than One Hundred and Twenty-two Million Dollars.

Coal..	$17,600,000
Coke..	$ 2,200,000
Gold, iron and other minerals	350,000
Gypsum, limestone, &c..	880,000
Building materials..	315,000
Pig iron..	1,500,000
Steel, steel rails, rods, &c..	14,500,000
Fisheries..	8,100,000
Manufactures, ships and freights...	45,500,000
Products of the farm..	25,926,076
Products of the forest..	5,000,000
Game..	200,000
Total..	$122,071,076

I regret that I have not the figures of the wealth produced in the provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in the same year, but I have no doubt that they would show the same strikingly large proportion in comparison to population.

I have spoken very briefly of the manifold resources of the province of Nova Scotia, and it would seem to me that the extent and quality of these natural resources, coupled with the sparsity of population, would prove sufficiently attractive to the immigrant. But there is a third advantage possessed by these provinces which we must not lose sight of. They occupy a strategic prosition geographically. Nova Scotia has been called the wharf of the Dominion, jutting out as it does into the Atlantic ocean, with each of its eighteen counties bordering on the sea. The same advantage is enjoyed by Prince Edward Island and in a very great degree by the province of New Brunswick. Then we have the great natural harbours of Halifax and St. John, among the best in the whole world, each as free from ice as the great harbour of New York, and a full day's sail nearer Europe than any other port on the continent. They are the oldest settled portions of the Dominion, and their social and economic conditions closely resemble those of the old world. Furthermore, for a portion of the year, there is a large flow of immigration through the ports of Halifax and St. John. In spite of all these admitted advantages, during the past decade we have not held even the natural increase in population.

I find that the population returns of the Dominion, as disclosed by the last census, reveal the following figures:

POPULATION OF CANADA BY PROVINCES.

—	1901.	1911.	Increase.	Decrease.
Alberta	73,022	375,434	302,412	
British Columbia	178,657	390,229	211,572	
Manitoba	255,211	455,869	200,658	
New Brunswick	331,120	351,8·9	20,769	
Nova Scotia	459,574	492,338	32,764	
Ontario	2.182,947	2,523,297	340,350	
Prince Edward Island	103,259	93,722		9,537
Quebec	1,648,898	2,002,726	353,828	
Saskatchewan	91,279	492,344	401,068	
Yukon	27,219	8,512		18,707
Northwest Territories	20,129	15,762		4,367
CANADA	5,371,315	7,202,122	1,830,807	
Maritime Provinces	893,953	937,949	43,996	

Thus we find that while the population of Manitoba has increased almost 100 per cent, and that of the other prairie provinces over 500 per cent, the population of the maritime provinces has increased slightly under 5 per cent. The question naturally arises, if we have all these magnificent natural resources, and a homogeneous population chiefly of British origin, an intelligent people and a good geographical position, why is it that the population of the maritime provinces has remained stationary? I have the idea that one reason is that these provinces are too richly endowed, that this very fact is one reason for their lack of progress. If you look about you will find that the leading men in any walk of life, political, commercial, or literary, are largely recruited from the farms—that the successful men of this country have become successful because they had to scratch for a living in their earlier years.

Take the same condition as applied to countries. That small country Holland, whose very soil had to be wrested from the sea, and whose people have to contend with nature to maintain their country, is perhaps the most wealthy country on earth in accumulated capital. Contrast conditions there with those in some of the West Indian Islands where nature has been lavish in its gifts. I might carry this illustration still further. The cities in any country that grow the most, are those, in the main, that have the least natural advantage. They tell me, for instance, that the port of Bristol is the finest in the British islands. Yet the shipping that goes in and out of that port is not a tithe of that which seeks the port of Manchester which, but for the energy of its citizens, would to-day be an inland city. So, it would appear that individuals, communities and nations prosper in adverse proportion to their natural advantages. And it may be for that reason that the maritime provinces have not grown as rapidly as they should. But, while this condition prevails with our present population in the maritime provinces, most of whom were born there, the same conditions, perhaps, would not exist if we had a large flow of new blood into that country. Perhaps it is fair to inquire why we have not had a larger immigration into the maritime provinces. I think that in this connection I cannot do better than quote from a paragraph from a very excellent book entitled 'Nova Scotia' written by a celebrated English journalist, Mr. Beckles Wilson:

Of the eight Canadian provinces stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific seaboard, the one of which Englishmen might be expected from its origin, its proximity, its history, and its resources, to know most about they know least. This is a puzzle I have often had to explain. Go down into Kent or into Wiltshire, and you will find villagers talking glibly of Saskatchewan and of Alberta. The ale-house wiseacre can give you off-hand all the salient peculiarities of the Far West. I have heard a farm labourer near Westerham, expatiating upon the grazing lands of the Bow river, and the duties of the Mounted Police, five thousand miles away, never forgetting to refer to the Canadian Pacific railway—tout court—as the C. P. R.. To hear him one would suppose he had already made his venture into those far occidental regions of the empire, but it was only in prospect 'when he had saved up a bit more.'

'Why in the name of common sense do you go so far?' I asked. 'What's the matter with Nova Scotia?'

The worthy fellow stared and scratched his chin. 'Nova Scotia,' he replied, not without difficulty, 'where is that?'

Here his intelligent little niece, a half-baked product of the Board School, came to the rescue. 'Dont you see, uncle Bob, the

gentleman's only having a little joke with you? Nova Scotia is an uninhabited island in the Atlantic ocean. Now, Saskatchewan is between 4,000 and 5,000 miles from England, Nova Scotia is less than half the distance, long-peopled, storied, picturesque to the eye. Both are Canada—both are crying out for immigrants. Yet the one stands almost solely for Canada in the mind of the prospective emigrant, and the other he confuses with Nova Zembia. Could you demand a more striking tribute to the powers of advertisement? For alone of the Canadian provinces, those on the Atlantic seaboard had not shared in the astounding uplift, 'the spectacular development' which has characterized the Dominion since 1896. Hundreds of thousands of immigrants poured into the country past the forests, orchards and valleys of what has been aptly called : Canada's front door.' It was decreed that they should be carried on to where there were lands to sell and wheat to be freighted; and so they travelled westward—'gone farther and fared worse' in many cases, although serving an undeniably good end in buttressing and giving body to the lately invertebrate trunk of the Dominion, of which Nova Scotia is undeniably the 'head.'

I do not quote that paragraph for the purpose of claiming for the province from which I have the honour to come that it is the 'head' of the Dominion, nor do I ask any other hon. gentleman to subscribe to that characterization. I quote it to show that the merits of Nova Scotia are not known to the people of the mother country. And what I say with respect to Nova Scotia is, no doubt, equally true with regard to Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. One has only to peruse the reports of the Department of the Interior issued by this government to find out one reason why there has been no immigration into the maritime provinces. Take, for example, a statement showing the literature printed by the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior, as disclosed in the annual report of that department for the year ending March 31, 1911. In this report, Sessional Paper No. 25, at page 65, we find the title 'List of Publications.' And this is the way that list begins:

	Copies.
'Last Best West,' English..	571,675
" " French..	30,000
" " Danish..	10,000
" " Norwegian..	25,000
" " Swedish..	25,000
" " German..	25,000

Now, take the newspapers, for example:

Alberta 'Herald,' German	26,000
Alberta 'Herald,' German, special crop edition..	10,000
Bassan 'News'..	4,000
'British News' of Canada..	52,000
'Canada Posten,' Swedish..	26,000
'Canada Posten,' Swedish, special.. ..	5,000

And so I might go through the list showing the character of publications and showing that they deal, if not solely, almost solely, with the western portion of Canada. There were printed publications of various kinds for distribution in the Department of the Interior last year to the number of 2,428,760 copies, and of these the publications dealing with the maritime provinces showed a total of only 150,000 copies. And as to these publications I shall say a word or two later. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) moved the other day for a return, a copy of which I hold in my hand. It relates to the expenditures upon immigration by the Dominion government. I find that in the last ten years there has been expended for literature for free distribution $914,705.40, of which only $13,760.05 went for literature descriptive of the maritime provinces. Upon examination it will be disclosed that the expenditures for the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island began only some three years ago. And I found upon inquiry that that expenditure did not come about as the freewill offering of the Department of the Interior. There was established about that time a Department of Industries and Immigration in the province of Nova Scotia, and desiring some Dominion government literature for the purpose of advertising the province, they wrote to the Department of the Interior asking for some such literature or asking that it be prepared. And the reply came back that the department could not print special literature with regard to the various provinces. I will quote one paragraph of the letter of the secretary of the Department of Industries and Immigration of Nova Scotia, showing how it came about that these publications were printed by this government.

He says:

When it was proposed that the Dominion government should issue these pamphlets, I was met with the objection that they had previously not issued anything in relation to the provinces, and therefore could not attempt it in regard to us here. I was fortunately able to show, however, that though the statement was made by the officials, pamphlets had been issued previously describing the resources of the eastern townships, Quebec, of sections of British Columbia and New Ontario.

Now, I find in the report last year of Lord Strathcona, High Commissioner of Canada, a list of some 38 successful farmer delegates who were sent by the Dominion of Canada to go to the British Isles lecturing with a view to bringing prospective immigrants back to this country. Out of these 38, descriptions of all but three of them are given, and they come from the following places: Saskatchewan, 12; Manitoba, 9; Alberta, 5; Ontario, 6; Quebec, 2; New Brunswick, 1; Nova Scotia, none; Prince Edward Island, none. So out of the 38 successful farmer delegates sent last

year to the British Isles, only one went from the maritime provinces, notwithstanding the fact that the maritime provinces represent slightly more than one-eighth of the total population of the whole Dominion. Now, I find in the annual statement of W. J. White, Inspector of United States agencies, a few lines which I wish to quote, indicating the nature of the work being performed by the agents of the Interior Department in the United States. This is one paragraph:

The settler of to-day is not the pioneer that his farmer neighbour was, but he may possibly take with him more capital; in fact this is necessary if he wishes to keep himself abreast of the advancement of the man who went to any of the provinces—Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta—A few years ago.

He defines the word 'provinces' to be Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. In another place he says:

The farmer with means, the man who is able to dispose of his farm in Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Missouri, or any of the western states is satisfied that western Canada has passed the experimental stage in the mater of agricultural existence.

Take the concluding paragraph of this report:

We have continued advertising in the same manner as before, which consists in the securing of space in the advertising columns of the farm and country weeklies and also placing notices from time to time. The work of the agents throughout the territory has been satisfactory in every way. Our literature deals with western Canada as a whole, including British Columbia. It is carefully revised every few months, and no old literature is allowed to be placed in the hands of the public.

That statement speaks more eloquently than any words of mine could do as to the nature of the propaganda which at present is being carried on in the United States. I find in the same report, for example, the annual statement of the Canadian immigration agent in Belgium:

I have this year added 376 schools to the number already large (3,900) in which the atlas of Canada is used in geography lessons. I take a special interest in keeping the winter night schools for adults well supplied with every kind of our literature, and the monthly edition of west Canada is regularly furnished to every teacher who applies for it, either in French or Flemish language.

The special literature which he refers to there is a magazine dealing entirely with western Canada. It points out more eloquently than I could the character of the advertising work of this government in its various publications. I have here a few leaves torn from several well known publications. The first is a leaf from the 'Canada Gazette,' of London, England, published on December 14, 1911. It is a whole page, headed 'Canada.' The picture shown is a very large barrel headed 'The flour barrel of the world.' The background is a field of wheat, and on the hoops of this barrel appear the words, 'Two hundred million acres of wheat land free for settlement.' It is hardly necessary for me to add that this advertisement is one dealing with the prairie provinces of Canada. Here is another page taken from the magazine 'Canada,' published in Great Britain, issued December 9, 1911. This shows a large field of wheat in a prairie country, with a three horse reaper and binder, and a prosperous looking Canadian wearing a Stetson hat, pointing out to a prospective English settler the merits of this beautiful farm. The scene is one which is typically western. Take another page from the magazine 'Canada,' of February 20, 1909, 'Free land for all in Canada. 160 acres of government land free for farming,' and so on, dealing entirely with western land. I have also a page taken from the 'Standard of Empire,' of Friday, December 1, 1911. It says, 'The British farmer sees a good thing in Canada. For full information, free maps, and pamphlets, apply to J. Obed Smith, Assistant Superintendent of Immigration, 11-12 Charing Cross, London.' What is the picture? A western prairie scene with elevators in the distance, wheat growing in the foreground, three or four reapers and binders gathering the harvest, a typical western scene. Take another page from the magazine 'Canada,' of January 29, 1910. It is headed 'Free land for all.' The advertising scheme is a barrel of flour, at one end of which appears the words 'Manitoba No. 1 Hard XXXX flour.' On the side of the barrel is a picture and map, showing the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, bounded on the east by Winnipeg, on the north by Prince Albert and Edmonton, on the west by Calgary, and on the south by Arcola. Below appear the words: 'The flour barrel of the world, Canada.' A man knowing very little about the geography of this country would suppose, from this government publication, that Canada was composed of the three provinces, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I hear some of our western friends saying, Hear, hear, to that statement. Here is one more page taken from the magazine 'Canada,' of December 5, 1908: 'Free land for all in Canada. Free farms in the golden west.' It goes on in a similar tenor.

Now, coming down to the question of expenditure for immigration, I find, upon examining the Auditor General's Report, for the year ending March 31, 1911, at page J—2, these figures:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Expenditures, Year Ending March 31, 1911, Auditor General Report, J—2.

Immigration salaries	319,298 86
Contingencies..	755,271 49
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals..	4,559 50
Total..	$1,079,129 85
Civil Government salaries.. ..	833,373 42
Contingencies..	56,732 66
Total..	$ 890,106 08

A very large portion of the cost of the Interior Department is chargeable properly to the immigration branch, and I contend that it deals almost solely with the three provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. It is impossible for me to define just exactly the proportion, but I find, by way of illustration, as disclosed at page J-13 of the Auditor General's Report, that for the salaries of officers and clerks of the immigration branch, 80 in number, the expenditure was $94,310.61. Deducting abatements in the department, the total was, in round numbers, $90,000. Take salaries, for example at Ottawa, a large proportion of which must properly be charged to the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior under the following heads: minister, deputy minister, assistant deputy minister, staff in the deputy minister's office, and minister's office, accountant's branch, and secretary's branch; they cost last year, in round numbers, $100,000. I find also, under the head of 'Canadian National Parks,' all located in Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, that $146,671.60 was expended. It is true that these are national parks, and as such they are for the whole of Canada. We find no fault whatever with that expenditure, but as a matter of fact the whole of that sum happens to be expended in these provinces and no portion of it reaches the maritime provinces. I find, under the heading of 'Miscellaneous costs litigation,' an expenditure of $7,520.99, and I venture to express the belief that no portion of that money found its way to the maritime provinces. The total expenditure last year in the Department of the Interior amounted to $4,829,520.69, and I believe I am within the estimate when I state that at the very least $2,000,000 of that expenditure is confined almost entirely, if not entirely, to the western provinces and that no portion of it reaches the maritime provinces. I could give illustrations of a like nature showing the policy which has been pursued by various governments in this country, but I believe I have given sufficient to show the direction which it has taken and that I could gain nothing by multiplying evidence of a similar kind.

We would have sufficient to complain of in the maritime provinces if this expenditure had prevented us from receiving a fair share of the immigration to this country, but it has another objectionable feature and one which bears very hardly upon the people of the maritime provinces, that is that it not only takes away from us a portion of the immigration which is properly ours, but it attracts to the western provinces a great many of our sons and daughters too, who can be ill-spared from the maritime provinces. There is the additional fact which, I sometimes believe, people resident in the west are inclined to overlook, and it is that the great railway corporations of this country, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific are carrying on a propaganda of advertising at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars with the view of attracting population to the prairie provinces. Why? Because they have land to sell and they have some 2,000 miles of railway over which to haul people, and out of which they can make a profit, from the seaports to the interior. I contend that if not one cent of money were expended from this day forward on the part of the Dominion government by way of immigration advertising, the money to be expended by these various railway corporations in their own interest would be more than sufficient, with the impetus which immigration has already in the west, to carry the development of the western country along very rapidly.

I am only going to give one illustration to this House of the nature of the advertising which is carried on by the great railways. I have here a pamphlet circulated by the Harrison Agency of Philadelphia, an agency that is only enabled to exist by reason of the fact that it is subsidized by the Canadian Pacific railway and by certain towns in the west. This agency has issued a pamphlet for circulation in the United States and accompanying this pamphlet is a map of North America. It gives the provinces beginning with those in the west, first British Columbia, next Alberta, then Saskatchewan, then Manitoba, next Ontario, and, on the extreme east, Quebec. The maritime provinces do not appear on this map at all. One of the sad features in connection with this advertisement, to those who come from the maritime provinces, at all events, is that the live, bright, up-to-date man who is in charge of this immigration bureau is one of our sons from the maritime provinces.

I have very briefly, Sir, shown in the first place the nature of our population and I have recited some of the conditions of the maritime provinces, sufficient to show that there is a state of things there which requires to be remedied, and it seems to me that the remedy lies in a propaganda of advertising. I believe that that propaganda

will have to be assisted very materially, in justice to the maritime provinces, by this government. The criticism has sometimes been launched that the people of the maritime provinces were too much inclined to look to the government. One former Nova Scotian said to me on his return from the west: The people of the maritime provinces are too much inclined to look to the Lord and the government for prosperity. Whether there is any truth in that criticism or not, at all events for the past two or three years the maritime provinces have endeavoured to take themselves ont of the rut. In St. John, New Brunswick, there was established by the local government, in 1909, an immigration bureau. But, I find that the sum at the disposal of the government of the province is very limited. In the fiscal year 1909 the total sum expended at the St. John office was $2,231.14, and at their London, Eng., office, $2,784.55, making a total for the province upon immigration work of $5,015.69. The returns for the fiscal year 1910-11 were not obtainable by me in the library, but I have no doubt that they would show a comparatively small increase over the figures I have named.

The reason why more money is not expended by the maritime provinces is because their revenues are so very small that more cannot be allotted for this purpose, but there is a strong disposition on the part of the maritime provinces to carry on a propaganda which will bring increased population to them. Premier Fleming of New Brunswick has recently made a suggestion to form a reunion association along lines similar to that which has I believe worked so successfully in the city of Winnipeg. A number of philanthropists there have each guaranteed a certain amount, and a portion of the capital sum is advanced to worthy immigrants for the purpose of bringing out their wives and families from the mother country. In the province of Nova Scotia some immigration work has been accomplished and with regard to the expenditure of Nova Scotia on immigration the secretary of industries in that province writes me:

> Since the inauguration of the department, the expenditures on immigration work both here and in Cape Breton by the provincial government, including the salaries and expenses of the officers of the agent general, which approximate yearly between seven and eight thousand dollars, were in 1908 twelve thousand dollars; 1909, seventeen thousand dollars; 1910, twenty-three thousand five hundred dollars; and 1911, twenty-three thousand dollars, which sum includes all expenses for advertising.

The work in that province has been going on for some two or three years, but with that limited amount of money it must be patent to every hon. gentleman that very little can be accomplished. I believe that the facts as given this afternoon are sufficient to indicate that the maritime provinces have never received anything like a fair proportion of the money which has been expended on immigration in this country. It may be difficult to find out just how much should be allotted to the maritime provinces, but I throw this out by way of suggestion: the population of the maritime provinces as disclosed by the census of 1911, is 937,949; the total population of Canada is 7,202,122. That means that in the maritime provinces we have a little more than one-eighth of the total population of the Dominion of Canada, and that being the case it would appear to be just that one-eighth of the total amount of money expended for immigration in Canada should be expended to bring immigrants into the maritime provinces, and one-eighth of two million dollars, which I think is a low estimate of the immigration expenditure, would amount to the sum of $250,000 per year. I am not so much concerned as to how this money should be applied; that is a question of important detail which can be dealt with better by those who are more familiar with it, and perhaps it may be that the only true method of finding out how it should be employed would be to have an investigation into the whole matter. In view of the fact that we have immigration machinery in two of these provinces at least, it would seem to me that the case could be met by this government appointing one immigration commissioner for each of the three provinces with an office in London, England; that these agents should be supplied with assistants all of whom should be men familiar with the needs of these various provinces, and that possibly the machinery existing in the provinces could, with some slight improvement, be sufficient to take care of that end of the immigration question.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman made a statement with respect to the expenditure by the Immigration Department in connection with the literature, and I understood him to say that within a certain period upwards of $900,000 had been expended, and that of that sum the proportion relating to the maritime provinces was $300,000.

Mr. RHODES. I said $13,000, was the total sum expended on the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Now, Sir, the character of immigration advertising which has been sent out by this government is almost entirely concerned with the free farms in the west. It is true that in various publications issued by the Dominion government a description appears of all of the provinces of this Dominion, including Nova Sco-

tia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, giving the nature of the products, the population, the climate, and so on, but there is always the inducement held out to the immigrant that if he comes to this country he gets one hundred and sixty acres of land free and in order to avail himself of that opportunity, he must go to the west. The character of the publicity which should be given to the maritime provinces is entirely different. We have no free lands to give away in the maritime provinces; there is very very little Crown land, and for the purpose of settlement that is practically a negligible quantity. Any publicity with respect to these provinces must deal with our resources and be directed largely to the purpose of bringing in capital to develop our resources, to enlarge industries which already exist, to create new industries, possibly to take over our vacant farms or to help in the purchase of farms from farmers in the maritime provinces who are perhaps not farming on the very best lines.

I have no doubt that representatives of Ontario and Quebec will wonder why it is that when I proposed this resolution, I did not mention these provinces. I may say that in the first place, looking at the census returns, and seeing the magnificent growth of the population in these two provinces, that was evidence they were not being neglected. But, Sir, there is another reason: the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario are wealthy. We find that the revenues of the province of Ontario are sufficient to enable that province to open a magnificent immigration office in London which is described in 'Canada' for January 13, 1912, and I will read one paragraph from that article:—

With the New Year the Ontario government entered into full possession of its reconstructed headquarters in the United Kingdom, which occupy a commanding position at 163 Strand, near Somerset House, and of which the government now own the site until 1950. The building has been entirely reconstructed. Not only does it present an attractive exterior to the passer-by, but the interior space on its five floors has been so economically used that the building can welcome its oversea visitors in a well-appointed reading room, and can show the prospective British emigrant or investor fine samples of Ontario's production in agriculture, fruit growing, lumbering, mining, &c., and the attractions it offers to the sportsman and the tourist.

The article goes on to describe the great length and splendid equipment of this building. But I shall not weary the House with details. Let me mention, however, that in the year 1911 over 1,000,000 pamphlets, handbooks, &c., were sent away by mail and parcel post, describing the advantages of the province of Ontario. I am inclined to believe that the Ontario government in postage alone, for the distribution of that literature, has expended more than the largest amount spent by the province of New Brunswick in any one year and, perhaps, nearly as large as that expended by the province of Nova Scotia in any year out of its sparse revenue. The province of Ontario has also opened an office in Belfast, Ireland, and has a representative there, besides special immigration agents whose duty it is to travel all through the British Isles describing the advantages and attractions of their province to prospective settlers.

I find that the wealthy province of Quebec has opened a splendid office in London. I find, also, from the last annual financial statement of that province, that it announces a surplus of something over $900,000, and that, deducting extraordinary expenditure which was taken from the revenue of the whole year, there is an actual net surplus in cash of over $600,000 in that province in one year alone. Contrast that with the condition of the maritime provinces where every one of the three local governments is struggling practically with a deficit every year.

As I stated at the opening of my remarks, I am not bringing forward this resolution in any factional spirit. I do not—and in this I believe I express the sentiment of the people of all the maritime provinces—object to any expenditure in any other province in this Dominion. We rejoice in the success of the other provinces and in the efforts made to increase their prosperity, and we do not ask that the expenditures in any one of them should be curtailed in any material degree. All we ask is that a fair proportion of the money expended by this Dominion to encourage immigration shall be expended in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. We do not ask this as a matter of favour but as a matter of justice. In this connection I would draw attention to an article which appeared in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of October 30. last. In that article the writer says:

It will be quite in order for the Dominion government to study the situation of the maritime provinces and to devise, if possible, a more aggressive policy of immigration for the benefit of those highly favoured sections. Canada wants the maritime provinces to share in the general progress which is marking its history. There is no reason under the sun why they should not attract and hold their share of the stream of immigrants coming yearly to our shores.

The difficulty I have experienced, Mr. Speaker, is not in lack of material, but on the contrary in selecting out of the abundance of material at hand sufficient to con-

vince the House without trespassing too long on its time and attention. I trust, however, I have made out a case which will commend itself to this House and the government. If some such treatment as I have suggested is meted out to the maritime provinces, the added stimulus which will be given to the feeling of hopefulness and sturdy optimism, which are already making their presence felt there, will make for such development as will place these provinces on equal footing with the most prosperous of any in Canada. Not only will the benefit inure to the maritime provinces, but we can then accomplish our full share in making for that growth and development which will—I believe—before the middle of this century make Canada the wonder and admiration of the world.

Mr. R. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence). I do not rise to criticise in any way the very eloquent speech made by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House (Mr. Rhodes) in urging on this government the claims of the maritime provinces and particularly of his own province of Nova Scotia. But a similar argument would apply to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. I think that all our eastern provinces have been neglected to a certain extent by the rush to the great west; but why I rose particularly is to point out again to the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) some defects in our present Immigration Act. Clause 28 of that Act provides that immigrants coming to Canada shall be inspected and examined on landing in this country. But the ground I take is that they should be inspected and examined before being allowed to sail from the other side. If that were done, a great many cases of hardship and a number of serious divisions of families would be avoided. There is one case to which I would draw attention. A father and mother and five children were about to land in this country when it was discovered that the youngest child, some four years old was afflicted with Trachoma. The father remained in this country but the child had to be sent back and naturally the mother had to go back with it. Now, if that family had been inspected on the other side before getting on board the immigrant ship, that separation would have been avoided. I shall not detain the House but simply wish to point out two or three sections of our Immigration Act which ought to be amended. In fact I think the whole Act might well be burned and a new one drafted. Take for instance the provision regarding the amount of money which an immigrant must have before being allowed to land. Every immigrant desiring to enter Canada must have in his possession $50 during certain months instead of $25. But why should a good man, a desirable immigrant, be obliged to have $50 in his pocket at any time. Had such a provision been in force years ago, when I was a boy, there are many in this House who would not be now in this country.

If a good man came with only $10, I would let him in, and if a bad man came with $5,000, I would keep him out. I think there ought to be some way of getting over that requirement. There are some people who are exempt from it—farm labourers and domestic servants; but if a man is an engineer, or a blacksmith, or a carpenter, he cannot come in except under that regulation. Another regulation is that no immigrant of Asiatic origin shall be allowed to enter Canada unless in possession of $200. According to that, if a man is born in India or any other part of Asia, and wants to come to Canada to spend the balance of his life here, he cannot come into this country unless he has $200. If he is not a desirable citizen, the possession of $200 will not constitute him one. I wish to draw the minister's attention to these points, and I hope he will give them his consideration.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, the resolution which has been introduced by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) is one of great importance to every maritime province man, and for that reason I desire to make a few observations upon it. I congratulate my hon. friend from Cumberland on his very able presentation of the case, to which he must have given a vast amount of study. I have very much pleasure in supporting the resolution. My hon. friend has spoken of the immigration policy of the late government, and of other governments with respect to western Canada. Personally I do not think there has been too much money spent in promoting immigration to the west, but there has not been enough money spent in bringing the maritime provinces to the attention of European countries. Not only have we had very little immigration into these provinces, but we have not been successful in holding our own people. It is of vastly more importance to the maritime provinces that we should retain our native-born population than that we should bring in numbers of undesirable immigrants from Europe. We in the eastern section of Nova Scotia, in the industrial portion of the island of Cape Breton, have not very much to complain of. The population in the constituency which I have the honour to represent has almost doubled in the last ten years. What surprises me is that my hon. friend from Cumberland, with all the attention he has given to this subject, has suggested no cure for the loss of population we have had in Nova Scotia for the last ten or twelve

years. What is the use of this government or any other bringing population into the prairie provinces of the west if their products are allowed to rot in the fields? There is one cure as far as the maritime provinces are concerned, that is, getting better and larger markets than we have at the present time. It will benefit the maritime provinces little to bring in a thousand or two thousand or ten thousand fishermen from Norway or Denmark and place them on our shores if the fish they catch are allowed to rot on the coast because they can get no market for them. Mr. Edward Blake once said that the great needs of Canada were men, money and markets. Last year the Liberal government at Ottawa endeavoured to get larger markets for us; but what was the attitude of the political friends of the hon. member for Cumberland? What was their attitude when the Liberal government of Nova Scotia sought to introduce capital into that province, and to amalgamate all the coal mining companies which we had previous to 1894? The coal trade was dead; there was nothing doing. The coal fields were there, but there was very little capital to operate them, and our available market was very small. The late Finance Minister, Mr. Fielding, then Premier of Nova Scotia, conceived a plan whereby American capital would be introduced into the province for the purpose of developing our coal mines, and what was the policy of the political friends of the hon. member for Cumberland on that occasion? Why, Sir, they went up and down the country decrying this attempt of the Liberal government of Nova Scotia to introduce capital to develop our mines.

And why did they decry it? Because, forsooth, some of that capital was coming from the United States. As a boy in those days I can well remember the great oratorical efforts made on behalf of the Conservative party to impress upon the people of that province how awful a thing it was to introduce American capital to operate our coal mines. They told us the Americans would come in and would close down our mines; they told us it was a disloyal thing to introduce this capital; in fact, attending a Conservative meeting, you could almost hear the bullets of American rifles whizzing by your ears. Notwithstanding their opposition, that measure was carried in the Nova Scotia legislature. But the friends of of the hon. member for Cumberland were not satisfied. They sent a delegation to Ottawa to try to induce the Conservative government that then controlled Dominion affairs to veto that legislation. But, notwithstanding, the legislation remained; the government here at Ottawa allowed it to stand. And, as a result of the legislation and of the 'Yankee dollars' introduced into the province, we saw the greatest industrial progress in that province that has ever been witnessed in any part of Canada. This took place in the island of Cape Breton. As a result of that movement the markets of Montreal were captured for the Canadian coal trade; and to-day, it is not a question of selling our coal in the Montreal market but a question of getting the coal there.

Now, last February something was attempted to be done which, to my mind, would have helped out the province of Nova Scotia very materially. As I have shown, we were opposed by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite when we tried to bring in American capital, and we were told that our action was disloyal. Last year, we attempted to secure the American market. And the very same argument was raised against us by the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. We were told in Nova Scotia—as, I presume, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) told his constituents—that, while it was all right to get a free market in the United States for our lobsters, it was a disloyal thing, a trampling of the Canadian flag under foot, to attempt to get our codfish and mackerel into the American market free of duty,—a truly marvellous situation. Now, the only part of our Nova Scotian fishing industry that is upon a footing such as every Nova Scotian would desire is the lobster fishery. And I do not think it takes a very profound mind to understand the reason why. The reason is simply that we have free access to the American market for lobsters. I just pointed out that the industrial centres of Cape Breton had a great deal of prosperity in the last eight or ten years. It was not in the mining centres that we lost population. Where then was that loss? In the last redistribution of seats in Nova Scotia where did we lose? It was found that the counties of Queens and Shelbourne had to be joined together and given one representative because their population was not sufficient to entitle them to two representatives. And these are both fishing counties. And the same is true of the county of Victoria, an almost entirely seabound county, which was attached for purposes of representation to a part of the then existing county of Cape Breton.

Mr. RHODES. With the hon. gentleman's permission I would like to ask him a question as I was unfortunately unable to be present at his opening remarks. Do I understand that he objects to the terms of this resolution?

Mr. CARROLL. I do not.

Mr. RHODES. The hon. gentleman is in favour of it?

Mr. CARROLL. Very much so.

Mr. RHODES. Glad to hear it.

Mr. CARROLL. And as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rhodes) will see in 'Han-

sard', I congratulated him very highly on his very excellent efforts. I was speaking of the fishing counties. I think it is a very pertinent fact that Queens, Shelbourne and Victoria whose principal industry of fishing were the counties in which we lost population. And why? I take it to result from the fact that our fishermen could not find sufficient markets for their fish. We have a fair market. We sell some fish in Ontario and some in Quebec, but very little. I think it was Joseph Howe who said that if you threw a grindstone into the Bay of Fundy it would naturally drift into the New England States. Mr. Speaker, that is our natural market for our natural products, it is our natural market for the fish taken along our coast. It is for that reason, in my estimation, and I believe in the estimation of every man who has given this subject consideration, that the fishing counties in Nova Scotia have lost population. Last year something was going to happen which did not happen—unfortunately, as I believe, for the province of Nova Scotia. Years ago we secured capital for mining development though we were opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. We attempted to get the markets, and we were opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. And in my opinion, without that money and without those markets it is absurd to try to get more population into the province of Nova Scotia. But we were told that this effort to secure reciprocity for the benefit of the fishermen was a disloyal thing, an awful thing. Why, in the riding of South Cape Breton which I have the honour to represent. I heard the gentleman who opposed me, speaking at a large meeting in the town of Glace Bay, attended by perhaps nine or ten thousand people, tell these people that the savage customs which existed in the United States of hanging and burning negroes would follow in the wake of reciprocity should reciprocity be approved by the Canadian people. Such were the arguments put up against reciprocity, and such were the reasons, I believe, which induced the people of this country, including a large proportion of the people of Nova Scotia, to vote against reciprocity.

Now, I agree with the hon. member for Cumberland when he tells us that we have a great country in the maritime provinces. I agree that there is no better country in the whole of Canada than the little province of Nova Scotia. But I do not agree with their policy. Or rather, I am in favour of the policy that these hon. gentlemen have been trying to block for the last sixteen years. Now, what is the use—I put it in all fairness to my hon. friend from Cumberland—what is the use of trying to induce more people to come to Nova Scotia under existing conditions? We have not the men we formerly had employed in our fishing industries, because we have not the markets.

We have our coal mines, and we have a great many men employed in them, because we have a market for our coal. It is true that in some parts of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island there are sections of country becoming depopulated; but we are not actually losing the people, because they are going to the industrial centres. What is the use, therefore, of bringing in any more men? At what employment are we going to put them? Are they going to engage in profitable farming? I am sorry the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), while dealing with this question, did not tell us that the Liberal government of Nova Scotia has done something to induce immigrants to come to our shores. It is true they have not done much, the reason being the small revenue which the government of Nova Scotia has at its disposition, and which prevents them from doing as much as they would like for the development of the province. But again I ask, where are we going to place those men? Are we going to put them in the lumber camps? Why, Mr. Speaker, we have not now sufficient market for our lumber, and we cannot get freely into the United States market. Last year, I believe, the maritime provinces sent about $2,000,000 worth of lumber into the United States, notwithstanding the fact that they had to pay a high tariff on that lumber.

Mr. RHODES. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. CARROLL. For my information, or for the information of the House?

Mr. RHODES. For the information of the House, although the hon. gentleman may need it also. If he is in favour of my resolution, why is he speaking against it?

Mr. CARROLL. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman was not in the House when I began my remarks, because I said that I thoroughly agreed with his resolution. Then I started to point out what had been done by his political friends for the past twenty years.

Mr. RHODES. What has that got to do with this resolution?

Mr. CARROLL. It has everything to do with it. I would like to see the population of Nova Scotia increase four-fold what it is now, but I must say again that we must have something for that population to do when it comes to our shores. I am pointing out that while the resolution of my hon. friend is a good one, and worthy of all consideration, there is something else that must precede this resolution, something that this government must do, before we can get anything for this extra population

to do. I want to say in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that I have it on reliable authority that seven out of every ten fishermen in the port of Gloucester are Nova Scotians. Now, if the reciprocity agreement had been sanctioned we would have got that population back again, and that is what I am complaining about. I have nothing to say against a single word that fell from the hon. member for Cumberland; but I repeat that before we bring in any more population we must provide larger markets for the population we have already. We have not even a sufficient market for the industries that are being developed at the present time. We have not sufficient market for our fish, hence the fisheries are not as flourishing as they ought to be. Now when I was interrupted by the hon. gentleman, I was going on to discuss the causes for the loss of population in the province of Nova Scotia. It is well known that the farming centres have lost population, and while the late government had proposed a remedy, the present government so far has shown very little indication of a desire to afford a remedy for our loss of population. I make the statement on good authority, that the late government were preparing to relieve the farming centres of the province of Nova Scotia of some of the hardships under which they are labouring in getting their products to our markets. We have pretty good markets there. In the estimates last year the late government had put many thousands of dollars to help build a railway as a feeder for the Intercolonial railway down to the little town of Baddeck, which is the shire town of the county of Victoria, but which unfortunately is fast losing its population. We have no means there, especially in the winter months, of getting our farm products to market. A considerable amount of money was placed in the estimates last year for the purpose of providing a railway by which those people could get their products to market, and have a needed communication with the rest of the province. But what has happened? The present government has blotted those estimates off the book, and notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has asked many questions from the Minister of Railways on this subject, he has received no satisfactory explanation of what the government intend to do with that road, and what they intend to do with the sum of money which was voted by this House for the purpose of building branch lines in many other counties of Nova Scotia; for example, the acquisition of the St. Peter's road. The money was not voted for it, but I think I may safely say that it was the intention of the late government to take over that road, and extend it into the town of Louisburg, to build a road also into the county of Guysborough, which is becoming depopulated owing to the fact that the fishermen have no markets for their fish, and also owing to the fact that the farmers are unable to get their products to market. What has happened with that road? Is the hon. member for Cumberland doing his duty in trying to impress upon the government the desirability of going ahead with that very important branch of the Intercolonial railway, so important to the people of the eastern part of the province, to Halifax, to the county of Pictou and to the county of Guysborough? These are some of the things that would help us to keep our population. We want better markets, better facilities for getting our farm products to market than are possessed by the people of Nova Scotia at the present time. Let me say again that I agree with the proposition that the maritime provinces have not been given enough attention in the matter of immigration. I do not say that too much is being expended for the west; but what I do say is that in Nova Scotia we want not only more population but better markets for the population we have. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for Cumberland.

Mr. A. DeWITT FOSTER (Kings, N.S.). I desire to say only a few words in support of the resolution which has been so ably moved by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), and which has also received the support of the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). Let me say, however, that the speech of the hon. member for South Cape Breton struck me as being characteristic of those made by hon. gentlemen of the opposition. He says that he is in favour of this resolution, that is he is in favour of more attention being paid to the maritime provinces in the matter of immigration, and in developing the resources of that part of the Dominion; yet he evidently still feels so sore at the result of the elections on the 21st of September last, that he cannot get away from the old song of new markets, a proposition on which the people of Canada pronounced so decisively last September. He has placed his views upon 'Hansard,' and I hope that his speech will be circulated largely in the maritime provinces. I hope that the miners employed by the Dominion Coal Company, and by various other companies will have a chance of reading his speech, and the farmers also, in fact all who were responsible for his election. I hope that it will be perused by other miners in that section of the country, whom we are credibly informed were locked up in the mines on a certain occasion. The very fact that that was so—as I am informed—

Mr. CARROLL. On whose authority do you get that?

Mr. FOSTER (Kings). I will give my authority at the proper time to the hon. member for South Cape Breton, but, as a matter of fact there evidently must be some truth in it, because my hon. friend comes to his feet very quickly, showing that he feels that there is something behind the prod after all. It is a well known fact that a certain section of the people of that constituency, who are responsible for his being in this House at this time were prepared to accept the proposition to lower the duty upon coal. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he is in favour of protecting the industry of the people who elected him in Cape Breton county, or if he is in favour of doing away with the protection which has been accorded, and will be accorded to that company? He was so anxious to rise in his seat and ask upon what authority I founded my previous statement that perhaps he will be so kind as to tell this House whether he is in favour of the protection of that industry or whether he still believes that there should be a lowering of the duty to the extent of 8 cents a ton on coal. I will sit down and give my hon. friend a chance to declare himself.

Since he does not declare himself on that question I shall proceed. We were told by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that the Conservative friends of the hon. member for Cumberland, Nova Scotia, opposed any attempt made by the government of that province to bring capital into that country, to establish industries, and generally to build up the country. Such a statement seems to me to be tantamount to saying that the Conservative party and Conservatives generally in the province of Nova Scotia were a class of people who were not progressive, and did not want their province to be progressive. Well, I noticed that it was left to the hon. member for Cumberland, himself a Conservative, to bring the case of the maritime provinces for the first time to the attention of the Dominion parliament along these lines. It seems to me that the hon. member for South Cape Breton might have impressed it upon his friends who were here to take up the case of the maritime provinces and impressed it upon the late government who were spending a great deal of money on immigration into Canada. I am not here to find any fault with the amount that was expended so long as that amount was honestly expended, and so long as the people of Canada got a dollar's worth of value for every dollar expended. I believe that the people of the maritime provinces will agree with the hon. member for Cumberland, and with every hon. gentleman in this House, that with any expenditure that this country makes for the development of the Canadian Northwest, for the development of Ontario, or Quebec, find absolutely no fault so long as it is honestly expended according to the best policy, and the best advice of the men who are in power. We in the maritime provinces are Canadians, we do not limit ourselves to one particular province, and say that we must have this to the exclusion of the other people or the other parts of this Dominion. We had an illustration of that spirit from the opposition benches the other night when an hon. gentleman, speaking in this House, stated that he did not care anything about protection in so far as the west was concerned, that what they wanted was free trade. Well, I submit, Sir, that in the humble judgment of the most humble representative of the people, who believes in the principle of protection, he will not get free trade for the west at this particular time in the history of Canadian development at least. Whether or not subsequent years will prove that this is the best policy for this Dominion is entirely another thing, but I think that the majority of the people who are in line with the progress of affairs and conversant with public sentiment, would say that it was time to cease harping back to some narrow, little policy that appertains to a particular portion of the country, and to adopt and stand by a policy which will give the greatest good to the greatest number.

I want to say a word or two more before I pass on to another line, to my hon. friend from South Cape Breton. He said that the Conservative party down there were opposed to this policy of bringing capital into the maritime provinces as in the coal industry. My recollection of the coal industry is something like this—I stand to be corrected if I am wrong—that there were certain Conservative members in the local legislature who opposed the particular kind of contract that the government was entering into at that time because under that contract the people of Nova Scotia would be compelled to pay a very much larger price per ton for their coal than they ought to pay by virtue of the fact that they were situated near the mines. It was pointed out at that time that they would pay six and seven dollars per ton for their coal. Conservative members in the House and others in the country pointed out that the adoption of the proposed contract between the government and the syndicate which was then being formed, would enable the syndicate to charge practically any price that they wanted to for their coal. The supporters of the government said that such was not the case. The events of history

have proved exactly the claim made by the Conservative members of the House and by large sections of the people in general. What do we find upon investigation in Nova Scotia? We find that where it costs a little over $2.10, not exceeding $3, to produce the coal, those only a short distance from the mines have to pay $6.25, $6.75 and $7 for their coal while the same article is being delivered to larger firms such as the great railways, and even in the city of Montreal, at $3 or $4 per ton. It was found that coal was being delivered to the Intercolonial Railway, the government road, at a siding at Sydney or at Pictou for $3.10 per ton. Well, it seems to me, that the results have demonstrated that the men who were opposing certain sections of that contract took a wise course and clearly foresaw the events which have actually happened. I repudiate the charge that the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island or any province of this Dominion are or were against the bringing in of capital, the establishing of industries and the building up of this country. What the Conservative party have always stood for throughout their history is the building up, within this Canada of ours, of a great nation. That is what we stood for previous to the 21st September and that is what the Conservative party, if it is true to its own ideals, will always stand for in the history of this Dominion. We were told that down in Nova Scotia we had Conservatives going on the platform and saying that it would be disloyal to trade with the United States. I venture to say that there is not a Conservative candidate in Nova Scotia who ever made such a foolish statement as to say it was disloyal to trade with the United States. That statement was made on the stump in Nova Scotia and throughout the Dominion by the very men who make it to-day in this House and it was made in a sarcastic way for the purpose of getting around the argument that confronted them. In my own constituency I was asked by a very estimable lawyer and a member of the local legislature if the fact that we got a dozen eggs from the United States, or we got two cents more for our eggs in the United States, would jar my loyalty any? I submit that a child would know better than that. When hon. gentlemen opposite say that Conservative members have said in Nova Scotia that it was disloyal to trade with the United States, I say they are but stating that which they themselves stated, to my own knowledge, upon the hustings in the province of Nova Scotia.

I was very glad to hear the hon. gentleman admit that the government of Nova Scotia has done very little for immigration. Practically all they have ever done, is to come out at the first of the year and state that Nova Scotia is in the greatest state of prosperity that could be imagined. The newspaper supporting that administration displays in large headlines the announcement that Nova Scotia is most prosperous and that immigration is flowing in every year at the rate of one thousand a month or some such exaggerated figure. And, when the proper time comes around, these self same gentlemen declare that Nova Scotia is going backward, and that reciprocity with the United States is the panacea. The hon. gentleman told us that we had no market in which to sell our potatoes, but I can tell him that in the county of Kings, which I have the honour to represent, we grew 250,000 bushels of potatoes last year and we had a market for all of them. Let me tell him, further, that a few days previous to the 21st of September, when the Liberals were telling the people that what we wanted was the market of the United States for our potatoes, a carload of American potatoes came right into my own constituency and were retailed to the people of the town at a lower price than our own farmers were getting for their potatoes in the home market. That was a fine illustration of the absurdity of the argument put up by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I am very glad that carload of potatoes came because had I not such a concrete evidence as that of the absurdity of the contention set up by the Liberals, I might not have the honour and pleasure of sitting in this House to-day. The hon. gentleman told us that we had no market for our lumber, but I would point out to him that in Nova Scotia we are disposing of our lumber at the rate of four hundred million feet a year, which is one hundred million feet faster than it is growing. Will the hon. gentleman tell me that that is not taking away from the forest fast enough? In the face of all this evidence these gentlemen opposite have the effrontery to tell us that we have no market. The hon. gentleman told us that we had no market for our fish, which seems to me to be a peculiar statement. Does the hon. gentleman forget that we took over $7,000,000 worth of fish from the waters of Nova Scotia alone last year and would he pretend that we are not selling this fish and that the men who cure it and distribute it are not making a profit and the fishermen a living?

Will the hon. gentleman state in this House now that there is no market for the products of the canning establishments in Nova Scotia? Why, if he looked at the returns published by the provincial govern-

ment he will find that there are firms in the town of Digby who are finding a market for their fish in the Canadian Northwest. The hon. gentleman also told us that there was no market for our apples but the fact is that last year we sold our apples in the Canadian Northwest, in Germany, in England, in Scotland and in Ireland, and some of our fruit even went to the West Indies, and so soon as our communication with the West Indian Islands is improved, I have not the slightest doubt that more of our apples and our potatoes will go there. The maritime provinces had eight million bushels of potatoes last year and I believe that in 5 or 6 years hence they will be raising five million bushels of potatoes and selling them too. I wish to say that I am heartily in accord with the resolution of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) as I am heartily in accord with every project that will bring immigration to the maritime provinces. And Sir, whether a measure with that object in view comes from a Liberal or from a Conservative government, I am free to say that I believe the people will heartily endorse it. I believe, Sir, that all the brains and all the administrative ability to be found in this Dominion or in any new country, is not to be found in one political party and it seems to me that my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) instead of speaking for five minutes in favour of this resolution and for fifteen minutes to throw cold water on it, might have forgotten, in his zeal for the welfare of the maritime provinces, that the resolution was introduced by a Conservative.

And, Sir, as to immigration, we are not only bringing back our sons and daughters who left Nova Scotia to go to the United States, but we have been sending out people from the maritime provinces and from Ontario and Quebec as well to the Canadian Northwest. We are proud of our people who have settled in the west, and who have done a great deal to advance the prosperity of their adopted province; I venture to say that no people who leave one part of this Dominion and go to another, bring more credit upon their native place than do the men of the maritime provinces. In this very Chamber we have men representing western constituencies who originally left the maritime provinces to settle out there, and that in itself is a tribute to the success which they have met with, and to the manner in which they have been able to establish themselves in the confidence of the people. Such men are sure to be foremost in the advocacy of a united east and west, and the binding together of all the provinces of the Dominion in one great country. I do not think that I can add anything to the eloquent words of my hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes) in supporting this resolution. Let me point out, however, that in the last eleven fiscal years, from July 1900 to March 31st, 1911, out of a total immigration of 1,764,475 only 73,502, or a trifle over four per cent. went to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER (Kings, N.S.). Mr. Speaker, when the House rose I was pointing out that the maritime provinces had been practically entirely neglected by the late administration. In support of that statement I need only point out that for the last eleven fiscal years, from July 1, 1900, to March 31, 1911, out of a total immigration of 1,764,475 only 73,502, or a trifle over four per cent went to the three provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. If even this small percentage had gone to the three provinces mentioned with the intention of taking up their homes there, while still a very unfair division, we of the maritime provinces might not complain, but it is well known in the British Isles the advice given by immigration agents was: 'Spend six months or a year in the east, get used to the ways of the country, and then go west where the free homesteads are available.' That this advice was largely followed is well known; so while the perusal of statistics might lead one to believe that the maritime provinces secured four per cent of Canada's immigration, the real percentage was much lower. Now, we do not object to people going to the Canadian Northwest. If there were more farmers in Manitoba, there would be larger markets for the manufactured goods of the east; if the number of grain-growers increased in Alberta, there would be more purchasers for the agricultural implements of which our manufacturing friends are so justly proud; and if a larger area is placed under cultivation in Saskatchewan, it will mean more persons requiring the cotton and woollen goods, the boots and shoes and other products of those flourishing industries whose manufactures is as yet largely confined to the older parts of the Dominion. We do not object to promoting immigration to the west. Our whole argument has reference to the distribution of the immigration. While we are willing that the west should have its fair share of the immigration, we think more attention should be paid to the eastern provinces. In support of that position, let me read from a speech delivered in this House by the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), on May 10, 1909, in which he said:

From the year 1900 to 1907 the Minister of Interior subsidized the following societies which are especially charged with the work of repatriation and immigration from the United States: The Quebec and Lake St. John railway was subsidized during these years to the amount of $25,300; the Repatriation Society of Montreal was subsidized for $25,300; the Repatriation Society of Quebec was subsidized to the amount of $22,000, and, by the last report, that of 1908, I see that the Department of the Interior, in order to encourage these societies has voted $8,000 to the Quebec and Lake St. John railway, $4,000 to the Repatriation Society of Quebec, $15,000 to the Ottawa Valley Aid Immigration Society, and $1,000 to the Union National Francaise.

I do not think the friends of the maritime provinces will take very much exception to the subsidizing of these societies. As has been pointed out, there are upwards of 50,000 French Canadians on the other side of the line, who would in all probability like to come back to Canada, and we take no exception to any effort to bring them back; but where can you find an instance of a subsidy being granted to any society or company or railway in the maritime provinces for a similar object? Surely this shows lack of attention to the east.

Before passing to the advantages which Nova Scotia has to offer to the immigrating population of the British Isles or of Germany or of the northern part of Europe, I wish to state that my remarks as to the policy of the late government are not in any manner whatsoever intended to reflect upon the officials of the department. The officers of the Immigration Department, whom I have met in Ottawa, I have always found to be courteous, obliging, and well versed in their work, and I have much pleasure in stating that they apparently are thoroughly conversant with the requirements of the province from which I come. But administration and policy are two different things. The officers attend to the administration and with the administration I find no fault; but the policy is in the hands of the government, and, while I would hardly go to the extent of saying that Nova Scotia has been discriminated against, I will say that it has not received the attention at the hands of the late government which its importance and needs demand.

Coming now to the opportunities which Nova Scotia offers to the resident of the motherland, they may be divided briefly into five classes: mining, fishing, manufacturing, dairying and fruit-growing. I understood that it was not the policy of the late administration to do much for the first three of these industries, and perhaps a good deal might be advanced in support of that claim; but at the same time I do not see that there could be any great objection to inserting in our advertising literature for distribution throughout the world, the immense and far-reaching advantages that might be found in the maritime provinces for the establishment of industries along these lines. In the maritime provinces we have the resources along with ample water power and electrical power for the establishment of industries, and the government might very well put in their advertising literature something that might catch the eye of the immigrant intending to come to this country that would induce him to settle in the maritime provinces. It might perhaps be said that the manufacturing and mining interests are sufficiently well organized to take care of themselves. But with the dairying and fruit growing or the agricultural industry it is different. In neither of these quarters is the province developed to anything like the extent possible; nor is it reasonable to suppose that those now engaged in that work should of their own volition attempt to extend the production of the province by inducing others to enter the same occupation. They have neither the time nor the organization necessary, but they fully realize that an increase in their numbers would be a gain not a loss, to those already so engaged. If the apple production of Nova Scotia were trebled, the fruit would be that much better known in the western, German, and London markets and the Nova Scotia farmer would be correspondingly benefited. Here then is an opportunity to use a portion of the immigration appropriation for the benefit of the maritime provinces.

Let us look for a moment at what the people of the maritime provinces are doing in the potato industry alone. In 1901 there were 36,290 acres in the province of Nova Scotia alone under cultivation, and they produced 4,269,610 bushels. In 1907 there were 43,836 acres under cultivation, producing 8,294,097 bushels, an increase of acreage of 7,546 acres and an increase of production of 4,024,487 bushels. When we remember that it was practically the same population that were producing nearly twice as much, we are led to wonder what would be the possibilities of that province if our population were increasing so that instead of having 450,000 we had a million people there.

For we know that, as the late Dr. Johnson pointed out in a very able public address, that there are some millions of acres in the maritime provinces capable of producing farm crops not yet reduced to cultivation. It seems to me, as Dr. Robertson pointed out the other day, that with advanced methods of agriculture, such as are in use in some parts of Ontario, our present maritime provinces could increase their production by from seventy-five to one hundred per cent, even if they used only the land now in cultivation. In the

year 1910, the total value of field crops for Nova Scotia was $21,203,000; for New Brunswick, $18,959,000, and for Prince Edward Island, $9,998,100. It seems to me that, with the improved methods to which I have referred, production could be doubled even by the present population. Add to that the annual influx into the maritime provinces of 1,000 people a month from Denmark, Holland, Norway, Germany and the British Isles, and the prospect is just by that much the brighter. And when I speak of immigrants from the British Isles, some in the maritime provinces may say that our friends from the old country are not as excellent farmers as those who have been trained among ourselves. But these people from the British Isles are in this country only a short time when they become proficient, and as soon as they become proficient they settle down as farmers amongst us. In my own constituency some of the most progressive and up-to-date farmers were formerly residents of the British Isles.

Now, with regard to the fruit industry, only a few years ago in the province of Nova Scotia—in fact only last year—we were growing a little over 400,000 barrels of apples. This season we grew 1,500,000 barrels. And no one, even the most optimistic, pretends to set a limit to fruit growing in the maritime provinces. And from parts of Nova Scotia not now devoted to fruit growing, as well as from many parts of New Brunswick, come reports which show that the land suitable for the raising of fruit in the maritime provinces is unlimited. Well, why should not this information be given in the press reports and in the documents distributed all over the world in order that attention may be directed to the maritime provinces as well as to the golden west of which we are all so proud.

Turning now to the dairying industry, we find again an excellent opportunity for advancement, and a field which offers great inducements to the proper class of immigrants to be found in many English counties. The Dominion Dairy Commissioner, Mr. J. A. Ruddick, in the course of a public address, made this statement:

> There is no reason why Nova Scotia should not produce at least $25,000,000 worth (instead of $5,000,000 worth) of dairy produce a year. The export of butter from the little country of Denmark amounts to nearly $50,000,000 a year, and Denmark is only two-thirds the size of Nova Scotia. It is true that there is very little waste land in Denmark, but the total area available for dairying cannot be any larger than in Nova Scotia, and there are large sections of this province that are infinitely more productive than any land to be found in Denmark. I believe that the season in Nova Scotia is quite as favorable as it is in the European country. Cattle do not suffer in Nova Scotia to the extent that they do in Ontario and Quebec from the heat and flies in the summer months.

The members of the Scottish Agricultural Commission who visited Canada in 1906, gained an impression of the advantages offered by Nova Scotia for the development of the dairying and beef raising industry. In that section of their report that deals with the live stock industry they say of animal husbandry in my province:

> In Nova Scotia, as in the greater part of eastern Canada, conditions are especially suitable for dairy cattle. With a suitable climate and a rain fall of over thirty-five inches spread well over the spring and summer, Nova Scotia in many parts seemed especially adapted for rearing and feeding cattle. Roots of all kinds seem to grow well, and hay of good quality is abundant which means that the provision of winter keep for stock is not a matter presenting much difficulty.

It is a well known fact that in Nova Scotia great attention has recently been given to fruit growing. People have gone into fruit growing as a specialty and have neglected the raising of beef, with the result that we have had to depend very largely upon the provinces of Quebec and Ontario for our supplies in that line. I believe, and Dr. Robertson expresses the same idea in the address he delivered—that directly the people of these provinces realized that they have facilities for raising and placing upon the market their own beef, directly they realized that this is a profitable industry, especially coupled with sheep raising, as soon as they become fully possessed of the notion that we have in the province of Nova Scotia this opportunity, just so soon we shall have these things developed in our province. Then, as I have already asked, is there any reason why we should not have such information as this distributed amongst the people whom we desire as colonists? It seems to me there is none. Opinions such as those I have just quoted, leave no doubt that there exists an excellent opening for new settlers, and I trust the government will give early attention to seeing to it that the advantages of Nova Scotia are properly placed before the emigration portion of the population of the motherland. With the improvement of the cold storage service to which this government is pledged, an immense impetus and additional advantage will be given to both dairying and fruit growing, and for that reason the present time is especially opportune for making an effort to direct a reasonable portion of the immigration towards the maritime province. As to the best course to pursue to bring about the desired results, the government will, I am sure, give the matter its best consideration; and, with thousands of acres of the finest land in the Dominion

lying fallow or only partially cultivated, with our population at a standstill and with our representation decreasing in this House, the subject is one, I contend, which should be dealt with energetically at the very earliest opportunity.

I make my statement with regard to what I believe to be the right of the maritime provinces, without any desire to have recourse to partisanship. But the House has seen that no sooner was the reason laid before the House than partisanship was dragged into the discussion. I believe it was my duty to appeal to the facts in refutation of what was said and which did not pertain to the resolution. In conclusion, I am in hearty accord with any movement that will tend to the upbuilding of the maritime provinces and of the Dominion of Canada; for I think I can truly say that in the maritime provinces we are all of us Canadians first, maritime province people second, and party men last.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). I desire to endorse the resolution moved and so ably supported by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes). There is undoubtedly a general feeling throughout the maritime provinces that those provinces have been ignored in the advertising propaganda which has been carried on by the Immigration Department of the Federal government within the last ten or twelve years, and that the efforts of the department have been too exclusively devoted to the booming of the west.

There is no objection in the east to the freest and most generous advertising of the resources of the prairie provinces, or to the employment of all legitimate means to attract desirable settlers to that section of the country. But we feel in the east that the efforts and the energies of the Immigration Department should not be wholly devoted to that purpose, as they have been in the past, and that the maritime provinces, which are seeking more population and which have equally attractive and more varied opportunities to offer for settlement, should now be given equal attention. At the present time, I may say that there is in the province of New Brunswick a feeling of optimism and hopefulness with respect to our future development that has not, I think, been equalled in any previous period of our history. For a long time that progress was not made which we would like to have seen, in agriculture particularly, in consequence largely of the fact that the valley of the St. John river, which traverses 7 of the 15 counties of the province from the Quebec boundary in the north to the Bay of Fundy in the south, and which contains the most fertile and productive lands within the province, has been deprived of very necessary transportation facilities. Now, however, that the construction of that great public work has been assured by the joint action of the provincial government of New Brunswick and the present Federal administration, a fresh impetus has been given to the whole of that section of our province, agriculturally , commercially and industrially. To-day the attention of the whole population has been fixed as it never has been before upon the extent and variety of our natural resources, and the unexcelled opportunities and advantages which New Brunswick offers for expansion and development. Only recently I had the pleasure of listening to an address delivered before the Fredricton Board of Trade by Mr. Palmer, of the 'Financial News,' of London, Eng., a very illuminating and encouraging address with respect to the resources of the province of New Brunswick. He stated that he was more impressed with the possibilities and resources of that province than with those of any country he had ever visited, and he had travelled over the whole of Canada three or four times. Therefore I say that in the province of New Brunswick at the present time the people are particularly hopeful and optimistic with regard to our future development. We have in that province valuable fisheries, we have iron deposits, we have coal fields, we have oil wells and waterpowers, and a wealth of timber resources which is equalled by few of the provinces of this confederation, and a soil adapted for fruit growing and profitable mixed farming. In addition to all these things, we have the principal ocean port of the Dominion of Canada. All that we need at the present time is more population, and in order to get that we only need to make better known the resources of that province to the intending emigrant in the old world and in other countries. I am sure that this government will do its utmost in that respect. What we desire in New Brunswick is that the Immigration Department of this government will cooperate to this end with the provincial authorities to a greater extent than it has done in the past. I am already assured that the government will do so, and that the result will be that within the next ten years we will have the greatest development in New Brunswick that has ever been known in the history of that province.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland). I think this House will be ready to congratulate my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) on the admirable way he presented his case in moving the resolution now under consideration. Indeed I think that the thanks of the hon. members representing maritime constituencies generally are due to my hon.

friend for what I may call the admirable compendium of facts which he has presented to this House. It is in a sense a handbook relating to the maritime provinces. Admittedly the resolution is one of importance to the people of eastern Canada, not alone to the maritime provences; it is a resolution in which the people of eastern Canada will take a keen interest. It is, therefore, essential that we should discuss this matter dispassionately, without any partisan bias whatever, solely from the standpoint of the interest of our common country. Mr. Speaker, I quite concur in the objects of the resolution, in its spirit; but if in some respects I do not agree with my hon. friend in his diagnosis of the case, I am sure he will not attribute to me any desire to import into this discussion any partisan considerations. I may have to deal with what I conceive to be an economic truth, but I will do so in no partisan spirit.

My hon. friend says that the maritime provinces have been taunted in the past with relying almost solely upon the Lord and upon governments. It is a taunt which has been frequently heard, not only in this House, but outside, and in the press of the country. I am sure my hon. friend did not wish to endorse a taunt of that kind. I think we must all acknowledge that Providence has done much for the maritime provinces and no one can make any complaint on that score. If any proofs were necessary to show how rich and profuse the gifts of Providence have been to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, we need only to refer to the speech of the hon. member for Cumberland. He has pointed out concisely the rich resources of that section of Canada, and it is upon those resources that he has based his resolution, a resolution that I will for a moment try to analyse.

He says:

That, inasmuch as the immigration policy of the government and the several railway companies has for many years been almost entirely confined to the development of western Canada, and largely in consequence of this policy the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have not grown in equal degree with the rest of the Dominion, in the opinion of this House, in order to promote uniform progress and prosperity throughout Canada, the government should speedily inaugurate and carry out a policy of publicity and immigration designed to promote the more rapid development of the said provinces.

If my hon. friend had charged the want of prosperity or population to other causes than the exclusive one which is mentioned, I would certainly be in harmony with his resolution in every respect. I do not take exception to it even as it is, but I think it would be my duty to point out to my hon. friend wherein the policy of the Immigration Department has not been the only clog to the wheel of progress in respect to population in the maritime provinces. My hon. friend said, and I think with considerable truth, that the attention of the Immigration Department in the past has not been given, as it should have been, to the matter of promoting immigration to the maritime provinces. I hold that this is true in respect to all Immigration Departments from 1867 down to the present moment, and I am not going to withhold my words of censure and criticism upon Dominion governments in the past in respect to their shortcomings in this regard. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, until the advent of the Hon. Clifford Sifton into the Department of the Interior there was very little attention given to immigration to any part of this Dominion. If that attention was given, as it should have been, certainly it was a signal failure, because, until the régime of that hon. gentleman there was no progress made commensurate with the resources of Canada or commensurate with the bright prospects that we have in that land known as our western heritage. Up to that moment there had not been given the attention to this matter which should have been given to it and from 1896, or shortly afterwards, down to the present, there has been nothing but a steady, spectacular progress with regard to the settlement and development of our western country. But, during that time there has not been any attempt made to direct the attention of the people of other lands to eastern Canada, that attention which I claim the resources, prospects, and wealth of these eastern provinces would justify. If immigration has been steadily going into the west and if it has not gone to the east, I am not one who would charge the department with the sole responsibility. I hold that the people of eastern Canada are themselves to blame. I hold that the press of the country and the public of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the maritime provinces generally should share in the responsibility. So that, during all these years, our attention has been devoted to the west. My hon. friend has said that the railway corporations have done very much. They have done a great deal to withdraw the attention of the people of other lands from eastern Canada and our own people of eastern Canada have done very much more, perhaps unwittingly, in that direction. We have all been glorifying our western heritage, we have talked of the illimitable prairie, we have spoken from our public platforms, and our press has teemed with articles laudatory of our western country, and its rich re-

sources. Too little attention has been paid to the conditions which have prevailed in the maritime provinces. My hon. friend says that he is going to remedy them by a campaign of publicity on the part of the Department of the Interior. While that might do much to remedy it, while it might be of considerable assistance, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think it is the sole remedy that should be applied. It would almost seem, from the words of my hon. friend, and of some other hon. gentlemen from eastern Canada, that this is the first time that any attention has been given whatever to the promotion of immigration to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Why, Sir, it was for many years in New Brunswick a very burning question. In 1849, the government of New Brunswick, with the view of peopling the waste lands of that province, with the view of inviting settlement, in the rich valleys of the St. John, the Miramichi, and other fruitful sections of the province, brought over from Great Britain a gentleman of very great eminence, Mr. Johnson, to make an examination, survey and detailed report of its possibilities and resources in order that, he might return to Great Britain and bring to the attention of the people of that land that particular province as a possibility for intending settlers. I have in my hand a report on 'The Agricultural Possibilities of the province of New Brunswick, by J. F. W. Johnson, F.R.S., S. L. and E.' This report was published, many thousands and tens of thousands copies were circulated broadcast throughout the British Isles, and it was advertised to the fullest extent possible. It is an exhaustive, able and thorough report and well repays the attention that any one would give to it having a desire to make a research as to its contents. That was in 1849-50. In 1854 the government of the province of New Brunswick took further action.

Mechanics' Institutes and other societies throughout the province carried on a propaganda to make the rich resources of New Brunswick known in the motherland. The Mechanics' Institute of St. John was in existence long prior to 1850 and had its headquarters in the building known to this day as the Mechanics' Institute. In 1851 a pamphlet was issued by the government of New Brunswick giving full and detailed information as to the conditions existing in the province and that was sent broadcast throughout Great Britain. In 1854 Mr. M. H. Perley, at the instance of the New Brunswick government, published a handbook of information for immigrants thousands of copies of which were circulated. In 1860 the government of New Brunswick sent the Hon. James Brown to Great Britain and Ireland to promote immigration. I should have mentioned that in 1849 the Mechanics' Institute offered substantial prizes on the subject of New Brunswick as a home for immigrants and the best means of promoting immigration and developing the resources of the province. One of these essays was written by William Till, jr., editor of the 'New Brunswicker,' one of the first papers published in that province. In 1874 Mr. Thomas Potts was appointed by the Mackenzie government to represent the Dominion Immigration Department particularly in the interests of Canada and he issued a pamphlet. Mr. Samuel Watts of Woodstock also issued a book entitled 'Facts and Information for intending immigrants to New Brunswick.' In 1866 Mr. R. M. Burtis, at the expense of the Mechanics' Institute, distributed in Great Britain his pamphlet on the subject, which was one of considerable value. Then, there was the report of Professor Johnston published by the government in 1849, and the pamphlet of James Edgar issued in 1860. In 1879, when the Hon. Michael Adams was Surveyor General of New Brunswick, the government issued a comprehensive pamphlet as to the opportunities afforded to immigrants in that province. All along, down to 1867, the government of New Brunswick by constant effort endeavoured to bring to the knowledge of the people of Great Britain facts relating to that province. But notwithstanding these efforts there still exists that sparsity of population which is a drawback to the progress of New Brunswick. Prior to confederation, we had, as we have now, such products as fish, coal, grindstone, building stone, gypsum, lime, oil, oil shales, lumber, agricultural products. I believe that the conditions which existed prior to confederation in my province were very different from the conditions which have existed since.

The Department of the Interior has been charged with being responsible for the want of increase in the population, but that charge cannot be well founded because from 1851 down to 1861 the maritime provinces increased in population to a marvellous extent. That was previous to confederation. During the first period of the decade, between 1851 and 1861 there was a material increase in the population. From 1881 to 1891 we had our first decrease in the population of New Brunswick, and I think I am correct in saying that the same statement would apply to Nova Scotia. From 1871 to 1881 the decrease was not so marked. But since 1881 and down to 1911 the population of eastern Canada—certainly the rural population—has been practically stationary. That condition has been due to this fact that there has not been a proper development of our natural resources. It is due to the fact that our stone quarries, gypsum and lime quarries, the small lum-

bering operations have been miserably stagnant, the stone quarries are silent. We hear a great deal about our home market. Why, in 1867 down to the period when the United States entered upon an era of high tariffs and enacted prohibitory tariffs, we had a home market certainly in the maritime provinces beyond anything we have had ever since. In the counties of Westmorland and Albert alone in New Brunswick, there was a home market furnished by the stone quarries alone where we had 1,000 people engaged, not to mention the other industries connected with these quarries which also gave employment to a large number. There were the coasting vessels employed in freighting that stone, there were the shipyards alive with industrious hands engaged in the construction of these coasting vessels. All these afforded to the agriculturists of that section of eastern Canada a home market certainly far better than the market now afforded them by the works of the Intercolonial railway in the city of Moncton. There are not more than 1,000 men employed in the workshops at Moncton. In 1867 and during that period between 1856 and 1866, there were quarries in operation which gave employment to thousands of men who are not there to-day because these quarries have been shut down owing to the closing of their natural market the American market, and no substitute having been obtained. If the people of eastern Canada are ever to develop their stone and gypsum and lime quarries and coal mines, they must find a market for these productions. But some one will say have they not a home market in western Canada? Well, the conditions of transportation and the conditions in western and other portions of Canada preclude the possibility of our finding there an adequate market for these products of the maritime provinces, and naturally the closing of the American market, the consequent silencing of our quarries, the sweeping away from the seas of our coasting vessels, the shutting down of our shipyards, brought about a great change in the conditions in eastern Canada. Where to-day are the men who worked in these quarries and their descendants? You may look for them beyond western Canada and in the State of Ohio. Where are the ship carpenters who worked in our ship-yards, and their descendants? They are to be found on the Kenebeck and along the coast of the New England States employed in constructing vessels that sail, not under the Union Jack, but under the Stars and Stripes.

I am not going to hold any government responsible. I am not making charges against the last or any preceding government, but I am inviting attention to conditions which prevailed forty years ago in Eastern Canada as compared with those which prevail to-day. The people of the United States, in their frenzy for a protective tariff, closed to us their market, and we have had no substitute for that market down to the present. We had an opportunity,—and I do not refer to it in order to excite any discussion with respect to freer trade relations with the United States or improved reciprocal trade relations,—but I will say this, that if there were these open markets between Canada and the United States, if there were this interchange of commodities as the result of an arrangement between the two countries, the people of eastern Canada would have an opportunity of developing their resources, which they are now lacking, and there would be work for our labouring population. There would be thousands employed in the stone quarries, in the ship yards, in the construction of coasting vessels, in the gypsum and lime quarries not to mention coal and small lumbering. If this opportunity were furnished the people of eastern Canada you would not hear any complaint about the population of the eastern provinces. The subject is a gloomy one, the matter is one to be deplored, and the question to be solved is how can we best remedy present conditions. If there has been a decrease in our population from 1881 down to the present or if our population has been practically stagnant as regards its increase, and if preceding that period there had been an increase in the population of eastern Canada, then where are we to put the responsibility? That decrease or stagnation has not been due to lack of publicity, because in the period when our efforts for publicity were feeble on the part of our local government and naturally circumscribed, we had a population increasing every year and there came to our ports, people from the old land particularly, by the hundreds and thousands.

New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island may well congratulate themselves upon the character of their population. My hon. friend has spoken of the rich resources of the maritime provinces, but he has not dwelt on the character of the men who went in and did the pioneer work there, hewing out homes for themselves and their families. I do not wish to be charged with making a partisan speech; I am not. I am giving utterance to the faith that is in me with respect to a certain economic policy. I hold that after all protection is a reciprocity, but it is a reciprocity of monopoly, while free trade is a reciprocity of freedom and of commodities. My hon. friend says that our natural resources have been awaiting expanding markets. Why is it that we have not sought those expanding markets and

that those natural resources have to grow gray in their waiting? When the opportunity was afforded us to develop those resources and to obtain those expanding markets, we did not seize upon it, and we are slow to-day to do so. Therefore I make this assertion, that the fact that we have not a larger population to-day than we practically had 20 or 30 years ago is due to the want of development of our natural resources. My hon. friend let fall a remark which certainly was full of meaning: he spoke of the vacant farms in the maritime provinces. Mr Speaker, there must be a cause for vacant farms, and if the Immigration Department had gathered together a list of those vacant farms in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and had it circulated in Great Britain, what a splendid invitation it would have been to intending immigrants; what an incentive to them to take up their lot in a country which had been settled for a hundred years and which had reached that stage of agricultural development or stagnation that it had an innumerable list of vacant farms. Vacant farms are not a recommendation to any country from an agricultural standpoint. My hon. friend wanted the Immigration Department to take hold of that question. Why, the Government of New Brunswick, in 1897-98, when I had the honour of being connected with it, had pamphlets printed for circulation in Denmark, Scandinavia and Great Britain with a view to inviting immigration, and we were urged to have inserted in those pamphlets advertisements of farms for sale; but I am bound to say that I had not the hardihood to admit the advertisements stating that there were so many vacant farms, because I did not think they would recommend the country to those who wanted to come to the new world to take up farms. Now, these vacant farms are in existence; why? I hold that it is because there has not been an incentive to the agricultural interests. I hold that the policy which has been pursued from 1878 down to the present even, has not been of such a character as would tend to the development of those agricultural interests in eastern Canada; and if there were an earnest and honest desire to develop our natural resources, if a proposition were placed before this House having for its aim and object the development of the marine interests, the fishing interests, the stone interests and the coal interests of eastern Canada, it might be that we would be met with the cry that to develop your natural resources you exhaust them, and if you sell those resources, though you develop them, and find a market to the south, you sap your national independence and disintegrate your empire. That has been and is the cry, and it seems to me that when we seek to place upon the shoulders of the Department of the Interior the responsibility for existing conditions in the maritime provinces in the matter of population, we are forgetting entirely the cause which brought about those conditions. How can you invite to your land for settlement the people of other lands when they are restricted as to their home market, and every one must admit that in a limited home market you have a most uncertain and variable market. There is no incentive to production and therefore no great call for labour, and with no great call for labour there cannot be any great increase of population. We are in the position in Canada to-day of having compelled those engaged in the development of our natural resources to buy in the dearest market. That is admittedly the very object of our fiscal policy in the past and certainly of all protective policies. But, worse than that, we have denied to the agriculturists of Canada and to all others developing our natural interests, the privilege of selling in the best market or in wider markets. Is not that the story in a nutshell? Under these circumstances does it not seem reasonable that there should not be that increase in population that God and nature intended that there should be in that section of the Dominion? We have had in the province of New Brunswick in the last decade a slight increase, I think about 20,000 souls. In the previous decade ther was no increase; our population remained stationary. But in former years, when the development of our natural resources was going on, our population increased, our agricultural lands were settled, our lumbering operations went forward.

My hon. friend has spoken of the resources of the county of Albert, its immense oil deposits, its gas fields, its mountains of oil shales. It is true that the attention of the public in the United States and this country has been directed to these rich resources again within the last ten years. But the oil shales were the basis of an industry in the fifties. Men were converting the oil on these shales into illuminating oil, which was sold in the markets of Boston at $1 a gallon. But when the oil wells in Pennsylvania were developed and oil was procured at a much cheaper rate, it naturally commanded the market and the business of production from the oil shales of Albert died out. But, all these years, that resource has existed and it has been known. But the conditions which have existed—conditions which we had an opportunity to set aside—have prevented the development of this industry. I have called attention to the pamphlet issued by the province of New Brunswick and written by William Till, jr., who was the editor of a newspaper. In speaking of the development of the resources of New Brunswick, he said:

It, therefore, follows that not only individual efforts but some legislation should be directed towards giving an impetus to those branches of business which promise the best and safest returns.

Then he calls attention to some of the opportunities afforded by these resources:

As the agricultural resources of the province are universally acknowledged to be good—its forests limited only by its boundaries, affording the basis of an extensive trade in shipbuilding and lumbering—its harbours numerous and safe, and its water courses abundant, furnishing ample facilities for manufacturing establishments, while its mineral resources (which are as yet imperfectly known) cannot be justly estimated; but as far as they have been developed, the projectors have in general met with rich reward for their industry and enterprise. Limestone, coal, copper, iron, gypsum and other valuable deposits are known to exist in various sections, and in two of the eastern counties (Albert and Westmorland) mines of extraordinary richness are being worked. Building stone is also to be found in abundance, and some of our finest public and private edifices have been constructed of the various descriptions quarried in the province.

I have also referred to Mr. W. R. H. Burtis, who published a work on New Brunswick as a home for immigrants under the authority of the government for the province. He said:

We come now to the third branch of our subject—'The best means of developing the resources of the country.' And first—it may be asked—what does the word 'resources' mean? In a limited sense, it may be taken to signify the material products of a country—whether animal, mineral or vegetable—either in a raw state, or enhanced in value by the labour of its people. In a more extended sense, it may include with these, local advantages, with facilities for amplification by artificial means, such as canals, railways, and the like. Viewing it in this broader import, the range of vision extends over a wider field, and gives scope for indulgence in brighter visions of both the early and the later future of this fine province. Next comes the question—what is meant by the phrase 'developing the resources'? To my mind, the developing the resources of a country is not a single fact or attainment, but a successive and never-ending series of facts or achievements reaching far into futurity—a constantly gathering and accumulating capacity, strengthening as it goes, in an increased ratio to its progress.

Further, he says:

Lying contiguous to Canada, and having water communication with that great and growing province, we might hope, in time, to drive an extensive trade with our sister colony. But our prospects in that direction are being blighted by the enterprise of our American neighbours, who are cutting off our trade, not only with Canada, but with the people of our own interior.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. EMMERSON. Naturally, my hon. friend says 'hear, hear.' But there are the geographical conditions and transportation conditions to be met, and our market for many of the products of our resources was necessarily limited, and could not expand under conditions then existing. Speaking of the conditions that then prevailed, Mr. Perley says:

All that is wanting is an extensive market. Hence arises the important question—whether anything, and what may be done to improve our condition in this respect? As there is but little prospect of a radical change in the commercial policy of the United States——

At that time the policy of the United States was towards exclusion, and there was exclusion to such an extent that even prominent men in these British colonies favoured even annexation to the United States as a means of securing a market and improving the economic conditions among our people. To such a height had this feeling risen that annexation manifestos were prepared and signed even by men eminent in the councils of the country, one of whom afterwards became Prime Minister of Canada. What they wanted in 1850 was an extensive market. And unhappily the conditions that existed then to too great an extent exist to-day. We lack a certain and extended market. We find ourselves without scope for our energies, ambitions and aspirations. Mr. Perley says further:

We have all the requisites but one, perhaps the only one, that to which I have elsewhere alluded, the want of a more extensive market.

Here you have the people and the resources, but you have not the market. That was in 1850. In 1854 that was given to them, and they prospered, and their population increased. It was taken away from them, and since then they have ceased to prosper and increase in population. But they might have done so if we had availed ourselves of the recent offer of the United States in the matter of reciprocal trade, and which would have afforded to our agriculturists, to our fishermen, to our lumbermen, to our gypsum quarry men, a market which they need, and which, if given them, would greatly stimulate our trade and increase our population. Now I cannot close without inviting your attention to the remarks of a Mr. Burtis, speaking on the resources of New Brunswick:

What an inviting field for immigration! To the stranger of every rank and degree, the road to wealth and distinction is as free as to the native of the soil. There are no favoured classes—no exclusive privileges—no absurd and depressing monopolies—no checks or hindrances to laudable ambition—no station unattainable by patient industry and honest work. With nothing to cramp his energies

or chide his hopes and aspirations, the intelligent European who seeks this country for a home may reasonably look forward to comfort, if not wealth and position, as the result of a few years of well directed labour.

Those, indeed, were halcyon days for the people of eastern Canada, days which have been succeeded by lack of prosperity, by lack of contentment. In 1874, during the regime of Alexander Mackenzie, his government sent to the old land representatives with a view to inviting people to make their home in this new land. One of the gentlemen thus sent, Mr. Thomas Potts, of St. John, a gentleman who was well and favourably known throughout eastern Canada, but who has long since gone to his rest, delivered a speech in the city of Liverpool, which was published by the Liverpool 'Daily Post' and widely circulated throughout Great Britain. After speaking of the resources of Canada generally, he came down to the province of New Brunswick specially, and I desire to make a short quotation from his remarks:

Let me tell you further that Canada is one of the best governed and one of the least taxed countries in the world. The taxes imposed by the general government are scarcely one-fifth of what they are in the United States. (Cheers). In this connection, permit me to remark that I have found on the minds of many gentlemen I have met a very wrong impression. In conversation some time ago with the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester he said: 'Why do you in Canada put high tariffs upon our goods to protect your own manufactures?' I respectfully said to him, what I now repeat, that we do nothing of the kind. Upon some articles the duty is moderately high, upon others there is no duty. There are upwards of eighty articles upon the Canadian catalogue that come in free, the greater part of which are imported from England. For example, everything that enters into the construction of a ship, the whole of which is imported from England, except the wood and the labour, comes in free. The average Canadian tariff for 1871 was only 12½ per cent, while that of the United States was 45 per cent. Canada puts on no tariffs for protective purposes. She puts duties on the articles that can best bear them, but for nothing more than to pay her liabilities and keep her credit unimpeachable. And we want British capitalists to understand that she is determined to keep herself in that position.

Subsequent events show how wrong he was in his prophetic vision.

A gentleman largely interested in manufactures in Rockdale said to me one day: Why don't you take the duties off our goods and tax the people direct for the support of the government?' I replied: 'Why don't you in England follow that plan?' I admit it would be the cheapest way a country could be governed; and after all your experience, you find there is something you are compelled to put in the bill where they can't see it.

Perhaps that is not a correct conclusion as to the conditions which then existed in Great Britain, but beyond question it is true with respect to the conditions which prevailed in Canada during that period. Now, Sir, I have referred to these matters with a view of diagnosing the conditions and to applying a remedy. I am in hearty accord with the policy of publicity, I am in hearty accord with the desire evinced in the resolution, and which is so important to eastern Canada. But that remedy will not alone be sufficient to meet the requirements. What we want is to make Canada a cheap country to live in, and to that end we must create trade, we must create a home market. I am heart and soul with the policy of creating home markets, and I think the best way to create home markets is to stimulate production, and by stimulating production we will inevitably increase population. There can be no question as to the effect which would follow upon Canada by increasing our home markets. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior would not then have to carry on his shoulders the sin of blocking the way of progress in the matter of population in eastern Canada.

I do not think it is fair to throw the responsibility upon Providence, or the departments for this matter of population. I have felt called upon to analyse the resolution, and to point out to my hon. friend wherein he has failed in applying the whole remedy. I think that western Canada has been wisely advertised. I am not blaming this, or the preceding government, or the government preceding that. The conditions which have prevailed have been inevitable. The Minister of the Interior in all governments is likely to continue to be a gentleman who represents western Canada, not that he would not represent eastern Canada as well, but his attention would be largely confined to, and his interest largely directed towards our western country. It is natural, it is human. There have been efforts made with respect to urging upon previous governments the desirability of paying particular attention to eastern Canada. I am told that if you go into the Canadian government office in London you will not find a man who knows anything about Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, and they know very little about Quebec or Ontario. They know the west, they are schooled in it. That has been unfortunate and in so far as governments are responsible for it I charge it upon the preceding government as I charge it upon the government that preceded that one. But, this is not a matter of inquiring into the conditions that were. The object of this resolution is to direct our eyes towards the future, to have action taken at the present time, and in the future that will remedy these existing

facts. I know that this resolution will be viewed favourably by every one in my constituency, and by the people throughout Canada. I know that there are those who will favour it, and yet who will say that it does not contain all. The hon. member for Kings, N.S., (Mr. Foster) in his remarks endeavoured to refute some statements that were made by the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). I do not think he was successful in that. He talked about some of our natural resources, our apple barrels, our fish, and our apples. When he mentions fish he knows that the vessels that sail out from Nova Scotia upon the fishing banks work side by side with the American vessels, and that when they get their catch the American vessel can sail into the open market of the city of Boston with its cargo and sell the fish at a price which, in the case of mackerel and cod, is nearly double the price that the Canadian fisherman receives at either Canso or Halifax. The Canadian fisherman is obliged to go to the market in Halifax, he is there met with monopolistic prices, and he is compelled to sell. The American goes into the market of the United States, and he enjoys advantages twice as great as those enjoyed by his Canadian brother fisherman. They both endured the same hardships, they underwent the same peril, but their rewards are entirely different. My hon. friend spoke of apple barrels and he thought that we should not seek a market for shingles, laths and small lumber that are so largely produced in eastern Canada, but that we should conserve this lumber for the manufacturer of apple barrels. The people of Nova Scotia, I believe, make barrels out of spruce and soft lumber. I do not know that that has been the practice in other parts of the Dominion, and I do not know that it has been a great advantage to the people of Nova Scotia. But if it had been so that is no reason why the lumberman should not have the advantage of the expansion of these resources simply because in the dim and distant future the apple growth of Nova Scotia may so increase that all this lumber would be exhausted in the manufacture of apple barrels. But these are only incidents, and they do not in any way touch the vital, the sore spot that is involved in the subject of this resolution, a sore spot that has certainly existed, and does exist to-day in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island. It is something intolerable to think that Prince Edward Island, with 103,000 population in 1901 is nearly 10,000 short in that number of souls, at this census. It is something awful, it is lamentable, that a peohardy, energetic and intelligent should not be able to live under the conditions which to-day surround them, amidst the most fruitful valleys, and rugged hills, and with the rich resources that nature has provided for them. It is lamentable, I say, that they should not be able to hold their own, to grow and expand, and to gather around them, if not their own people, at least those from abroad. The states of the union are filled with deported Nova Scotians. Western Canada can rejoice that she is receiving from the maritime provinces such a splendid representation. The western provinces are to be congratulated, but Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island are to be condoled with. It is our loss. It is all very well to talk about the growth of this magnificent Dominion. It is to express a beautiful sentiment, and also an undoubted fact, to say that we have a magnificent heritage, that we are helping to build up western Canada, and that we should all be proud of our country. That is all very nice, but when you come down to the cold, hard facts of dilapidated country districts, dwindling towns and villages, and a decreasing population in almost every rural constituency, and when you contemplate these things all this beautiful word picturing that you have with regard to the west is no compensation to us.

It is a sad commentary on the conditions there to realize that the hopes of the pioneers in these provinces have been blasted and that their descendants have been unable to realize their aspirations.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon). Mr. Speaker, there is a suggestion in the resolution before the House that preferential treatment has been accorded to western Canada to the disadvantage of the east, and for such a suggestion there is no foundation in fact. The people of western Canada do not desire to have any undue favours or any preferential treatment from Canada. They desire and will expect to be treated on a fair and just and equitable basis with every other portion of our country. The people of the west wish to extend to the people of the east the same generous consideration which they are confident the people of the east are ready to extend to them. We realize that if one province is neglected the whole nation suffers, and if, under the past immigration policy of the Dominion government Nova Scotia has been placed at a disadvantage, then that policy so far as it detrimentally affects Nova Scotia should be changed. I have no objection at all to the resolution except in so far it suggests that the west has been benefited to the disadvantage of the east. In order that both east and west may prosper, they must have confidence in and good will to each other which mutual trust is necessary if our entire country is to attain her high destiny. We are proud of the people of Nova Scotia than whom there are none better in Canada. Their brilliant history and

traditions and ideals are part of our heritage. The great Canadians who came from the lower provinces; Howe, Tupper, Tilley, J C. Pope, all fathers of Confederation, and in a later day Sir John Thompson and the present respected Prime Minister of Canada belong not to the east, but to the west also. The desire of the Fathers of Confederation was that the west should be developed and the Canadian Pacific railway was projected with that object in view. It must not be forgotten that it is the Dominion government that retained the lands in the three prairie provinces and that it is the natural duty of the owner of these lands to see that they are peopled with industrious and thrifty settlers who will properly develop those resources and thus add to the country's wealth. Thev send their products east and in their turn buy of the commodities of the east, and stimulate by their trade the large centres of industry. There has been a suggestion made that the Dominion government purchased the western lands for one million five hundred thousand dollars from the Hudson's Bay Company, and thereby the east had benefited the west, but they are held and administered for the whole of Canada, so long as the Dominion holds those lands, so long will the Dominion be responsible for their proper administration, and their proper settlement. The west would be glad to repurchase them for the price paid and take charge of the settlement of them if that were possible.

In advertising western lands the Dominion is simply desiring to have them properly disposed of and settled. The Dominion has no public lands in Nova Scotia for settlement. The west desires the very best class of settlers that can be found. We have been told that seventy per cent of the immigrants coming from continental Europe are from northern Europe, we would like all the settlers from there to be from the north. It is not the area of a country, not the large numbers of its population, so much as the character of that population that makes a nation prosperous. We should not be in such a hurry to settle our country as to go into the highways and the hedges to compel settlers, whatever be their character, to come in. It is the duty of the government to bring to this nation people who will obey our laws, respect our institutions, and live thrifty and virtuous lives. Those who make complaint that the west has been unduly considered in the immigration policy we contend for should not forget the millions which have been expended in building wharfs and improving harbours in the maritime provinces, of which only the west gets indirect benefit, and we hope that there will be without delay made in the estimates provision for the construction of ports on the Hudson bay, and thus give similar treatment to the west as to the east. I trust, Sir, that successful efforts will be made to bring to the maritime and other provinces the good settlers they desire. But let us not forget that the policy of the government has been to settle in the west the lands which belong to the whole of Canada, and not to the western provinces.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (Oxford S.). Mr. Speaker, the two great provinces of Ontario and Quebec are not included within the scope of this resolution, and we have been told that on account of their health and prosperity it was not necessary to mention them. The resolution, speaking of the immigration policy of the government, says:

> Largely in consequence of this policy the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have not grown in equal degree with the rest of the Dominion.

I believe, Sir, that in discussing a question of this kind, every province of the Dominion should be considered. As an Ontario man I wish to say a few words as to the policy of the late government with respect to immigration into that province. I was somewhat amused at the statements made by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) and speakers on the other side of the House.

They did not confine their remarks to the subject in hand, but endeavoured to find some solution for the difficulty that would not reflect on the late government. In starting out the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), said he was not going to discuss the question in a party spirit, but he nevertheless went on to find fault with previous Conservative governments for what he described as their lack of attention to this subject, and to say that until the Hon. Clifford Sifton came on the scene no progress had been made in immigration to this country. Since that time, however, he declared that the movement of immigration to Canada had been of a spectacular nature. Let me point out to the hon. gentleman that if immigration to this country was not as great as we would like in years gone by, there were conditions prevailing at that time which afforded some excuse for this condition of affairs. One of these was that until the building of the Canadian Pacific railway you could not expect that western country to fill up very rapidly. Not only that, but after the Canadian Pacific railway was built, we found hon. gentlemen opposite, extremely energetic in denouncing the policy of the government of that day. They could not find language strong enough to condemn the protective policy then in force; and it was not until after they themselves took office, it was not until after the late government came in power in

1896, that the minds of the Canadian people became disabused on that point, and they realized that the policy of both political parties was purely protective. The late government, despite their previous denunciations, continued the old policy which they found in force when they took office. Capitalists consequently obtained confidence, investors became impressed with the stability of our tariff to an extent that never existed before, and that confidence remained unshaken until in the early part of last year, when these hon. gentlemen opposite began an agitation to undermine that policy which had been productive of so much progress. No wonder, therefore, hon. gentlemen opposite can not discuss any questions in this House for any length of time, no matter how brief, without drifting back to reciprocity. One can well excuse them for their evident feeling on this matter, but in deference to the verdict of the people I should think that they ought to cry a halt. Surely we have heard enough on this question, and they ought to realize that under the circumstances they would be doing far better if they would allow the business of the country to proceed, and not be continually harking back to that policy which the Canadian people so vigorously condemned for all time to come on the 21st of September last.

I would like to point out that everything in the province of Ontario is not so satisfactory as my hon. friend who moved the resolution (Mr. Rhodes) would have us believe. The census returns, of which we have a portion completed, do not show that the province of Ontario has made the wonderful progress we would desire.

I was also somewhat interested in the statement made by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), on the necesssity of our making every effort to have our vacant lands in the Northwest settled. But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we have in the province of Ontario vast tracts of suitable land for settlement which have been absolutely neglected by the late government. Let me tell you that we have nearly twenty million acres of virgin soil which are awaiting people to come in and cultivate it.

And to show that the government of the province of Ontario is keenly alive to the interests of that province, let me point out that they have built a railway line into that district without the aid of the customary bonus from the Dominion government which has been given without exception to every other railway in the Dominion. But the province of Ontario built that road itself and is paying for it out of the provincial treasury. And although Ontario is paying its proportion of the cost of the railways in other provinces, not one of these other provinces has contributed a dollar to the building of the railway in question. In that respect the Ontario government has done a great deal to induce people to settle in northern Ontario. Very little was done by the late government towards advertising the resources of the province of Ontario in the old country. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Cumberland, the Dominion government spends about two million dollars a year in connection with immigration, and he urged that the maritime provinces, according to their population, should be entitled to about one-eighth of that expenditure. Let me point out that the province of Ontario has entered into an aggressive campaign for the purpose, not merely of bringing people out to settle on its vacant lands, but to bring out agricultural labourers to work on the farms already under cultivation. What is needed most is not so much people to develop those vacant lands as to cultivate the lands already under cultivation, a large acreage of which has to remain untilled for lack of farm help and a still more considerable portion is improperly tilled for the same reason. I maintain that it is the duty of this government to pay more attention to these matters.

A few years ago the government of Ontario established a labour bureau in that province, the object of which was to bring out farm labourers to supply the demands of the farmers of that province. Up to 1905 that was the policy in force, but about that time there was a change of government in Ontario, and from 1905 to 1907 we found the late government of Canada had agents walking the streets of Toronto inducing those who had come out to the Ontario Bureau not to carry out their agreements, but to go to the local distributing agents. As a result of their action in this respect, and their claim that their employment agents could meet all the requirements and supply the Ontario demand, the government of Ontario turned over to the Dominion government the labour bureau in that province and the Dominion government carried it on. This went on for a couple of years until the provincial government, finding the requirements of its province neglected, again took up the placing of farm labourers and entered on an active campaign in the old country to meet the requirements of the farmers, but from that time down to the present they had been handicapped in every possible way in their efforts in Great Britain and here. The regulations made by the late government affecting Ontario reflected but little credit on them. I may tell hon. gentlemen opposite that there were other questions besides reciprocity before the people of Ontario during

the recent election, and it was not prejudice or passion that influenced them, but resentment of the indifference of the government to their most pressing need when the people rose in their might to condemn the government which had been so narrow in their views with regard to a policy that should have done much to develop the whole country.

What we do object to in Ontario is being handicapped by any government in our legitimate efforts to secure for that province the people it requires, and I may tell the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) that in a sense, I am sorry to say, the inflow of people into our Northwest is spectacular. I believe there is a danger confronting our people and the sooner we realize it the better. I believe that a great deal of the attraction is of a speculative nature.

With the rapid increases in the value of lands and the desire to mine the fertility of the soil without regard for the future, when the effect of the present policy will become evident, you must realize the vast difference between the science of agriculture and wheat mining, you may mine the wealth that has been the accumulation of centuries, but there is a limit to it; the day will come and has already come in many sections of the west where the folly of this course can be seen. There is also another effect which is becoming serious, particularly in the towns and cities with so many of the people engaged in industrial pursuits and grain growing. The cost of local products has increased very rapidly during the past few years until to-day, notwithstanding our immense agricultural areas, some difficulty is being found in supplying its home market. The remedy proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite was to take off the tariff and place this market at the disposal of the United States and other countries. Reciprocity was the remedy not for the benefit of the farmers, but to place them in competition with the cheap labour of foreign countries.

Let me mention some of the imports into Canada from the United States for six months of the present year, and it is somewhat significant that we are importing from the republic to the south large quantities of products similar to those raised in the province of Nova Scotia from which the mover of this resolution and most of the speakers upon it have come. In those six months we imported from the United States 493,379 pounds of mutton, from Australia 1,217,224 pounds and from other countries 2,000 pounds. Of butter we imported from the United States 509,778 pounds, from Australia 101,080 pounds. Of horses we imported from the United States 9,299, although we were told what a great market we were going to have for our horses in Buffalo, New York, and other American cities. During the same time 62,579 American sheep were brought in and sold in this country. During the six months we imported from the United States 52,547 barrels of apples, and during the previous twelve months 150,961 barrels. Of eggs we imported from the United States during those six months 1,564,039 dozen; and so on down the list. So that it will be seen that reciprocity was not going to solve the problem. We have in Canada opportunities that are not to be found in any other country. We ought to have the greatest confidence in our country, and the people of Canada have that even if hon. gentlemen opposite have not, for which reason they are sitting on the opposition benches to-day. I have pointed out that the late Dominion government hampered the province of Ontario in supplying the demand for farm labour in that province. The increase of population in the province of Ontario has been about half a million during the last ten years. In seven cities of the province the increase has been over 300,000; and taking into account the increases in all the cities, you can more than account for the total increase in the whole province. In the last twenty years, in the oldest and richest districts of Ontario, the finest counties in the Dominion, the rural population has fallen off by upwards of 112,000, the lack of men to till the soil has resulted in the spread of noxious weeds to an alarming extent and is spreading all over the province weeds that are a menace to the province. It is absolutely necessary, if we are going to hold our own and increase the output of the farms of Ontario that the demand for labour shall be supplied. The literature that was referred to by the mover of this resolution was supplied by the Ontario Department of Agriculture, and was distributed by the agents who had been appointed by the provincial government. I may say that during the past year the Ontario Department of Agriculture loaned to farm labourers and domestic servants in the old country upwards of $25,000 to assist them to come out here to relieve the scarcity in the province for those classes of labour. Some time before that, in 1910, the Ontario Minister of Agriculture wrote to the Minister of the Interior asking that a representative of the department might be allowed access to the immigration buildings at Quebec and St. John, with a view to direct the farm labourers who had received loans through the provincial government agents in the old country to stations in eastern Ontario. Early in the present year I made a similar request of the Superintendent of Immigration, and it was refused. In 1910

the Minister of Agriculture received the consent of the Minister of the Interior. At this time I had charge of the Colonization Department for the government of Ontario, I wrote as follows to the Superintendent of Immigration:

Toronto, Ontario, April 21, 1911.

Dear Sir:—

We find that many immigrants booked to Toronto and other points in western Ontario do not reach their destination. This often happens where men have received loans to assist them to come to Ontario. We also have a great number of applications for men from eastern Ontario. In order to, if possible, get in touch with the former and supply the latter, without having the immigrant come to Toronto, we would like to have an officer connected with this branch stationed at the port of landing, particularly Quebec. We would esteem it a favour if such officer would be allowed office room in the Immigration Office at the port of landing and also be allowed the privilege of interviewing parties for this province and having them booked direct to applicants.

An early reply will be much appreciated.

Yours truly,

DONALD SUTHERLAND,
Director of Colonization.

W. D. Scott, Esq.,
Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

I received the following reply from the superintendent of immigration:

Ottawa, April 26, 1911.

Sir:—

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 22nd instant in regard to distribution of farm help. Your experience is much the same as our own and is probably due to the fact that the demand for general labourers and skilled workers is unusually great at this season of the year, thus offering tempting openings to immigrants who might otherwise have taken farm work. We have, as you are aware, quite a number of employment agents in eastern Ontario, none of whom are able to secure a sufficient supply of help; in fact I do not know that they are any worse off than those west of Toronto.

I regret being unable to comply with your request in the matter of stationing one of your officers at the port of Quebec. We have been obliged to refuse this privilege on a good many different occasions, and I am afraid to open the door now would only result in confusion.

Your obedient servant,

W. D. SCOTT,
Superintendent of Immigration.

On the strength of the letter that had been recived from the Minister of the Interior by the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario, and owing to the fact that we had a large number of men coming out to whom we had advanced loans, I sent an agent from the department to Quebec to meet that party and had made arrangements with the Canadian Northern railway people to have access to their office at the immigration building there in order to meet them. A short time afterwards, I received a letter from the party sent down stating that he had been refused access to the building and had been notified that he would not be permitted to interview these people on their arrival. A little later I received a letter from the superintendent of immigration notifying us that they were going to enforce regulations that would provide that for those being sent to the Ontario Government Labour Bureau at Toronto the booking agent would not receive the customary $5 bonus. After having received that, I had occasion to write again and I sent the following letter:

Toronto, Ont., June 10, 1911.

Dear Sir:—

I am in receipt of your letter of the 1st instant in reply to mine of the 25th ult., with reference to a number of immigrants who recently arrived here and who gained admission to Canada through false pretences.

My object in calling your attention to the matter was owing to a clause in the Immigration Act which makes this sufficient cause for deportation. I note that you do not consider this sufficient cause to have them deported. I can give their names and full particulars, if necessary, but in view of your refusal to make an example of others in similar circumstances I have not done so.

I do also note the intention of your department to discontinue paying bonus to farm labourers, booked to Toronto, after the 1st of October next and your statement regarding the cause of your having adopted the present mode of distributing immigrants through your local agents throughout Ontario. In view of the serious consequences likely to result to this province from withdrawing the bonus on immigrants placed by this office, I desire to call your attention to several features connected with securing farm help for Ontario.

It was as a result of your department having appointed local employment agents at various points in the province that the distributing from Toronto by this department was given up in 1907 and the office here has since that time remained in charge of pour department, but the problem of securing farm help becomes more acute than ever. So much so that it was found necessary, in order to meet the demands of the province for the Ontario Department of Agriculture to again resume the distribution of immigrants from here. Very little attention had been paid to the requirements of this province either in the literature circulated by the department or by the agents connected therewith employed in Great Britain. Booking agents have repeatedly complained about the unsatisfactory method of sending men to fill applications received by the local agents, of which they have been advised, as they have frequently found that the places were filled when the immigrant arrived here, owing to the length of time that must necessarily elapse between the time the application is made and the time it can be filled. Our attention had been called to many instances of this kind by parties who were disappointed in this way and for whom we had secured situations. This has also something to do

with the unsatisfactory reports sent home by immigrants which have appeared from time to time in the British press. There has been a severe drain made by the west on the supply of farm labourers in this province. The Ontario government is spending large sums to promote immigration to Ontario and is in a position to look after farm labourers on their arrival here. With our system we reduce to a minimum the danger of sending any one out to places already filled.

The withdrawal of the bonus on farm labourers induced to come to Ontario by our agents and to whom we guarantee employment will be a serious handicap to this province securing a fair share of the immigration to Canada. The demand of the industrial centres will have to be supplied one way or another. They are continually drawing from the men sent to farm work. You will find that many men who have been sent to your local agents have been induced to accept employment in towns and cities after a short stay on the farm. I hope that you will reconsider your decision to withhold the bonus on parties being sent to us, as after all the percentage who do not go out immediately on arrival here is very small and with a little firmness in dealing with them, I think that nearly all difficulty on that score would be removed.

Yours truly,
D. SUTHERLAND,
Director of Colonization.

We find that on the 5th of July, notwithstanding the protest made against the proposed policy of that government, a circular was sent to the British booking agents notifying them what the consequences would be if they continued sending men, as they had been sending them, to the Ontario government. I will read that circular:

Ottawa, July 5.

Canadian government employment agents were appointed in Ontario and Quebec so that persons desirous of securing work on farms might proceed to the point at which these agents are located and without charge, be placed in suitable positions. The department regrets that some of the British booking agents have neglected to direct persons booked by them to these employment agents, but have booked them to large cities where no employment agent is located, with the result that the immigrant has engaged in industrial pursuits, and so been lost to the agricultural communities.

With the object of remedying this condition, it has been decided that no bonus will be paid upon immigrants arriving on or after October 1, 1911——

Fortunately they did not have much to do with matters after that date.

——who are booked to cities in Ontario and Quebec where no Canadian government employment agent is located. Booking agents have been supplied with a list of Canadian government employment agents corrected to March 1, 1911, and if further copies are needed they may be secured from Mr. J. Obed Smith, assistant superintendent of emigration, 11-12 Charing Cross, London, S.W.

Booking agents will be good enough to understand that it is the intention of the department to enforce this rule strictly and in the event of any claims being disallowed on those grounds, nothing will induce the department to alter its original decision, unless the agent interested can supply this department with the name and address of the farmer with whom the immigrant, upon whom the 'bonus has been refused,' is working.

Bonus will be paid as heretofore upon domestic servants whether going to country districts, to towns or cities.

Your obedient servant,
W. D. SCOTT,
Superintendent of Immigration.

The list sent out to the British booking agents would show that there were no agents in the city of Toronto itself. As a result of these circulars there are but very few immigrants now coming to Ontario. With about several hundred applications on file the Ontario Government Bureau at Toronto and the farmers of Ontario are asking for men, but are not being supplied even at this time of the year. I received a notice from the superintendent of immigration dated 15th January, 1912, notifying me that two of these local distributing agents in the riding I represent, appointed by the late government, had sent in their resignation. I wrote back asking him to give me the date of the resignation and how many men they had placed in the last two years. I received the following reply:

In reply to your favour of the 18th instant, I beg to state that Charles H. Denton, of Tillsonburg, resigned on January 4, 1912. In 1910 he placed 9 farm labourers, and in 1911, 3 farm labourers, 2 domestics and 4 children. H. Van Valkenburg, of Norwich, resigned on January 8, 1912, having placed no immigrants from the date of his appointment.

Now these are the kind of agents the late government appointed in the various constituencies, and a great many of them are placing just about as many immigrants as those two of whose resignations I have been notified. I know that to-day the people realize that it is absolutely useless to apply to the Department of the Interior for farm labourers on account of the process that their application must go through. Possibly half a dozen booking agents in the old country may be notified or they may not be notified, to send on the men. The notice has to go to the Superintendent of Immigration, thence to the assistant superintendent, thence to the booking agent, and sometimes two or three months may elapse before the farmer can be supplied, and he has to engage some one else. You see, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous such a policy is. I believe it was conceived with the idea of obstructing the policy of the Ontario government in regard to supplying farm labourers in that province. I have asked for the returns—which have not yet been brought down—as to the amount that has been earned by the differ-

ent employment agents in the various provinces. I find that there have been 82 appointed in the province of Ontario, and 16 in the province of Quebec; I believe those were the only provinces in which they adopted this method. I want to point out that most of the large bonus earners are located in the city of Montreal. I believe one of them is an agent of the province of Quebec, and the other is engaged in bringing out domestic servants, not only to Ontario, but to Quebec as well. Outside of these, the number that has been placed has been very small indeed, and altogether inadequate to the demand. Therefore, I contend that the resolution now before the House does not go far enough, but that it should include the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. For the reason I have pointed out, unless the demand is supplied the result to the province of Ontario is going to be disastrous. I may also say that the railways are largely responsible for the difficulty in the province of Ontario. We have dealt generously with the railways of this country, and we find that every fall, at the very time of the year when the farmer requires help more than at any other season, the railways offer low rates to take farm labourers out to supply the demand of the wheat miners of the west; they offer rates that are not fair to the farmers of Ontario. Many of them have engaged men by the year, and these men when they hear of these low rates become restless and dissatisfied, and want to go west, and the farmer has to let them go, as becoming dissatisfied they would be little use to him, although he has employed them by the year. I may say that not only the railways, but the press of this country also is largely responsible for the way in which Ontario is annually denuded of farm labourers. In view of the training that farm labourers receive in the old country, they have to get acquainted with the methods of agriculture in this country before they can become thoroughly efficient; therefore, I think that the department should see to it that the province of Ontario is supplied with labour fitted to her requirements. I hope that the present government will take hold of this matter vigorously, without discriminating against any province in Canada, and will do their whole duty to every province. I hope they will establish a labour bureau in every province of this Dominion, and see that each province is treated fairly. I may also point out that although we have built a railway into northern Ontario the late government has done nothing towards advertising that district. The time has come when it is necessary to do something in that respect. The late government did issue a small pamphlet dealing with the Rainy River and Thunder Bay district, and another one last year dealing with the Niagara peninsula. It is said that the appropriations made to Ontario have been small indeed. Let me say in conclusion that during the past year the Ontario government had 7 agents in the old land. The people of Ontario require especially more labourers and domestic servants. I contend that the regulation that was passed by the late government on July 5, was one that the people of Ontario resented. It ill becomes any government to resort to tactics such as those resorted to by the late government. I am glad to know that they did not have an opportunity to put their policy into effect for any great length of time, and I hope the present government will be more generous. I understand they have cancelled the restrictions referred to.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). There is no doubt that the policy of the government for some years past has been directed more especially toward getting people to go into western Canada rather than eastern Canada; perhaps it was because the government thought that eastern Canada was fairly well populated already, and that the east could look after itself. As a matter of fact, the results show that the east, in this respect at all events, could not look after itself without assistance from the federal government, because the bulk of the immigrants, practically all the immigrants that came to this country, went into the west. I think, now that the tide of immigration has set so strongly towards the west, that the government could afford for a few years to neglect that part of the country and turn its attention toward the east. If they did that for a few years, no doubt a sufficient number of people would still go into the west to meet the requirements of that part of the country, as many would go as could be perhaps assimilated. Now, it is generally supposed that eastern Canada has a soil as fertile as that of the west. In my remarks I will confine myself to Prince Edward Island chiefly, as that is where I live. I cultivated a farm myself some years ago, about the ordinary size in Prince Edward Island, and I will tell you what it produced. I do this chiefly for the benefit of the Minister of the Interior, who has most to do with the policy of immigration. I found I could produce from an acre of land about 300 bushels of merchantable potatoes, 800 bushels of other vegetables, such as turnips and mangles. I could produce from 30 to 35 bushels of wheat to the acre, about 50 bushels of oats, about 40 bushels of barley, from 3 to 4 tons of hay. I do not think the west could do much better than that. Of course, there is this great difference; in the east we have to ap-

ply manure to the soil in order to get these results, but I am informed they have not got to do that in the west at the present time. The time will come probably when they will be obliged to do that.

It is under ordinary conditions that we get these results. I am told that under better conditions much better results would be obtained. Dr. McPhail of McGill University who is now growing potatoes largely in Prince Edward Island has told me that he can get 500 bushels of merchantable potatoes from an acre of land and that he can produce that result by applying some $12 worth of commercial fertilizers and seeding down to clover every three years. Results like that, providing we had a market for the produce, must be profitable. We have about a million acres of land on Prince Edward Island, practically all cultivable, and providing one fifth of that was devoted to the growing of potatoes under Dr. McPhail's plan, there would be nothing like a market in Canada and we would have to look for a market abroad. There is no doubt that if we had access to the New England states for that article, at all events, it would be a very great advantage to us. It may be asked: Why are we losing our population in the eastern provinces, particularly in Prince Edward Island where the soil is so fertile, when we can produce such abundant crops. There is no doubt that we are losing population and it appears to me that our young people will leave us anyhow. Some years ago it was considered that perhaps farm work was more laborious, that it was more —shall I call it, degraded?—and that an equal degree of credit could not be obtained from work of that kind as that which could be obtained by work in a profession or some other occupation of life. The young people therefore were lured to the states. Since the west has been opened up the lure of the west has drawn our young people away. They are going away and, in my judgment, they will continue to go. Many of our young people have gone to the United States and as a rule they have done well and the reports that come back induce others to go. They have gone to the cities of Canada and to the west and they have done well. Farm help has become so scarce that it is very difficult to operate a farm in Prince Edward Island. When the young people go away and the older people find they cannot get farm help they simply have to sell the farms or leave them and for these reasons there are a number of vacant farms in Prince Edward Island that may be purchased cheaply. I think that perhaps similar conditions prevail in other provinces. If the Minister of the Interior could obtain farmers in the British Isles or in northern Europe with a small amount of capital, with even $2,000, accustomed to farming, such people might settle in Prince Edward Island with a considerable degree of safety. If they had $3,000 or $4,000 so much the better. You can purchase cultivated farms with buildings in a fair state of repair for from $15 to $50 per acre. I sold a farm I had with good outbuildings at $30 an acre largely because it was almost impossible to get farm help. There is a good field for young men and women who would be disposed to go upon the farms as farm help. There is a good field for a reasonable number of men from the old country who had a small amount of capital and would like to settle in a country such as the eastern provinces rather than go to the west. I do not think efforts have been made in the past to get that class of people to come to Canada. The men who have been brought to the west have gone out there to farm upon a large scale, but the small farmer, the man who is accustomed to a mixed farming and who perhaps would wish such under established conditions, would be an acquisition and if this class is obtainable every effort should be made to get it. I believe our young people will leave us anyhow, and the only way to get the farms occupied is by getting men from the British Isles and Northern Europe. If that could be done it would be a great advantage. There is no doubt that Prince Edward Island would support a population three times as large as that which we have now. We have now something over 90,000. Some few years ago we had over 100,000. Losing our population like that is a most deplorable thing, but if we could get people to take the places of those who are leaving it would be an important thing for us and anything the government can do along that line would be of advantage to the eastern provinces and to the whole of Canada. The railways do something, perhaps, to take the young people from Prince Edward Island and the eastern provinces, and I think that their policy in this regard is scarcely fair to the eastern part of the country. They give very cheap rates for these harvest excursions and a great many young people, desiring to see the west and to see something away from their homes, take advantage of these cheap excursions and go into the west, perhaps with the intention of coming back, but inasmuch as the railways charge a very high rate for bringing them back, many of them do not come. I think that is unfair. If something could be done to compel the railways to bring back the young men and women who wanted to come back at the same rate as they took them out west it would be only just and fair. A number of our people leave us on these cheap

harvest excursions and do not return. They are induced by the railways to do that, and chiefly by the Canadian Pacific railway. I wish to make these few remarks for the benefit of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) or for those who will have this matter under consideration. There is plenty of room for the right kind of immigrant in eastern Canada, and particularly for farmers with small capital and farm labourers. We are very much in need of that class of people. Whatever the Minister of the Interior or the government can do towards that end will be greatly appreciated in the east and will help to build up the whole of Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I desire the attention of hon. gentlemen but for a few moments upon this resolution now before the House. I regret that I was not able to be present this afternoon and hear the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) make his observations upon the resolution which has been upon the order paper for some time. I was rather anxious to know if he properly surveyed the conditions which he seeks to remedy in the maritime provinces, if he properly diagnosed the cause of these conditions and if he suggested a remedy. As far as his resolution is concerned itself, I would be inclined to give it my approval, but in a qualified manner. I do not like the suggestion contained in the resolution that the condition obtaining now in the maritime provinces is largely due to the consequences of the immigration policy of the governments in the past respecting the Canadian Northwest.

I am sure that no person belonging to the eastern provinces would criticise in any manner whatever the efforts of the government to bring in settlers to the three prairie provinces. Regrettable as are the conditions in the maritime provinces today, they would be worse were it not that the west is what it is. The latter part of the resolution says:

> In order to promote uniform progress and prosperity throughout Canada the government should speedily inaugurate and carry out a policy of publicity and immigration designed to promote the more rapid development of the said provinces.

To that I would give a qualified assent, I think that no government should inaugurate and carry on an immigration policy for the maritime provinces similar to that carried on for the prairie provinces. No greater disaster could fall upon the maritime provinces than such a thing, and I trust the Minister of the Interior will not consider a proposition of that kind. I think I can lay it down as a sound proposition that for the provinces it would be unsound to have an immigration policy unless it is restricted and selected. The member for Kings (Mr. Foster) suggested that in the province of Nova Scotia we could readily absorb an immigration of one thousand a month or twelve thousand a year. This is absurd. No greater menace to the province of Nova Scotia could be suggested. There would not be sufficient labour found for such a large number of immigrants, and the position I take with reference to immigration into the province of Nova Scotia is this: that we only need in that province one class of immigrants or settlers, and that is the class suggested by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. Of course it is to be regretted that from the maritime provinces there has been a very considerable emigration, in all the years from confederation down, but it would take a long time to discuss the various causes for it. Confederation itself was responsible in some degree. We have not had in the maritime provinces any great industrial development, which would aid in the retention of our population. Again the maritime provinces like all other countries of the world have suffered by the tendency of rural population to drift towards cities. That, of course, is regrettable, but it is more of a sociological than an economic problem and it cannot be settled by an immigration policy no matter what that policy may be. We find the same conditions obtaining in England, and within a few miles of the city of London some few years ago you could find vacant farms. In the older American states the same conditions prevail, and between 1880 and 1900 fourteen thousand farms were abandoned in the state of New York and four hundred thousand people left the farms and went to the cities. It is not in the interest of the nation or of the race that this should occur, but it does. These problems are not as easily settled as the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) would think. The hon. member (Mr. Sutherland) seemed anxious to blame the late government for not assisting the farmers of the province of Ontario in securing farm labour, but I would suggest that any government should be very careful indeed in soliciting farm labourers to come to Canada unless positions have beeen obtained for them before they arrive here. The difficulty about farm labour in the province of Ontario as in the maritime provinces is that a great number of our agriculturists are not as good business men as they might be, and they think it is all right to secure the services of a farm labourer during the busy season and then let him go. It would not be a very difficult thing for farmers in this country to secure farm labourers if the labourers could be sure that they would have work

for twelve months in the year. It is not fair for any government or any department of government to encourage the immigration of farm labourers unless it is assured that the farmers of the country will give these labourers constant employment. Speaking for Nova Scotia, I maintain that some immigration work can well be done there, but practically speaking the only class of immigrant I should like to see come to that province would be the farmer of experience, the man who possesses some scientific knowledge of the industry. Unless we can get that class of man to our province I think it would be unwise to encourage immigration of any other sort. There are no free lands to give to the intending settler in the maritime provinces, and the situation there is altogether different from the situation in the west. One of the difficulties which any government in encouraging immigration of the farming class will meet with, is that many who would desire to come to Canada are without capital, and the problem is how should they be assisted in raising capital to buy vacant farm land in the province of Nova Scotia. This matter has been dealt with, with what success I do not know, in some other portions of the British Empire. For instance, in the Australian states they have been endeavouring to meet the situation by providing a system of land banks and loans for settlers as well as advancing a portion of their passage money to the Commonwealth. A few years ago an agricultural bank was incorporated by one of the states and loans in amounts from $125 to $2,500 are advanced for clearing farms, fencing, water supplies, drainage and the erection of farm buildings. During the first five years interest at the rate of five per cent per annum is charged; the principal being payable in twenty-five years, by half yearly instalments. In New Zealand, as well as in several places in the Commonwealth, schemes of that kind are being worked out, and something along that line, if possible, is what would suit intending immigrants to Nova Scotia. The unrestricted, indiscriminate solicitation of immigration to the maritime provinces is in my judgment absolutely absurd and should not be encouraged. On the contrary, any immigration should be carefully selected and carefully placed. I do trust that the Minister of the Interior, when formulating his immigration policy for the eastern provinces will not deceive himself by thinking he has a very easy task before him. His experience in the west will be no help to him in that respect. I am glad to say that the maritime provinces are improving. There is an industrial development going on there; our connections with the growing west are becoming closer day by day, and I think there will be a gradual amelioration of the conditions which prevail to-day. Only recently I was instructed to interview the Minister of the Interior on behalf of a number of gentlemen in Nova Scotia who have the idea of purchasing a large number of vacant farms in that province with the idea of getting from the British Isles or Northern Europe farmers to settle thereon.

Their suggestion was that the government of Nova Scotia and the Dominion government should assist the project. I have not given it very full consideration, but I would suggest to the hon. the Minister of the Interior that he should give it his favourable consideration when it comes before him. I do not say that it is a perfect scheme but still I do think it contains some elements which are worthy of consideration and possibly of commendation.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, Prince Edward Island). The question under discussion is one which in common with the other representatives from the maritime provinces, I would urge the government to deal with in the most prompt and practical manner. In the maritime provinces our farmers are not able to carry on the farming operations as they should be carried on for want of help. Our young men and women are leaving the farms, and the result is that the older men have to work very hard and are almost discouraged. It is not true as has been said by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), that there is no incentive to engage in the farming industry in the maritime provinces. On the contrary, there is every incentive. We have the best home market in the world. We get the best prices for our products that can be obtained anywhere. We have good soil, especially in the province of Prince Edward Island, in which all the land fit for agriculture is under cultivation. In order to show the hon. member for Westmorland that he is wrong. I would point out that in 1901 the total products of the farm and live stocks in Prince Edward Island was only $7,415,999, whereas in 1910 that had increased to $11,753,000, or an increase of $4,338,000 in nine years. I think, therefore, there is every incentive in the maritime provinces to engage in agriculture. We are rapidly progressing, we are going ahead by leaps and bounds, all we want to-day and all we ask the government for, is a supply of farm labourers of both sexes. But we only require hundreds, not thousands. It is not true that there are many farms in the maritime provinces for sale. The old farmers have large tracts which they are holding for their sons, and those sons who have gone to the west, are coming back to settle again on their old homesteads. In fact the lure of the west will soon be a thing of the past, and our young men in the future will probably stay

at home, where they can prosper as well as anywhere else. We have great hopes in the east if the government will give us a share of the money we should have to obtain the necessary help for our farmers.

Another thing which the farmers of the maritime provinces require is transportation. In the west transportation has been rapidly pushed forward and is still being pushed rapidly on to-day, but we in the east, now that we have a progressive government in office, look forward to a new era in which every attention will be given to the development of transportation facilities in eastern Canada and not devote them entirely to the west. Let us only have proper transportation facilities, and we shall have no lack of immigrants. We require men from Denmark to teach us something about butter making and hog raising. We raise a great number of hogs in the maritime provinces, but we would benefit by the labour of men from these older countries, who have made this business a great success. We want fishermen from Scotland and men from England who understand farming.

We have had some immigration agents in the old country. The late government gave us two, I think. One of these agents was there between 1907 and 1909. He was sent there as an immigration agent for the province of Prince Edward Island, and there is to his credit the total number of one immigrant to that province during the three years he occupied that position and drew his salary. Another agent, the Rev. Mr. Winfield, was sent a few years ago, and he made a greater success. He sent out something like 80 first-class immigrants. He was there a little less than two years. The class he brought out were men of good character, men with money, some farm labourers and some domestics. These are the people we want in Prince Edward Island, and I have no doubt these are what are required in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. No doubt this House will agree that the time has come when the maritime provinces should receive their share of the public money spent on immigration. I trust, therefore, that the hon. the Minister of the Interior will give this question, which has been so ably and exhaustively presented to this House by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), his most favourable consideration.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of the Interior). Before making any reference to the subject matter of the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), I would like to say a word or two with reference to the remarks which have fallen from some hon. gentlemen who spoke after him. In the first place, let me say to my hon. friend the member for Westmorland that I heard with some surprise his statement to the effect that in the immigration office in the city of London, England, we have no representative who knows anything at all about Nova Scotia or the maritime provinces. Let me say to him that if, when I make inquiry, I find that he is correct in his statement, I shall take the earliest possible opportunity of seeing that we have in that important office men who have thorough knowledge and are able to speak intelligently regarding the possibilities and resources of every province in our Dominion.

I am not going to attempt at this late hour to follow the hon. gentleman in his discussion of that old question of reciprocity, which, so far as the people of Canada are concerned, is dead and buried for all time to come. I cannot agree with the proposition of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) that in view of the present conditions it would not be wise to invite immigrants to the maritime provinces. As the minister presiding over the Department of the Interior, I propose to invite immigration to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in the same form and manner and with the same hope of results that I do to the other provinces of this Dominion, believing as I do with an intense conviction that we have in the maritime provinces, in common with the other provinces of Canada, great possibilities which should attract immigrants who want to better their condition. As a result of that great National Policy which was laid down many years ago, and which has been adopted and followed by both parties in this Dominion from that day to this, we are in the proud position in Canada of being able to point to the fact that we have more desirable conditions for intending immigrants than those which can be found in any other country in the world. Therefore, it becomes my duty as the minister of that department to lend every energy I possess to the work of carrying out a policy such as I believe will be best calculated to increase our population to the advantage of those who come as well as for the upbuilding of the country. Now, I have taken careful note of the remarks of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean), and I shall be glad to receive the representations which he proposes to make, and I can assure him that they will receive full, clear and faithful consideration at the hands of the department. I have also taken very careful note of the suggestions which my hon. friend from the St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) has made for certain amendments in the regulations. I am not clear at the moment whether the changes which he

recommends would be advisable and desirable at the present time, but I shall be glad to give them the consideration which they require. In respect to the resolution itself, I entirely agree with the statements which have been so clearly placed before this House by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes). When I took charge of the Department of Immigration I at once saw, from an examination of the records, that in my judgment some improvement could be made in that department, and I found that that improvement could be best made by a policy of co-operation with the different provinces. To that end an officer was engaged, whose duty it was to visit the different provinces, and I am glad to say that that work is meeting with good results. I have had as a result of that course a visit from the Premier of British Columbia and one or two of his colleagues, and they are in a most hearty manner co-operating with us with respect to immigration to that province. I have also had a visit from a representative of the government of Ontario in the person of Mr. Duff, the Minister of Agriculture, and I am glad to be able to inform this House that I have been able to arrange a policy of co-operation with the great province of Ontario under which we are not going to duplicate our work, as we have done in the past, but are going to work together in harmony, and by this means are going to accomplish greater results for immigration in that province in the future than has ever been done in the past. I also had the pleasure of meeting the Premier of the province of New Brunswick and his Attorney General, and discussed with them the policy that they propose to inaugurate, better calculated to bring immigration to that province. I am very much encouraged by the aggressive policy which Mr. Fleming and his colleagues propose to adopt in connection with the work in New Brunswick. I have made an arrangement with them by which we propose to assist them largely in their aggressive policy, and I am satisfied that as time goes on very fruitful and very desirable results will be found to come from the arrangements which we have made in this connection, and which I believe will be announced by the Premier of New Brunswick in the very near future. We have invited every province of the Dominion to co-operate with us, and every province will receive fair and generous treatment at the hands of this government.

Adopting, as we have, a policy which we believe to be that calculated to advance the best interests of our common country, a policy that will be common to all the provinces of Canada, I do not desire in speaking of our immigration, to know either eastern Canada or western Canada. Let me say to those who have spoken this afternoon that we are going to inaugurate a policy by which we shall give publicity to every province in Canada. The gentlemen from the maritime provinces have pointed out in very able addresses the great possibilities which those provinces possess, possibilities which in themselves are inviting to intending immigrants in many respects; and it becomes our duty, as the central government, to advertise these advantages to the people of the world, in order that the maritime provinces in common with the others, may secure all advantages, and in order that the attractions which they possess may be presented to the intending immigrants from all parts of Europe, the United States, and elsewhere, who desire to become citizens of our Dominion.

Now, we have only to look at the returns of immigration in Canada during the last year, to find that the immigration to the three maritime provinces was less, I believe, than one third of the immigration secured by any other province in this Dominion. In view of this condition, I say, I am not surprised that we should have the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), and other hon. members in this House from the maritime provinces, bringing to the attention of this parliament and of the people of the country, the advantages they possess in those provinces. In view of the fact, they claim that the maritime provinces have not been getting their share of immigration. And the evidence of the correctness of their statement is to be found in the figures to which I have just referred. I am not here to say, nor am I in a position to say, what the reasons are that they have not secured a greater increase than that which I have named. But I am here to say, as representing the Department of Immigration, and voicing the policy of the government of the day, that we propose a policy of co-operation with all the provinces, to lend every assistance in our power, to give to the maritime provinces, and the other provinces all the support and all the assistance which a very healthy treasury is able to give, in order to bring immigration to Canada, with a view to having here a happy and contented people in greater, and much greater, numbers than we have at this time.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton). Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to criticise the resolution or to find fault with the policy of the Department of Immigration as laid down by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers). But inasmuch as a large part of the remarks offered to the House this after-

noon and evening have practically been in criticism of the previous administration of the department, it would hardly be in place for me to let the occasion pass without having something to say in regard to that administration and policy. The hon. members who have preceded me said frequently that they wanted a Canadian policy, a policy that would build up Canada. Well, I take it that Canada has been built up with a fair degree of rapidity during the past few years under the immigration policy that has been followed. When we consider the increase in the population of Canada during the past few years—increasing, remember, from year to year until the year which has just closed has shown the largest immigration that ever took place in the history of this country—and in view of probably a larger percentage of increased population than has ever occurred in the history of any other country in the world, it might be thought that a policy having such success might have received commendation rather than adverse criticism. The policy which achieved such results was not by any means a haphazard policy. And let me suggest further that a policy on the lines which have been suggested by the larger number of our friends who have spoken here tonight, could not by any possibility have achieved such success for this Dominion of Canada. Some of our friends who have spoken seem to think that immigration is a matter of finding the people in one place, picking them up and removing them to some other place. I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) is under any such impression. But I can assure the House that if he is, or if his colleagues are under that impression, they will find they are greatly mistaken. The first requisite of successful immigration effort is opportunity for the immigrants. I will admit that advertising is valuable; and the evidence given here today proves that the advertising efforts under the late adminstration were reasonably successful, and, I presume correspondingly satisfactory. But advertising alone will not make successful immigration effort. It assists. But the original foundation of success is opportunity for the immigrant. Unless you have the opportunity, you cannot get the immigration by all the advertising expenditure you see fit to make. It was because of the opportunities in western Canada that the immigration to western Canada has been so much larger in proportion than that to other portions of Canada, and not because of the advertising. So far as the advertising is concerned, I will just say for the information of the House, that the most important piece of immigration literature gotten out by the Interior Department during my administration was an atlas of Canada which gave every province in Canada equal treatment both in maps and in descriptive matter. This atlas is used in schools not only in many parts of Canada, but in foreign countries as well, notably in Belgium. It is also used in schools largely in England. And in that atlas the maritime provinces had practically the same consideration in proportion to area and population as the western provinces had. Again, a very large sum of money was spent in maps—'school maps' as they were called—which gave, of course, a complete view of the whole Dominion without partiality to one section or another.

Also when delegations have come out from the old country at the instance of the Interior Department to look over Canada to see what opportunities there were, they toured the maritime provinces just as well as the prairie provinces, and reported upon the opportunities they found there. Besides that, special pamphlets have been got out to describe particularly the advantages of the maritime provinces. I do not question for a moment the possibility of larger efforts being made in the future than have been made in the past. I do not find any fault with such efforts, I wish them all success, and believe they will achieve some success. But I say that if the department, in the past ten years, had directed its main efforts and its main expenditures to securing settlers for the eastern provinces, the results to Canada would not have been in any measure such as they have been under the policy that has been pursued. It is not in the nature of the case possible, and it will not be possible in the future, should it ever be attempted; and I give the Minister of the Interior credit for too much common sense ever to attempt such a policy. The result of the policy that has been pursued in securing the occupation and development of western Canada has been essentially and truly a Canadian policy, because it has been upon the successful development of western Canada, so far as that development has yet gone, that the prosperity and progress of this whole Dominion has been built. Its increase in cultivated land and in the number of farms occupied, in the products of the soil of those western provinces, has stimulated manufacturing enterprises in all parts of eastern Canada, and in no part more than in the very town of the hon. member for Cumberland, the town of Amherst where he resides. The town of Amherst depends very largely for its progress and prosperity on the settlement and development of western Canada. Of course, I give every credit to the enterprising men of Amherst who have established manufacturing enterprises in that city. But all the enterprises that could have been centred in Amherst, with all the ability of her business men, could not have succeeded were it not for the development of the

great Northwest, and the cultivation of the wheat fields of that country.

Now a lament has been made of the loss of population in the maritime provinces. From one point of view I must say that I have no sympathy with it. If the maritime provinces have not increased in population as fast as other parts of the Dominion there is a reason for it, a reason not to the discredit of its people, but rather to their credit. They are an active and energetic people, who look for opportunities wherever they may be found, and they seize the best that can be found, whether they be far or near. It is just because they have looked for wider and better opportunities than existed at home that the population of the maritime provinces has not increased, because the people have gone elsewhere where they could do better. It is immeasurably to the benefit of Canada as a whole that the population of the maritime provinces, instead of congesting there during the past five, ten or twenty years, has been spread far and wide over the whole Dominion. If the lack of increase of population was due entirely to the movement of the people of those provinces to western Canada, I say again that the maritime provinces are to be congratulated instead of being condoled with.

Unfortunately the natural increase of population in the maritime provinces, which I am given to understand is more than ordinarily rapid, has not been retained in those provinces. This is a fact to be deplored. I believe that a very large proportion, very much more than fifty per cent, has gone to the United States. This has been greatly to the advantage of the United States, and correspondingly to the disadvantage of Canada. If previous governments had established active agencies in the maritime provinces to secure a movement of people for the prairie west of Canada, fifteen or twenty years ago, would not Canada have been better off to-day, and would not the maritime provinces themselves be just as well, or better off? I say it is little less than a crime to have allowed so many young men of those provinces to go every year to the United States, while not a finger was raised to prevent that exodus. It would have been ten times better for the government of Canada to have entered upon an active immigration campaign in those provinces in order to create a movement of their people to the prairies of the west instead of to the United States. Canada would have been far, far ahead, not only in money, but in men, in prestige, and in national spirit as well. I had the pleasure of attending a dinner in Boston on the 24th of May last, a dinner given by the Intercolonial Club, and I was appalled, Mr. Speaker, at the figures that were given me of the number of people of lower province birth who were resident in the city of Boston, in the state of Massachusetts, and in the other New England states. If I remember right, I was told that there were not less than 30,000 people of maritime province birth permanently resident in the city of Boston, and over 100,000 in the state of Massachussetts. There is no doubt that they form a very important element of the population of the city of Boston, and of the state of Massachussetts. I say it is most unfortunate that this should be the case. The late government was so impressed with that condition of affairs that we established an immigration agency in the city of Boston for the express purpose of getting back some of the maritime province people, and directing them to our prairie west. We achieved some success, and I am sorry to read in the newspapers that the present administration has seen fit to close the office. I think it was doing valuable work, and more valuable work could have beeen done. I believe that a very considerable movement could have been secured of those people toward our northwest. A moderate movement had already been started, and I believe it would have increased with time. Now let me put this thought before our friends.

It is not to the interest of Canada that a man who has good abilities shall be kept in an environment where he cannot use those abilities to his own advantage or to the advantage of the country. With respect to the man who is born, we will say, in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick in that condition of life that does not give him a farm to cultivate or a business to conduct, and who must spend his time in those provinces an employee of some other person, surely it is to the interest of Canada that that man, by removing to our Canadian west, becomes a proprietor and a producer on a large scale and adds enormously to the productive wealth of the country year by year. Is it not to the benefit of the country as well as to the individual himself, that instead of only securing a livelihood in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick, by taking advantage of the opportunities which exist on the prairies, he is able to become a producer on a large scale, and become, we will say, a man of wealth and substance? Surely it is to the good of Canada that this change should be made as well as to the good of the man himself. I do not sympathize with the view that would restrict the people of the maritime provinces, Quebec or Ontario, to the limited opportunities of those provinces when the greater opportunities of the western provinces are available to them. I want it to be distinctly understood that I have no word of discredit for the maritime provinces, or for Ontario and Quebec, or the opportunities that exist there. Probably there are no more beautiful coun-

tries in the world. Probably there is no country where the advantages are greater, but if the initial advantages of this country have been occupied, if they have been absorbed by the population which has been resident there for a series of generations, it is reason and common sense that the same opportunity does not exist there for the recent generation that does exist in a country that still lies vacant and is open to the first man who takes advantage of it. That is the situation and that is why the population in the west has increased and why the population in the maritime provinces and Ontario and Quebec has not increased. It is for the good of the country that the opportunities of the western provinces are taken advantage of by Canadians as much as possible. It would have been a misfortune for Canada if these opportunities had not been taken advantage of by Canadians and Canadians could not stay at home in the eastern provinces and still take advantage of them. There is nothing to regret because they have availed themselves of them. The only regret is that the people of eastern Canada, in so many thousands, have gone to the United States, have added their population and their wealth and their energy to that country and that these have been lost to Canada. Over a million of our people, born in Canada, are to-day in the United States instead of in our own northwest building up our own country.

I do not wish to introduce any controversial matter, but I think the references of the hon. Minister of the Interior as to the results of what he was pleased to call the National Policy were scarcely unfortunate under these conditions when we consider that under the rule of that policy, when it was in its fullest blast, was the time when we lost most of our people, when they transferred themselves from this country to that. We lost them and our rivals gained them. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) went into a good deal of detail as to the administration of immigration matters in the province of Ontario and he found some fault with the attitude of the Dominion Department of Immigration. I do not know how his discourse struck other members of the House but when my hon. friend stated that he himself was an officer of the Ontario government administering matters, it struck me that from the amount of complaint that he was able to make and the readiness with which he found matter to complain of there would naturally be some difficulty for another government to give any administration within the sphere of his influence that would be satisfactory to him. May I just suggest here that this is one of the difficulties that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will have to deal with if he desires to co-operate with the provincial governments in regard to immigration effort. I wish him all success, but I must say that any efforts of ours to co-operate with the provincial government of Ontario were not met with any spirit that tended to success and co-operation as the House might very well judge by the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford. I do not wish to trouble the House with the details of the matter, but when we did the best we could to secure immigration of a desirable character to Ontario, we did not find the administration of the government of Ontario at all sympathetic or showing any apparent desire to co-operate with us in the effort. I hope the present minister will have more success in this line than I had. But, I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that in his mention of the interviews that he had with the different premiers of the different provinces his interviews so far were restricted to the premiers who were of the same political persuasion as himself, and did not happen to include the public representatives of the different provinces of a different political persuasion. There might be some difficulty in working out the problem on that line.

Mr. PELLETIER. They are all coming around now.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I suppose that is the object. Until they do come around I think possibly there might be some little difficulty such as we had the misfortune to find in Ontario. I will not trouble the House with the details of our little difficulties in Ontario. We did the best we could and we believe that the immigration effort that we put forth in Ontario did have a good effect. But, we were quite aware of the limitation of our work and we would be very glad to see that work carried on with better results than we were able to achieve. Possibly with cordial co-operation between the Dominion and provincial governments better results can be achieved.

I want to say one word now in regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) in which he objects strongly to the financial restriction which is placed upon immigration. That financial restriction was not placed until there appeared to be the very greatest urgency and necessity for it. The financial restriction was placed upon immigration, and I do not think there is any doubt or that there can be any question that the improvement which we have secured in the standing and character of the immigrants who have come during the past few years, notwithstanding the tremendous increase in their numbers, is very largely due to the financial requirement

as well as other methods of selection and restriction.

I do not think it is possible in this day and generation to have a successful immigration policy satisfactory to the people of this country unless it is selective and restrictive. It is true cases of hardship arise and it is true that in the past many have landed here who did not have twenty-five or fifty dollars, but the times have changed and I say it here now, and I say it strongly, that in my judgment a restrictive and selective immigration policy is an absolute necessity in this Dominion, and a financial requirement from the immigrant is one important feature of such a policy. I have no objection whatever to the resolution, but I must warn its mover (Mr. Rhodes), that he is too sanguine if he expects that any amount of government effort or government expenditure will achieve the same success in the maritime provinces as has been achieved in regard to the prairie provinces where the opportunities are greater.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), think that the immigrants should be examined at the port of embarkation.

Mr. OLIVER. The people have been kind enough to relieve me of the responsibility of administering the Immigration Department, and I do not think it important that I should give my opinion on that matter. However, I may frankly state that my view is that parliament having laid down the rule that immigrants shall not be admitted to Canada unless they meet certain physical and financial requirements, it is the duty of the government to carry out that law. It is a responsibility on the steamship companies that they shall not bring to our shores passengers who are not able to meet the requirements we have laid down, and if we took on ourselves the responsibility of holding an examination on the other side of the water, we would be taking on our shoulders a responsibility that the circumstances did not call for, and we would not be any further ahead in protecting the immigrants. We have not jurisdiction outside of our shores, but the steamships have jurisdiction in the ports whence they sail. They have a nominal medical examination at these ports, and if they make that nominal medical examination practical there will be no trouble about it. I do not think it is a sound policy for Canada to undertake a medical examination on the other side of the Atlantic. In my judgment our immigration policy is best carried out by the methods pursued up to the present time.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), did not touch the real question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike), has already spoken.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I just wish to point out that there is no doubt we could get a law passed allowing examination before embarkation and although there might be extra expense it would be worth money. If my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) realized the great hardship experienced by these families which are broken up, he would recommend the new Minister of the Interior to change the existing law.

Mr. OLIVER. The steamship offices have their own medical officers and make an examination in the country from which the vessel sails, and if that examination is effective, it is all that is required, and if it is not effective, the steamship companies suffer the loss of taking the immigrants back again. I do not think the responsibility of this country goes any further than that. While I would not find any fault with the present Minister of Interior if he should order an examination on the other side, we will be borrowing trouble without achieving any good results.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. HAZEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. What business to-morrow.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Bills and estimates.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the Grain Bill be taken?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand it will.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at twelve o'clock midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 30, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

On the orders of the day being called:

DEATH OF THE DUKE OF FIFE.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I desire to make allusion to the very sad tidings which came last evening of the death of His Grace the Duke of Fife. He was a man of distinguished ability, and one whose whole career has been characterized by earnest effort and purpose in all that concerned the United Kingdom and the empire. The exposure which he suffered in connection

with the unfortunate shipwreck which occurred on his recent voyage to Egypt undoubtedly gave rise to the illness to which he succumbed yesterday. He was very closely connected by marriage with His Majesty the King, and with His Royal Highness the Governor General. His widow is the Princess Royal of Great Britain and Ireland. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to express the profound and sincere sympathy of the members of this House in the bereavement which has occurred. And I am sure my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), will join me in expressing, on behalf of all the members of this House, their very deep sympathy in this bereavement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those who sit on this side of the House, I very sincerely associate myself with my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) in expressing the sentiments which to-day, I am sure, permeate the souls of all British subjects, not only in Canada, but in all parts of the world. His Grace the Duke of Fife, entering the Royal family, took on the spirit of that family, and that spirit is, as every British subject knows, that of absolute devotion to duty. They have made it their business as it is their privilege, in every branch of affairs, to interest themselves in all that concerns the life, not only of the British nation, but of the British Empire. For this they have earned the gratitude and sympathy of all British subjects, and everything of good or bad that affects them cannot but be shared by their subjects. On this occasion the mourning of the Royal Family will be the mourning of the whole empire.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. BEST: MR. MORPHY.

Mr. J. A. BEST (Dufferin). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a paragraph that appeared in the 'Toronto Globe' yesterday, a part of which reads as follows:

> For instance, in the Agricultural Committee on Wednesday last Mr. Sexsmith, the chairman, was formally told by Mr. John A. Best, of Dufferin, and Mr. H. B. Morphy, of North Perth, both of them stalwart Conservatives, that he must warn the Premier to 'keep that man Hughes in check' or there would be trouble.

I wish to say here that I never mentioned Colonel Hughes' name, nor did I mention that of the right hon. leader of the government (Mr. Borden). But I believe that the statement I have just read is on a par with many others that appear in the same paper. There is not a word of truth in it. I never criticised the Minister of Militia's (Mr. Hughes) estimates, nor the estimates of any other department, nor did I hear any other member of that committee criticise those estimates. I think it most unfair that such statements should be made concerning the meetings of the committee. A stop should be put to it. I wish to say to the Minister of Militia and the other ministers, that no fault was found in the committee with the estimates so far as I know. The paragraph I have quoted is quite untrue.

Mr. PROULX. Did the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Best), say that too much money was being spent on the militia?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MORPHY (North Perth). I also desire to say a word in regard to the same matter. The paragraph quoted by my hon. friend from Dufferin, so far as the mention of my name is concerned, is absolutely unwarranted. I did not, either directly or indirectly, refer to the estimates of the Militia Department, nor did I refer to the minister (Mr. Hughes) by name. Nor did I refer, either directly or indirectly, or use words which could have any reference to the estimates of the Militia Department. I do not feel much concerned myself about a report of that kind, but I think that in fairness to the minister (Mr. Hughes), I should make an absolute and unqualified denial of this statement made in the 'Globe.'

PAYMENT OF CENSUS AND ELECTION OFFICIALS.

Mr. NEELY. I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr Borden), in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), to the fact that I am almost daily receiving communications from census enumerators engaged in the census work of last summer, as well as from deputy returning officers engaged in the last election, complaining that they have not been paid. I do not know the reason for the delay; but, on behalf of the men who are sending these communications, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the situation.

Mr. BORDEN. I shall bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture at once. I do not know the cause of the delay, as it is a purely departmental matter.

Mr. EMMERSON. I desire to call the attention of the Secretary of State (Mr. Roche) to an inquiry made on Friday evening with respect to the non-payment of the election expenses in the county of Albert for the last election.

Mr. ROCHE. I have brought this to the attention of the Attorney General, in whose department it is; and as yet he has not furnished me with a reply.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yesterday I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), in the absence of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane), for a statement as to the newspaper report of the appointment of certain commissioners to investigate matters in connection with the Transcontinental railway. The Minister of Railways is in his place, and perhaps he would be good enough to let us know what foundation there is for this report.

Mr. COCHRANE. A commission has been appointed by order in council to investigate the affairs of the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. MACDONALD. Who are the commissioners?

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Lynch-Staunton and Mr. Gutelius, of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the minister lay on the table the order in council and other papers in connection with the appointment?

Mr. COCHRANE. I will be very glad to do so.

TARIFF COMMISSION.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the appointment of a Tariff Commission. (See 'Hansard,' January 24). He said: These resolutions relate to the creation of a tariff commission. It will suffice at this stage to say that the commission is to consist of three members to be appointed by the Governor in Council, for a period of five years. The salary of the chairman is to be $7,500, and the salary of each of the other members to be $7,000. Each commissioner gives his entire time to the work of the commission. The duties of the commission are set forth in the resolutions. Authority is given to the commission to engage such expert and other assistance as may be necessary for carrying on their work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What classes of the community are to be represented?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The question of the personnel of the commission has not yet been decided. I have no hesitation, however, in saying that I think it would be a mistake, either to exclude or appoint any member of the commission on account of his calling. My present idea is that the commission should consist of able, earnest and high-minded men, commanding the confidence of the entire community, men who are broad enough to be in sympathy with all the classes and interests of the community. I would not exclude any man by reason of his being a farmer, or an artisan, or a manufacturer; and I would not appoint any man for the same reason. I am not able to give a more definite answer at the present time, except to say that my idea is that this commission should be composed of men capable of representing not only the farming community but all other interests in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The resolution which we now have under consideration creates a new departure in our national legislation. Everything depends upon the character of the commission. It would, not, therefore, be advisable, to offer any criticism, either of approval or condemnation, at present, but to reserve for a future time suggestions on this matter.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Does the hon. the Finance Minister propose to fix a day for moving the second reading?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The second reading will come in due course. So far as I am concerned, I would be quite willing to fix a day that might suit the convenience of hon. members. But I expect it will come on in a week.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on the resolution.

On section 4,

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Has the commission any initiation of its own in any matter?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The commission is empowered to act under direction of the Finance Minister.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). In everything?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). In everything. It will only have independent initiation in the manner of carrying on an inquiry into any matter on which it may be requested to obtain information.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Then it will differ from the Railway Commission, which has powers of initiation of its own, and has a wide jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of this commission is limited absolutely to questions referred to it by the minister.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes. It is part of the machinery of government, for the purpose of obtaining information upon which the government may act.

Mr. KNOWLES. Have there been any representations made to the government asking for this commission, either from

the farmers, or from the manufacturers, or from other people?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am not aware of any representations having been made such as the hon. gentleman refers to, none, so far as I know, since our taking office. But the matter of a tariff commission, as my friend knows, has been a subject of discussion for a considerable time in this country.

The creation of a tariff commission was a prominent plank in the platform of the right hon. leader of the government during the last election, and I believe that as long ago as 1908 the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) expressed himself, in general terms at least, as favourable to the creation of a tariff commission. Apart from that I know of no direct representation that has been made, but from the comments of the press since the matter has been announced, I have reason to believe that the proposal to appoint a tariff commission has been well received by the people generally throughout the country.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Is it intended to create a body with any power to negotiate with other countries in regard to questions of tariff arrangements?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My conception of the commission is not that it would have any function that belongs to the government of fixing tariff rates, or negotiating; its purpose is to furnish information to the government on which the government may act in framing its tariff law or in negotiating. There is one clause in the resolution that they may:

> Inquire into any other matter or thing in relation to the trade or commerce of Canada which the Governor in Council sees fit to refer to the commission for inquiry and report.

Of course that is very wide in its terms. It is not in my mind that the commission is intended to negotiate, it is to obtain information on which the government may negotiate or frame its tariff law. I look on the commission as a part of the machinery of government for the purpose of obtaining accurate information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is of record that the Manufacturers' Association has again and again asked for a tariff commission but, as I understand, what was in their minds was a tariff commission with much larger powers than those contained in these resolutions, and which, for my part, I never thought could be granted. As I understand, the government could not see its way to give the wide powers to the commission which were asked for by the Manufacturers' Association, I always was of opinion that we might have a board to collect information. I do not know that this commission entirely corresponds with what I have had in my own mind but, as I said, this is not the time to discuss this matter, this is the occasion to elicit information upon what is proposed by my hon. friend.

Mr. CASH. Will the report of this commission be made public, or is it to be a report to the government alone?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). There is a provision in the Bill which I propose to introduce to this effect:

> Should evidence or information in its nature confidential, relating to the business or affairs of any person, firm or corporation be given or elicited in the course of any inquiry, the evidence or information shall not be made public by the commission in such a manner as to be available for the use of any business competitor or rival of the person, firm or corporation, respectively, but this subsection shall not apply to any inquiry under sub-section 3 of section 4 of this Act.

This particular subsection relates to an inquiry as to whether there is a combination to unduly enchance prices. Subject to what I have read, the report will be made through the Minister of Finance, and would be available to the government in framing its tariff law and, I should imagine, would be available for the information of the House, subject to the right of the government to withhold any information in the public interest. My idea would be that these reports would be made to the minister, and to the government. The information would be obtained by the commission, and would be of use for the purpose I have indicated. I should imagine the information would be available to the public, subject to these clauses.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend does not seem to have made up his mind as to the publicity that will be given to the information gathered by the commission. I would respectfully suggest that when the Bill is brought down it should make specific provision for opportunity to be given to the public, who are interested, to have the benefit of that information. If the country is paying for its collection the country is entitled to the advantage of it in making up its mind as to whether the recommendations of the government should be followed or not, that is, the country is paying for the information and the country should have the benefit of that information except in such cases as my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. BORDEN. The qualification to which the minister has alluded is one that has been the practice of all governments in connection with the customs and other departments of the government. There has been no departure from the ordinary practice.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the Minister of Customs be, ipso facto, a member of the board?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No, he is not to be a member of the board. The board is to consist of three members from outside of the department. It is a commission for the purpose of obtaining information for the use of the minister and of the government.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). As to the negotiation of treaties, we ought to have before us, when we discuss the Bill in the House, the Bill creating the Tariff Commission in the United States. That is an important body although it has very small powers as defined in the Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There is no Tariff Commission in the United States.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). No, but there is a board of experts at the disposal of the government and their reports and investigations, especially in connection with the recent negotiations with Canada, were immediately placed at the disposal of the House and printed as documents and it would be very essential that all the information collected by them of a public character should be at the immediate disposal of this House and of the country.

Motion agreed to, resolution read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 88) to provide for the appointment of a Tariff Commission.

The motion was agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE GRAIN ACT.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 32) respecting Grain. He said: I am not going to impose on the House an explanation of all the different sections of this very voluminous Bill, but I am going to say a few words by way of introduction, more with the idea of giving to the House, if indeed it is at all necessary, a connected idea of the operations of the grain trade, and consequently of the Bill which I am introducing. It derives its great importance, of course, from the immensity and from the wideness of the particular product with which it deals, and if important at any one particular time its importance is increasing as the years go by inasmuch as the commodity with which it deals is constantly growing in volume. Not to go back very far in the history of legislation on this subject I may say that the substance of the recent enactments, and of this Bill, are based largely upon investigations which commenced in the year 1906. In that year a commission was appointed consisting of three gentlemen, Messrs. Miller, McNair, and Goldie. That commission looked into all matters in connection with the grain trade of Canada and with reference to all the legislation which was at that time upon the statute-books, namely, the Inspection and Sales Act and the Manitoba Grain Act. These gentlemen took up the matter of investigation in July, 1906, and pursued it to a finish and reported on October 11, 1907. They went to the source of production of the grain in the west, and traced the operation from the farmer throughout the different stages of storage and carriage and inspection and marketing, going as far as Victoria and Vancouver on the western coast and as far as the Atlantic ports and Europe in the east, and they made, as I consider, a very thorough investigation, and produced a report of forty pages which for compactness and directness of recommedation has not, I think, been often surpassed by the report of any commission.

The conclusions they came to were: that the grade system was the most suitable system upon which to base the grain trade of Canada. They reported against the sample market as being expensive and cumbrous, and not in excellence to be compared with the grade system. They reported in favour of a better system of supervision for terminal elevators under present ownership. They reported against government ownership and against prohibiting private interests in the terminals and also for supervision and control over eastern elevators with the object—

Mr. OLIVER. What is that last remark of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They reported in favour of a system of more strict supervision of the terminal elevators under private or corporate ownership, and were rather against prohibiting private interests from participating in their operation, and therefore they were against government ownership of the terminals. They also reported for a strict supervision and control over the eastern elevators so as to keep—which was the object all the way through—the identity of the grade which had been established as the standard of sale. In the end, they reported a series of amendments to the Act then in force. What took place directly after that was a study I suppose by the government of the substance of this commission's report and after that there was a conference in 1908 where the grain growers and farmers' associations of the western provinces and the representatives of the carrying interests, the bankers, the grain and produce exchanges, the people who owned private and corporate elevators all met together, and before the minister

in conference threshed out all these questions taking up particularly all the amendments which had been recommended by the commission of 1906. The result of this was a volume of one hundred and sixty pages of evidence and of argument which was brought out in that conference and upon which the Grain Act and the Inspection and Sales Act were remodelled and strengthened. But, so far as I can judge, these acts very largely embodied the principle which had been laid down by the commission of 1906. Last year there supervened that immense deputation from the west which besieged the then Prime Minister and the members of both Houses and presented their views in extenso. Then after that came the formation of the Act which was introduced into the Senate and was accompanied by a select committee's investigation and report. All these different interests again met and canvassed all the questions of interest, gave their views very fully and very extensively, and after all this had been done the Bill was passed through the Senate. With some exceptions, but not many in number, it may be said that all parties agreed pretty well upon the substance of the Act. There are two or three points which are still in sharp controversy and which it will be for this House to take into consideration and ultimately to pass upon. Bill (No. 32) is a replica to a large extent of the Bill which was passed by the Senate in 1911, with a number of amendments and betterments which have been introduced and which are now comprised in the Bill which I place before the House. So much with reference to the course of conference and examination and legislation after examination, with regard to this matter within the last five or six years.

As one looks over that and examines the Bill before the House, he will be struck with several things. In the first place he will be struck with the idea, which I believe is entirely correct, that probably no country in the world possesses a system for the inspection, grading and sale of grain that at all compares in complexity and in thoroughness with that embodied in the Acts at present on our statute-books and in the provisions in the Bill before the House. Indeed no other business in Canada is wrapped around with so many restrictions and safeguards as that dealt with in this measure. Whether all these restrictions are conducive in the end to the best is a matter on which there may be difference of opinion; but, at present, at least, there is a large body of opinion which wants a little more law. Seemingly, every possible safeguard and facility that could be thrown around the producer and the primary seller of the grain has been sought to be embodied in the legislation which is either now on the statute-book or is contained in this Bill. Your farmer in the far west for instance has numerous avenues open to him, in most cases hedged around by every precaution which the law can use to make it easy for him to sell his grain and to give him security for the price agreed upon. He can have his own method of disposing of his grain unrestricted by anything; he sells it to anybody he likes at whatever price he likes and pockets his pay without any interference from the law or the government. If he is not satisfied to sell in that way, he can command his own car, by an arrangement made legal, by application in turn, and the railway company has to furnish him with a car at the siding or loading platform at his own station into which he can load his grain either from the platform or from the siding. He can have that car consigned to any elevator or consignee he wishes, and is protected by law as regards the grade upon which he shall be paid and also as regards the security and the like which attaches from that time until he has made final disposition of his grain. He can sell that car to the track buyer if he pleases, but the track buyer is hedged around by license and by legal provisions to the end that he cannot defraud the seller on the price he has agreed to pay. He has an elevator to which he can sell at the price agreed upon between himself and the elevator man, and if he and the elevator man cannot agree upon the price, the grade, the dockage, he can yet make a sale to the elevator man and the grain, its identity being preserved by means of sample, is to be inspected in Winnipeg, and the grade fixed by government inspection, entailing upon the elevator man the necessity of settling with his customer according to the inspection, the grade and the dockage which is given by the inspector at Winnipeg. If he does not wish to sell his grain at once, he has the privilege of storing it at the flat warehouse, or, under certain conditions, he can store it in the elevator and wait for a better market if he chooses to tempt the future. One of the primary objects of the legislation seems to have been to give as many facilities as possible for the easy sale of the farmers grain and to hedge around that grain with all possible security which shall ensure to the farmer the whole price of the sale he has made. So much with reference to that.

The system of grading as everybody in the House knows is simply an attempt by law to fix certain standards and make them uniform and permanent by which the seller sells his grain and by which the purchaser buys it from the time it leaves the wagon of the farmer, until it finally reaches its destination. These grades being fixed,

the farmer at his station sells out his wheat according to grade and gets the price according to that grade, and the ultimate buyer and every buyer between has to pay according to that grade. One of the primal objects of the legislation is to preserve, not the identity of the grain, but the identity of the grade from the starting point to the finish. Indeed there is provision in the Act which makes it possible if a man wishes to preserve the absolute identity of his grain from the starting point until it arrives in Europe, for him to do so. Although some of the members of this House who know these things may think that I am taking time without much warrant in making these standards, yet probably a good many members of the House and the public do not know the system. We carry this on a step further. All this grain carried from the west, when it comes within the purview of the city of Winnipeg, is there met by the samplers and inspectors who do the work of sampling and inspection and thereby fix the grades.

Next all this grain passes through Winnipeg until it is met with that sampling and grading, that fixing of the standard, by the employees of the government provided for that purpose. After it has been sampled and graded it is sent on to the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William. There again government officials open the door of the car, supervise the unloading of the grain from the car into the elevator, supervise the weighing of the grain, and supervise the placing of the grain in its own proper bin, so that again the identity of the grade by government supervision and control is maintained within the elevator. Receipts are given at one end of the elevator, and receipts are surrendered at the other end when the grain comes out for shipment. There again the government official supervises the whole process of shipment out so as to preserve the identity of the grade, inspects it as it passes on its way to the car or the vessel, to see that the grade of grain which has been entered at the other side of the elevator comes out at the shipping side, and that there is no deterioration between the two processes. After that the grain takes its flight by car or vessel and wends its way towards the market, in Ontario or in Europe. If it is for the latter, it is under supervision more or less constant and thorough until it reaches the Atlantic seaboard. This is the system which under past and present legislation has been provided, a system which in its theory is, I think, a very excellent one, which may have weaknesses, as every system will have, but these weaknesses, so far as it can be done, we aim to remove by the present legislation so as to make the whole system as strong and as thorough as it can possibly be made. I have stated that if we look over every other grain-growing country in the world we shall find no other system to compare at all with this. Conditions and circumstances differ in different countries, and that may explain in part the difference of systems. There are, however, many countries in the world which to-day are studying the Canadian system, and which are gravitating towards some features of the Canadian system and are designing to place them in their own legislation. Now, one would think that with all this there should be no dissatisfaction in the west, no troubles to be met, no grievances to remedy. But the experience of western men and of some eastern men will show that all is not calmness and peace in the far western region or the near western region, and that there are yet voices raised here and there, not a few, which demand something more and are giving voice to the troubles with which they are plagued and of which they wish to be rid.

Now, while I venture an opinion with a great deal of modesty, never having been a grain raiser, a grain shipper or an elevator owner, I think that some of these troubles are well voiced and some of them are due to circumstances which as reasonable men, we are all bound to take into consideration, and which it requires time and patience and co-operation to overcome. One of the main troubles in the west to-day is the problem of transportation. There is more grain there to-day than can be got out of the country. From the base of the Rockies down to Fort William grain is lying in the fields, in the elevators, in the cars and on the tracks. It is not moving fast enough, any of it that is moving, and a great deal of it is not moving at all, but the people who own it are very anxious that it should be moving. The problem, as I have stated, is one largely of circumstances. The grain-producing area has extended rapidly, the carrying facilities have also been extended rapidly, but production has not only overtaken but has far outstripped the capacity for transport, and that is one of the reasons which is causing the difficulty to-day. The three great railway systems in the west spread out to a width of 600 or 800 miles just this side of the Rockies, gathering in from every section of the country, then narrow down to a very narrow strip south of Lake Winnipeg, and after they reach Port Arthur and Fort William have no Canadian means of rail exit at this time, except the one single track of the Canadian Pacific. Up to the end of navigation, about the middle of December, the lake marine furnishes an easy and capacious method of taking away the grain

that comes to the elevators at those terminal points; but when frost closes that means of exit, then for from three to five months no grain can go out by a Canadian route with the exception of that which is carried on the single rail of the Canadian Pacific railway. Now, how can we remedy that state of things? I have gone into this matter pretty thoroughly. The Railway Commission has gone into it much more thoroughly than I have; they have the means of doing it. My opinion, which I believe is coincided in fully by the Railway Commission, is that the three railways have done all this year that they could do to facilitate the movement of grain in the northwest. But it is absolutely impossible for it all to be moved under the circumstances as they exist to-day. Now, how are we going to remedy that state of things? Presently it cannot be remedied. No man can in five minutes, five weeks or five months' time devise any method which will remedy that condition of things. It has to be remedied by time, patience and co-operation of effort. But remedies are opening up. In another year—and it is too bad that we have to wait for another year—or two at the farthest, there will be another line of railway which will give an exit from the west through Cochrane and the railway systems of eastern Ontario and eastern Canada. That will double the facilities. At some time or other, I do not know when, the Canadian Northern may have its independent line of communication from the west to the east, and that will give still another each.

In the course of time these railways may double their tracks, and that will more than double their capacity. But that will take time. The Hudson Bay railway, which has been getting along in an easy and listless way for the last ten years, is now in a position where it gives promise of speedy opening of another route. It will take time also to bring this about. But in the course of two or three years that route ought to be available as well. Then, I think, one of the greatest factors to relieve the situation in the future will be the opening up of a drainage of wheat from as far east as Moosejaw by western channels with a view to being carried by way of the Pacific ocean. I have no doubt that when the Panama canal is opened, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Northern railway will be favoured lines for the exit of the wheat by way of the Pacific. This will furnish transportation for a share of the increased product and will to that extent prevent congestion. So the farmers who are working in the west and others equally interested—though they may not be working at farming in the east—for this is a common interest—may look forward with confidence to the future and to an adequate transport for the mighty productions of the northwest. The subject is a most interesting one, and I would advise every member of the House to get his studying cap on and consider carefully the situation. It will be very interesting to note just what changes are to be made, even affecting the middle of the prairie regions of the northwest, and all other parts of Canada, by the stupendous undertaking now being carried on across Panama which may be expected to see its completion in a year and a half or two years from this time. It will have an immense effect on transportation and on the distribution of materials in Canada in future years.

Mr. DEVLIN. But what about the Georgian Bay canal?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend (Mr. Devlin), coming from greater things to smaller things—but not infinitesimal—is again anxious about the Georgian Bay canal. Let us stick to our muttons, and deal with this Bill. The Georgian Bay canal will come up in due time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But what has this Bill to do with all these questions of transportation?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will see in a moment. I have been speaking of the difficulties met in the northwest, and named transportation as one of them. I think I have given a plain statement of the situation——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And very interesting.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto)—and I thought it was not at all out of place to lighten up that question with the hope for the future.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is only by hope in the future that we better our present.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And that is why my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) is anxious about the Georgian Bay canal. That is one of the hopes of the future.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Quite so. But, unfortunately, the Georgian Bay canal will not be a very capacious winter method of taking out the grain, and that is the subject to which I have been specially calling attention. But we never know what the possibilities are, and it may be that the Georgian Bay canal will even be used as a winter route some day.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I desire to ask the minister (Mr. Foster), if the hope of

transportation for the future is the best solution he has to offer for the western grain blockade of to-day?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If the hon. member (Mr. Martin, Regina) will possess his soul in patience, he will hear what I have to offer. There is another thing intimately connected with transportation, and that is the question of storage. I think that the difficulty in the northwest, now and in the future, is to be met in part by increase of storage facilities as well as increase of transportation facilities—the two, indeed, go together. One of the factors of the situation in the northwest is that the farmers there, as a rule, do not think that it is a part of their work to furnish what the farmer of eastern and middle Canada furnishes—store houses, granaries, barns, in which to place the crops he raises in order to keep them until it pleases him to sell them. Whether it arises from inability or from whatever cause, the fact is that not more than one in a hundred of the farmers or grain growers of the northwest ever attempts individually to meet the problem of storage. It is much easier for him to put his grain on his wagon and take it to the elevator than to first put it in a granary and then re-handle it to take it to the elevator or station.

There are difficulties in the way of erecting granaries. Few farmers are able to erect granaries in the early times of their farming operations. Lumber is scarce; it costs money; and money is by no means a superfluity with the man who takes up a homestead and goes to work with only his hands and his hopes for the development of his farm and the making of a livelihood from it. However, the difficulty arises, it is the fact that storage is not provided by the farmers individually of the northwest as a rule. But that there is large storage capacity in the west we all know. There are farmers' elevators at various points on the several railways as well as the great terminal elevators. I have a statement showing the storage capacity as follows:

	Bushels.
Country elevators..	57,500,000
Ontario terminals..	25,700,000
Ontario milling terminals..	1,700,000
Eastern transfers..	20,500,000
Total..	105,400,000

Yet we have the fact that these storage facilities are inadequate to take all the grain that offers, so that there are millions of bushels of grain to-day, threshed or unthreshed, in the fields not stored in any way. The storage capacity is increased by the capacity of the vessels wintering at the terminals, which is about 5,000,000 bushels to 7,000,000 bushels.

The total storage capacity at that terminal point during the winter season, therefore, comes closely to 30,000,000 or 32,000,000 bushels. It is also to be remembered that when you talk of capacity you are not altogether close up to the actual storage they can make; owing to difference of grades some space is left vacant. Then there is a trouble in the west which intensifies this condition, namely, that the whole transfer of grain, so far as the west is concerned, compresses itself within a period of three months at most, and a period of probably nearer two months on the occasion of a season such as we have just had. So that the immense reapings from the farms of the west are garnered and ready for market in the brief period of two or two and-a-half months. That complicates the situation. It seems to be economically impossible for railway transport systems to have sufficient transporting cars to fill that great demand in two or three months, and at all proceed upon business or economical principles. A storage system must in some way or other come in to assist the present transport facilities, and the problem in the west will be solved by the increase of storage, and the increase, as soon as it can possibly be done, of transport facilities out from the west.

Mr. CURRIE. Has the hon. gentleman any figures to show the storage capacity of the granaries of the farmers in the west as compared with the granary system in eastern Canada?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think I read the figures of the company elevators.

Mr. CURRIE. I mean the farms themselves. In Ontario the farmer stores his own grain.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think, in comparison with the other figures, it is almost a negligible quantity.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That may be true as regards Saskatchewan, of which I cannot speak, but it is not true so far as Manitoba is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Manitoba being an older province, is coming more and more towards the point of preparing and arranging for its own storage, and in that respect Manitoba occupies a less troublesome position than either Saskatchewan or Alberta, which have not made the same progress in preparing storage facilities.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I think in Saskatchewan itself there are more storage facilities on the farms than there are in Manitoba. I know I am safe in saying

that in the older districts of Saskatchewan the great majority of the farmers have storage facilities up to date, not only in the shape of lumber granaries, but in the shape of granaries made out of some kind of galvanized material.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Is this kind of granary increasing?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Yes, as the country develops.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not object to these questions or interruptions at all. These gentlemen, who live in the west, have a more intimate acquaintance with the whole situation than I can have. Still, I think all will agree that my general reasoning is correct, and that the farmers in the west have not been preparing and furnishing themselves with storage facilities to the same extent as farmers in the east. The storage of farms, taking the newer and older sections altogether, is a quantity which is infinitely less than the line elevators and the company elevators, and other storage facilities. It is also true that the newer portions of the country, as the country opens up, have a minimum of storage facilities; the older parts of the country as they grow begin to furnish themselves, and have larger storage facilities.

Then there is the trouble in the west with reference to prices. The farmer feels that he does not get the amount which he is entitled to from his grain as the producer and the primary owner. No doubt that is a well-founded feeling and it arises from the very causes I have mentioned, namely, that the transport facilities are inadequate, and consequently either no transport can be got, or delayed transport only can be got, and this diminishes the price which the farmer has a right to expect. But these difficulties are gradually disappearing as transport facilities are made better, and that is something which requires time, co-operation and patience. The price is also affected by the rates of freight, and the complaint from the farmers is found very general that they are being charged too much on their grain. That is a matter which is in the hands of the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission has already done something in that line, and will do more, as it is about to undertake now in the month of February an exhaustive examination of freight rates in the west. I suppose that is one of the grievances for which the management and work of the Railway Commission will find some if not altogether a total, alleviation.

Then there are the manipulators or middlemen in the storage. It is complained in reference to some of the terminal storage elevators, so far as I can understand, that the grain of the farmer starting with certain qualities in each grade may be mixed by the elevator man or owner, or proprietor, so that the farmer gets no benefit from it, and that the elevator man, or owner himself, makes a profit by the mixing of the grades, strengthening a lower grade by an overplus of an upper grade, and bringing the two up to a higher grade for which he gets a higher price. That is a grievance of the western farmer, which brings to the front the question of terminal elevators, and it is that question which, in this Bill we undertake to solve, and it will require the best efforts of all of us on both sides of the House to solve it in a manner satisfactory to all, and at the same time in an effective manner.

I do not know whether I should offer another suggestion to men who are practical farmers, but I will venture on that dangerous ground, and say that in my view another alleviation for the future is possible, and I think is very probable, namely, if the farmers of the west will turn their attention more and more to mixed farming. In that way they will diminish, to a certain extent, the over-production of grain, and at the same time fortify their own positions in the maintenance of the fertility of the soil, which is after all, the most valuable possession they have. It seems to me a striking thing that out in the west where the land is in superabundance, the west must yet go to every other country under the sun, and to every other part of Canada, in order to find its own bacon, its own meats, its own vegetables, its own eggs, its own poultry, and that kind of supply, and pay freight and charges to bring them in from the distant places.

I am sure that at some time that condition will be remedied, and that the people of the west, besides raising grain, will also raise these articles in abundance for their own consumption, and I should hope in the not very distant future in sufficient quantity to export them to other parts of the country with a consequently increased revenue to themselves. I am not an adviser to advise the west, that is just the statement of an onlooker, and I think it is sympathized with by people who live in the west and by those who do not live there.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Have the farmers of the west now a grievance in connection with obtaining advances against grain on their places? Can a farmer get an advance on the grain in his granary or is there trouble in that respect?

Mr. TURRIFF. He could not get it.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not know whether that is a grievance which is put forward or not. It would be a difficult matter of finance for a man to get an advance upon the grain as it stands in the

field. He can get an advance on it when he gets it on a railway track, into a car or into an elevator, he then has something which he can deliver and which the man who makes the advance is assured will be security for his loan; but if the grain is on his field, or is threshed but still on his place, it would seem to me he would not have much chance of getting an advance especially under the present condition of things when there is no certainty as to when he will get it out. That makes it all the more difficult.

Coming down to the present Act, I have only a few words to say as I think it would be better for us to take this matter up in committee. The object of the present Act is to remedy these grievances and to alleviate these troubles in as far as an enactment of parliament can alleviate and help. The whole Act, which is a long one, is not new; it is a consolidation of the Inspection and Sales Act and the Manitoba Grain Act with some amendments and additions. The object is to perfect the governmental system of supervision and of control so as to meet some of the difficulties which have arisen and do away with some of the grievances which have been stated. A commission is to be formed which, in the first place, will have control of what has so far been controlled not by a commission but by officers appointed by the government. This commission will consist of three members. It will be the aim of the government to get three men who are in the first place honest, in the second place capable and efficient and in the third place, men with executive and organizing ability which, I think, is not the least qualification necessary for the work. In the hands of that commission, made as independent as a commission can be made, will be placed the whole control, supervision and work which is now entrusted to the different officers of the government.

The government also takes power in this Act to expropriate, to construct and to lease terminal elevators to the end that the selfish interest which it has heretofore been declared has worked against the interests of the farmer shall be eliminated as far as possible and such terminal elevators when constructed or built or leased will be managed by the commission, it will be their business to operate these elevators in addition to discharging the duties which are now placed upon the officers who are carrying out the Act as it has been on the statute-book.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Would you take away the existing rights of railways to maintain their own elevators?

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto). One of the most vexed and important questions that we will have to deal with in this House is what shall be done to eliminate the evil which is acknowledged to exist, the selfish interest. I am not prepared, at this moment, to say how far the government propose to go, that is a matter upon which I hope we shall be able to enlighten the House before this Bill is through; what we are getting by this Bill is the power to act and to operate through a commission.

This is not my Bill particularly, nor the Bill of any party; it is, as nearly as possible, a non-partisan Bill. I am its foster-father, at the present moment, but the child is much the same as when it came from its original parents; a little better dressed up it may be but still it is intrinsically the same child, and I take it that the parent of that child was not a Liberal government or a Liberal Conservative government, but it was the product of the conferences of all the interests in the matter after successive years of examination and discussion. This result was placed in concrete shape in the Bill which came down from the Senate. I do not know of any Bill that has come before parliament of recent years which comes upon a basis which more commends it to a careful, earnest, honest application of the best efforts of all of us on both sides of the House, to produce a piece of legislation which shall be acceptable to all concerned and which shall be beneficial to the country. The government are bound, by the introduction of the Bill, to steer it through the House but the government are not bigoted in this matter and for my own part I welcome the co-operation and the knowledge which so many members in this House have of this matter, I welcome and invite it in order that we may perfect the measure and make it, as I said, as good a measure as we can possibly have.

I do not think it necessary to keep you longer, I ought to apologize for having kept you so long. When I began to study this matter I found that I knew very little about it and that is what has prompted me to make a rather more extended exposition of the subject than I otherwise would have done for the benefit of members who had not paid attention to it so as to make us all more capable for the subsequent work of legislating in this matter.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the minister saying that he desires the co-operation of the House at large in perfecting this Bill. We private members on this side of the House are quite prepared to take full responsibility for any suggestions that we have to make in regard to its improvement, and I hope that any such suggestions will be accepted in a fair spirit by the government so that they may be properly discussed. At the same time, I hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) does not wish it to be understood in any

way that the government as a government and himself as minister are not absolutely behind this Bill and responsible for it to the House and to the country.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I stated that.

Mr. OLIVER. I repeat that so that there shall be no mistake about that part of it. When my hon. friend introduced the Bill he mentioned something about possible amendments which would be introduced in committee. If there are such amendments and they are of importance the House should have due notice of them.

I do not think any apology is due to the House from the minister for taking up considerable time in placing before the House and the country the conditions surrounding this piece of, what I might call, special legislation. I think perhaps he phrased the case a little too strongly, when he said there was no such legislation anywhere else, because there is somewhat parallel legislation on the other side of the line where the conditions are almost identical with the conditions here. There is, however, a very great difference between the conditions surrounding the grain trade in the Canadian west and the adjoining portions of the United States, from the conditions which obtain in the greater part of the wheat producing areas of the world, and it is out of that difference in conditions that this legislation becomes necessary. If the grain were placed in sacks and transported in these sacks from the place of production to the place of consumption there would not be any need for this Bill. But, as I understand it, the grain from India, the grain from the Pacific coast of North America, and the grain from Australia is carried in sacks, and,therefore, such legislation as this is not necessary.

Mr. CURRIE. Does the United States federal government exact a standard of grain similar to that exacted in this legislation?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think it does, but the state of Minnesota which produces similar grain to ours, under similar conditions provides a standard.

Mr. CURRIE. What percentage of the wheat of the United States is grown in Minnesota?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot tell, but I do know that a very large percentage of the wheat that stands on the same level as ours as to quality is grown in Minnesota. Such special legislation as this is in order that the grain may be carried from the point of production to the point of consumption without being put up in separate packages, and still preserve its identity as to quality. It is out of that situation that the whole of this legislation arises. The man who buys the grain from the farmer buys it on sample and the miller in Great Britain buys it also on sample, but in the carrying from the farmer in Canada to the miller in England it must be either carried in sacks or carried in bulk, and it being carried in bulk a great deal of this legislation becomes necessary in order that the rights, not particularly of the farmer, but of all the parties concerned in the transaction shall be preserved.

Mr. CURRIE. May I ask a question?

Mr. OLIVER. I shall be glad to answer my hon. friend (Mr. Currie), when I have finished, but I am now trying to present a somewhat intricate position to the House, and I would prefer to continue my remarks. It may be said: Why is not the grain transported in sacks and what difference would it make in the cost? Well, there would not only be the difference in the cost of the sacks, but there would be the difference in the cost of handling at each transfer en route. It is a fact that the grain can be handled from the railway car to the vessel and again from the vessel to the railway car more cheaply in bulk than if it were in separate parcels. As wheat is the great necessity of life, it is in the interests of producer and consumer that every item of cost that stands between the producer and the consumer shall be cut out, and that when conditions permit, the grain shall be carried in bulk. Then, legislation such as this is absolutely necessary if justice is to be done all the parties to the transfer.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). You mean every item of unnecessary cost?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, of course. I lay some stress upon this point because I think the minister seemed to lay the burden of the whole of this legislation upon the necessities of the farmer. The farmer is, of course, a very much interested party in the legislation, but he is not by any means the only party interested. The other parties who are concerned in the transportation and financing of this grain are proportionately as deeply interested in the provisions of the Grain Act, as the farmer is. It is legislation which is rendered necessary in the interests of the business of the country; the farmer, the merchant, the dealer, and the consumer. Then my hon. friend speaks of the difficulties that arise as soon as winter sets in, in connection with the transportation of grain to the ultimate market, and of the congestion that naturally results because of the freezing of the winter route. We have at present through Canada only one line of railway connecting the wheat fields

with the eastern seaboard. There are under construction two other lines of railway, and, therefore, within a few years there will be three railways between the wheat fields and the eastern seaboard. I will take the liberty of recalling to the attention of the House—although perhaps I should not do so—that when the proposition for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, especially its eastern division, was placed before the country it received a great deal of opposition as not being of urgent necessity. I do not wish to refer now to the arguments used at that time, but I want to emphasize the point that the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the construction of the Canadian Northern now in progress, connecting the wheat fields and the seaboard, are of the utmost necessity and urgency for the welfare of Canada in every line that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has laid so clearly before the House to-day.

Let me go further, and I speak of it, not because my hon. friend mentioned it but because two of my hon. friends from the west on the other side have on one or two occasions drawn attention to this condition, that the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific, in its eastern section to Moncton, has been abnormal, and they seemed to argue that that was an injury and an offence to the west. They seemed to consider that it was an injury to the west that this enormous expenditure was being incurred on that section of the Transcontinental. But if that expenditure be enormous, it is due to the fact that the road is being so constructed as to carry the grain of the western prairies to the seaboard at absolutely the lowest rate which the most competent engineering ability can bring it down to. That being the case, the very vastness of the expenditure upon that section is most directly and unquestionably in the interest of the west on the very line of the argument which my hon. friend submitted to the House to-day.

As regards the advice given to the farmers of the prairie west to provide granaries and go into mixed farming, I do not know that any one, who has ever spoken about the west, has not tendered that advice. That advice I admit, is good, but there is a great deal of advice that is very good in itself, but which it is not always practicable to put into effect. I was struck particularly by the suggestion that because the farmer of eastern Canada provides storage for his grain crop, therefore the farmer of western Canada ought to do likewise. But there is some difference between a grain crop produced on a field of 20, 30 or 40 acres, and one produced on a field of 160 to 640 acres. Those who speak so freely of the shortcomings of the western farmer in not providing proper housing for his grain would perhaps do well to remember that the rapidity of the progress of the west is due to the fact that it has been possible, with a minimum of capital and a maximum of energy to bring under cultivation and into production the maximum area of productive soil. If it had been necessary for the man who went into the western prairie to provide eastern barns before starting to farm, instead of the wheat production of the prairie being 175,000,000 bushels this year, it probably would not be 50,000,000 or even 25,000,000. Conditions in the west are favourable to the production and the handling of grain with the minimum of expenditure, and it is because of that fact many thousands of the people there to-day cannot possibly put up barns, if barns be necessary until they have arrived at a condition which is yet in the far future. A great proportion of the settlers in that country have only come in within the last few years and are not yet in such a position as would enable them to put up these buildings; and besides, owing to the climatic conditions the housing of the grain on a large scale is not necessary. It is therefore very doubtful if it would be sound business policy for them to spend their money in the housing of the grain on the same scale as that is done in the eastern provinces. The natural conditions in the west being different, we cannot reasonably expect that the people there should act as though the conditions there were the same as in the east, in order to relieve a situation which has occurred this year and which may not occur again for many years to come. In the eastern country we have a wet fall and in the western country a dry fall. Consequently settlers in the west can farm successfully on an expenditure much less than the farmers are obliged to incur in the eastern country.

As to the mixed farming question, if the people who went into these prairies had gone there with the intention of going into mixed farming, they would have required much more capital to start with than they did bring in, the results which have been achieved would not have been accomplished in anything like the same time, and the country would have been standing still these last few years instead of going ahead as rapidly as it has been.

When hon. gentlemen criticise the farmers of the west for their shortcomings, I would point out to them that according to Sir Byron Walker, the head of the Bank of Commerce, Mr. Flavelle, the head of the National Trust Company, and every head of every great financial institution in eastern Canada, the prosperity and progress of Canada depend upon what the western farmer has done and is doing and in particular on what he is going to do. It is always possible to criticise. There are individuals who even find fault with the plan

of creation, but I think that the record of what has been achieved in our western country, in the way of development and progress, in the way of laying the foundation of a great Canada, should make the western farmer as little subject to criticism as any man in the Dominion. And further, whatever may be necessary to improve the conditions in that country by means of legislation, should in all fairness be given heartily and thoroughly.

Mr. KNOWLES. Can the minister state briefly what the main amendments will be, or will he give full notice of them?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The amendments which are to be introduced into the different clauses as we proceed are not of such importance as I think to need any extended notice. Of any important amendments, and there may be two or three, I will see that the House gets abundant notice before being called on to discuss them.

Mr. ROBB. Has the minister given any consideration to the question of providing terminal elevators at Lake Superior Junction? Unless this is done the Grand Trunk Pacific, as a road for carrying grain east in the winter time, would be considerably handicapped over the roads going by Fort William.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The clauses which bear on terminal elevators come in considerably later in the Bill. When we reach them I shall be able to give my hon. friend the information he asks for.

Mr. McCRANEY. Will the minister lay on the table such forms as are at present in use under the Act?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will make a note of that.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Has the winter navigation of Lake Superior been considered as affording a possible relief to the transportation situation? There are big new ports now being built on the Georgian bay.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that this is the second reading of the Bill, on which it is hardly permissible to widen the discussion.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

On section 2—Interpretation,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I wish to add the following paragraph to the Interpretation clause:

Mill elevator includes every elevator or warehouse used or operated as part of any plant engaged in the milling of grain products in the western inspection division.

The necessity of this is for plainness. We are already licensing that kind of elevator, and there is a clause later in the Bill that has something to do with mill elevators and that renders this definition necessary.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not imagine that there is any objection to this amendment; but I would suggest that as the Bill progresses and he sees fit to hand in amendments, it would be fair and right that at the request of those of us who wish to consider them further, they should be held for further consideration.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Any that are wanted to stand we will allow to stand over.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 2, subsection 2,

2. The remainder of this Act is divided into three parts, as follows:—

Part I comprising sections 3 to 17 inclusive;

Part II comprising sections 18 to 117 inclusive;

Part III comprising sections 118 to 246 inclusive and the schedule of forms therein mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I wish to make some amendments to that. The last sections of the Bill as printed are sections which have nothing to do with the main body of the Bill in either of the parts, but both of them are general. One of them, No. 246, provides for expenses of administration, and the other, No. 247, for the repeal of old Acts which it is necessary to repeal. I wish to change the subsection now under consideration so as to provide that part III shall comprise sections 118 to 245 inclusive, together with the schedules, and part IV shall comprise sections 246 and 247. I imagine there will be no objection to that; it is simply mechanical.

Mr. KNOWLES. Then, will the schedules remain in part III, to be followed by part IV?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. The schedules are the last part of the Act and have to do with all the parts. They are no more associated with part III than with any other part.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, but they are not at all associated with part IV.

Mr. KNOWLES. Of course, the division of the Act is largely mathematical. It is to contain four parts. The schedules

naturally come in at the end, as they relate to all the parts.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It might make it more symmetrical if you transposed the two. But I do not see how that could be done either. However, the meaning is clear.

Mr. OLIVER. It will make a most peculiar looking Bill. But, of course, it is my hon. friend's (Mr. Foster) Bill, and if he likes the looks——

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If the looks are too peculiar, we will fix it up.

On section III, subsection VI. Salaries of commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The salaries are in blank. We will let the blanks in the subsection remain for the present time.

On section 8, appointments and salaries under the board.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I want to amend that by adding after the word 'minister,' 'on the recommendation of the board.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. I think this section would bear careful consideration:

Provided that the Governor in Council may authorize the board to make appointments of a temporary character, and to fix the remuneration to be paid to temporary officers and employees.

That is to say, that in the first part of the section the authority is entirely with the minister, but in the latter part it is delegated to the board. I think there would be difficulty in drawing a distinction in administration.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That only takes in temporary men, where you want to employ a man for a day or two. It would be unworkable to get a recommendation from the Governor in Council.

Mr. OLIVER. I would suggest that the remuneration for these temporary employees should be according to a scale laid down by the Governor in Council. As I read it here, the board might employ a man for a few days and pay him any price they liked. It is not difficult to lay down a scale of payment so that when the board employ a man he should be paid according to that scale.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Would it not be difficult to draw up a scale that would cover so many different employments?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think if they wanted to employ a carter for any purpose, or a man with a spade, it would be impracticable to fix a scale for that kind of employment. In the first place, we suppose that the commissioners, if they are able to carry on a large business that is vital to themselves, will be quite able to fix a reasonable remuneration for a spade man or a carter.

Mr. CURRIE. I suggest 'provided the minister may authorize the board to make appointments of a temporary character.'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) I don't think you can make it any better for practical working, presuming the commissioners will be three men of common sense.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In the latter part of the clause I understand that the commissioners may desire to employ a temporary man at once.

Mr. OLIVER. I know what the minister desires to convey, but it strikes me there is a difficulty in drawing a distinction between the provisions of the first part of the section and the second. There is liable to be friction.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If there is friction we can fix it afterwards.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does the minister propose to make any amendments in section 18?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No.

Mr. KNOWLES. Then I will call his attention at this stage to the fact that section 8 gives to the minister power to appoint all officers on the recommendation of the board. In clause (f) of the interpretation clause, an officer is defined as including chief inspector, inspector and deputy inspector, etc. In section 18 the board is given power to appoint inspectors. There appears to me to be a contradiction. We say in section 8 that every officer and employee attached to or under the authority of the board should be appointed by the minister; and in section 18 it says that the board, with the approval of the Govenor in Council, may appoint inspectors.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will make a note of that.

On subsection 3 of section 8. Salaries, &c., to be paid monthly.

Mr. ROBB. This clause may hamper the commission. During the busy season they will have their men working alongside people who are paid weekly. The minister might consider the payment of employees who are taken on from day to day, weekly.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I shall make a note of that.

On section 9, subsection 1. Office accommodation to be provided.

Mr. CARRICK. If it is the intention to have the offices of the commission estab-

lished at the head of the lakes I would like to see it incorporated in the Act.

Mr. CURRIE. Section 5 provides for the residence of the commissioners, and section 9 should repeat that the offices are to be there.

Mr. KNOWLES. It may be necessary for the board to have offices in Winnipeg or other places.

Mr. GERMAN. When it says that the commissioners shall reside either in Fort William or Port Arthur, I presume it is the intention that the head office shall be at either of these places. It seems rather a hardship to compel them to live absolutely in one of these towns.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). In section 5, provision is made that the commissioners and secretary shall reside in Fort William or Port Arthur. Then it follows, practically as a matter of course, that their offices will be in Fort William or Port Arthur. I do not at present know any reason why they should not be there. I do not see why it is necessary to have a compulsory clause in reference to the head office.

Mr. ROBB. The minister indicated that we might possibly be doing business via Vancouver, and for that business an office at Fort William would not be convenient.

Mr. CURRIE. A clause has been passed providing that the headquarters of the commissioners shall be at Fort William. Would it not make it a little clearer to include that in section 9?

On section 12. Warehouse receipts.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I move that section 12 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'receipts' in the third line.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I do not think that any fees should be charged as a rule. Section 246 deals with the same matter, but this section is a departure from the present system. I do not think there will be any hardship by leaving this as it is in the present Act. I think it better, in the interest of all parties, that fees should not be charged. Trifling fees may be charged in certain cases, that would be rather a hindrance than anything else. The Act would be more workable and satisfactory without this change.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Does the hon. member speak of the fees in this particular case, and for this particular purpose, or of fees generally?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Possibly I should not have spoken of fees generally in this case, but I make the suggestion that the same thing should be adopted throughout.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am afraid that my hon. friend and myself will have to consider ourselves at the parting of the ways because the fundamental basis of that whole arrangement is that the grain business shall pay the expense of the deputy minister. That has been understood between the western men and the government for some time.

Mr. OLIVER. That is one thing, but the question of how the trade shall carry it is another thing. It would strike me that such a charge as this is vexatious rather than remunerative.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It has not been found vexatious in the past.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think there was any such provision in the former law, but whether or not it is a pity to charge a fee like this which really amounts to very little, especially in view of the accepted principle nowadays that we should cut out these fees that are vexatious without being revenue producers.

Mr. CURRIE. I doubt very much if the federal authority has power to interfere with these civil contracts or to collect fees. The warehouse receipt is a civil contract within the provincial law and I do not think we should interfere.

Mr. OLIVER. This is not a fee for the issuing of a warehouse receipt. It is a fee for the registration of a warehouse receipt, which is required not in the interest of the buyer or seller but in order to properly administer the Act.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This is a new provision.

Mr. OLIVER. It is inserted under misapprehension of the purport of the section.

Mr. NESBITT. If it is necessary to register these receipts who is to pay the cost?

Mr. OLIVER. It is so trivial as not to warrant the imposition of a fee which must be only nominal. If after the Act has gone in force the board on their experience would recommend that a fee should be charged in this case I would be quite willing, but at this stage it is safer not to impose a fee.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). As this is left within the discretion of the board it would not seem there would be much objection to it.

Mr. OLIVER. It would be wiser to leave the law as it was, pending a recom-

mendation of the board after they have had experience. Anyway, I do not like the idea of any such body having authority to levy fees on the public.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They could not do that without an order in council.

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, well, that would be all right.

Mr. CURRIE. This provision entails a much wider order than the House realizes. For many years the elevators and the steamship companies have been at war at the head of the lakes over this question of warehouse receipts. For instance, a man is shipping 10,000 bushels of wheat to Montreal, the steamer will be sent to an elevator for say 9,000 bushels, and then for the other 1,000 bushels it has to travel some four or five miles to another elevator, at great pecuniary loss. But if we had a compulsory clearing house, the steamer could get all that grain from the one elevator. This section provides that the board may make regulations for and acquire the registration of terminal warehouse receipts. But that registration involves a very large order. It is a matter which has been under discussion between the elevator companies and the steamboat owners and shippers time and again. If a clearing house is to be provided—

Mr. ROBB. Does the hon. gentleman not know that there is a clearing house in existence where receipts are exchanged?

Mr. CURRIE. Where?

Mr. ROBB. At Fort William.

Mr. CURRIE. If there is a public clearing house at Fort William, it is only within the last three or four weeks.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. No.

Mr. CURRIE. I am personally interested and ought to know.

Mr. ROBB. The Act was amended in 1910 and provision was made for a clearing house, and a clearing house exists now and there are officers operating it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Mr. Fred Young is the manager.

Mr. CURRIE. But that is purely voluntary and private, and this provision is to make it compulsory to register warehouse receipts. You have to go to different elevators now just the same as before.

Mr. OLIVER. It has been said that as this section reads, the fees are subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. I do not read it that way. I read it to mean that the board may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, make regulations for and require the registration of permanent warehouse receipts, and the board may fix the fees. If the Governor in Council takes the responsibility of imposing fees, I suppose I have nothing to say.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is a question of interpretation, but it seems to me pretty clear. The board may—may what? May make regulations for and require the registration of permanent warehouse receipts, and fix the fees therefor, and determine by whom they shall be payable. Of its own motion? No, with the approval of the Governor in Council. It seems to me that the whole is qualified by these words 'with the approval of the Governor in Council.' That, at any rate, is the intention.

Mr. AIKINS. Any doubt can be easily removed by adding the word 'fixing' and inserting the word 'for,' which will make it read 'for fixing the fees therefor and for determining' by whom they shall be paid.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have no objection.

Amendment negatived.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 79,) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill (No. 81,) to incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina)).

Bill (No. 83,) respecting the Saskatchewan Power Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 84,) respecting certain Patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—Mr. Ames.

THE GRAIN ACT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 32,) respecting Grain.—Mr. Foster (North Toronto).

On section 12—warehouse receipts.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We had some discussion on the wording of this section before the House rose, and I have since been looking at it. I cannot see any reason why this section should not stand exactly as it is. I think the idea of the section is expressed as clearly and definitely as it can be expressed.

Mr. OLIVER. The minister is of course responsible for the wording of the Bill, and if he is satisfied that this wording expres-

ses the ideas he desires to express, we do not wish to delay the Bill by discussing that part of it. I would, however, give notice to my hon. friend that on this question of fees we would reserve the right to move against the principle on the third reading.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Quite so.

On section 15—free transportation of board and staff.

Mr. NEELY. The corresponding clause in the Bill introduced last year includes with the transportation of the members of the Board and the secretary, their baggage and equipment. I think it would be well to include these in this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I thought about that, but it seemed to me that no railway or steamboat company would cavil at their taking their baggage with them. It seemed too trivial a provision to put into a Bill.

Mr. NEELY. The statute providing transportation for the members of the House of Commons and the Senate, mentions baggage specifically.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Well, their baggage is very considerable.

On section 16—administration of oath.

Mr. AIKINS. I notice that in the interpretation clause there is no interpretation of the word 'commissioner.' A commissioner for taking affidavits is usually appointed by one of the courts. There may be a little ambiguity here, and I would suggest that the word be defined in the Interpretation clause.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I would call the Minister's attention to the fact that this section conflicts with sections 29 and 41. This section allows the oath to be administered by a commissioner or by the secretary, while sections 29 and 41 make it obligatory that the oath shall be taken before a commissioner or notary public. I also noted the point raised by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins). There may possibly be some confusion as to what commissioner means.

Mr. AIKINS. I would suggest that the words 'appointed hereunder' be inserted after the word 'commissioner.'

Section, amended as suggested, agreed to.

On section 20, regulations.

Mr. NEELY. Here the committee will notice that the board's powers are restricted by the clause 'with the consent of the Governor in Council.' Now that clause had already appeared in sections 12 and 13, and here it appears for the third time. This section does not even permit the latitude of the corresponding section in the Bill that was introduced last year, for it commenced 'The board may make rules and regulations, either with or without the approval of the Governor in Council, as hereinafter provided.' I think the minister must be aware of the fact that the men who are most interested in the passing of this Bill are exceedingly anxious about the constitution and the powers to be given to this board of commissioners. Hon. gentlemen who were here in the last parliament will remember that we had not an opportunity to discuss in committee the different clauses of the Bill that was then introduced. This is the first opportunity we have had for discussing the principle of this Bill, or the one that preceded it last year. It may have come to the notice of the minister and of other members of the committee that the Manitoba Grain Growers, in session, some time last week, passed a very strong resolution regarding the control, not only of the interior elevators but also of the terminals. They passed a resolution first of all condemning the commission system in Manitoba, and calling upon the government of Manitoba to place that commission on an absolutely independent, non-partisan basis. They also passed a resolution asking that when the board of commissioners which was to control the situation of the terminals was constituted by Act of this parliament, the same constitution and the same powers should be given to that board as they asked for the board in the province of Manitoba. Now it appears to me, from the frequency with which these words occur in these various sections, that we are restricting the powers of this board unnecessarily, and we are not meeting the demands of the farmers who asked for a commission that shall have the same control over the terminal situation and the grain situation generally as, for instance, the Board of Railway Commissioners have in dealing with questions of transportation. I do not see why the Governor in Council should interest themselves in the matter of the rules and regulations that shall be laid down by the board of commissioners for the operation of the terminal elevators. This board we trust and expect will be selected from men who have an intimate knowledge of the grain situation; and it appears to me that if the board is to be of any value, it should, by intimate knowledge of the situation, be better fitted to make proper and necessary rules and regulations than the Governor in Council I am strongly of the opinion that by the repetition of this clause, by its repeated insertion, by the restriction we are thus placing on the board of commissioners, we are not meeting the desires and wishes of the men at whose demands the

Bill is introduced, and whom we trust it will satisfy.

For there is no doubt, I am sure, in the mind of any one, that this Bill is being introduced at the urgent request of the grain growers of the west. They are the men who have been complaining about the conditions at the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, and they are the ones at whose instigation this movement for better legislation has been brought about. And it appears to me that in the construction of this commission there should be no question of interference in the matter of their administration of the situation at the terminals. I think that is one of the most vital and important points of this measure. If we have a board of commissioners who have to write a letter to Ottawa every time they wish to change a rule, if they have to communicate with the minister, who, in turn, will communicate with his colleagues and discuss the matter in council, it appears to me we are going to have a situation much worse than the present situation. If you are going to tie the hands of the board, if you are going to deny them liberty and compel them to refer everything to the Governor in Council, then I say we are better without this Bill and without the appointment of the board. For, as a result of this repeated necessary reference to the Governor in Council the board will be seriously hampered in their work and the situation at the terminals in any time of stress will be such as will not commend itself to the men for whom this Bill is being passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) say that the Grain Growers' Association have objected to this feature of the Bill?

Mr. NEELY. The members of the Grain Growers' Association, in convention in Manitoba last Thursday—I think it was Thursday—laid down the principle that the board of commissioners to be constituted under the Bill ought to be an absolutely independent body.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It is somewhat difficult to understand what my hon. friend means by 'an absolutely independent body.' If the terms——

Mr. NEELY. I will explain that, if my hon. friend will allow me. I mean independent of direction or influence from the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman mean independent of the people?

Mr. NEELY. They would always be responsible, I should judge, to this parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand, then, the hon. gentleman means that the board of commissioners, while they should not be responsible to the government, should be responsible to this parliament?

Mr. NEELY That is a fair meaning.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I think the hon. gentleman is about as indefinite in his idea of how the responsibility should be fixed as the association to which he refers. He complains at this stage of section 20 of the present Bill, in that it provides that the rules and regulations made by the board shall be with the consent of the Governor in Council—that is, with the consent of this government. Now, it is only elementary to say that, unless the rules and regulations have the approval of the Governor in Council, the Governor in Council can in no sense be responsible for these rules nor for the administration of the Act under these rules. So, if we make the approval of the Governor in Council unnecessary, we remove the board from responsibility to the Governor in Council. If the hon. gentleman wishes to take that position, well and good; we know where he is. But on the 19th of May, 1911, we had Bill (Q) of the Senate referred to this House, which Bill contained clause 20, which was exactly the same in this regard as clause 20 of the present Bill. This is not a detail, it is a concrete principle, and we are either going to approve or disapprove of that principle. The hon. gentleman says that unless we take his view of the principle, to pass the Bill would land us in a worse position than before. But when this same principle was introduced by the government that he supported on the 19th of May last, he approved the Bill and the principle and urged parliament not to delay a minute not even to consider it further but to swallow, the Bill and the principle. But now that he finds it in legislation that we have time to consider, he tells us it would be better to refuse the Bill altogether because it will put the western farmer in a worse position than he was in before. I say frankly I would not approve of anything that would place the commission in a position where they would be independent of the government. Nor would I approve of such a thing in provincial legislation; the principle is too sacred and too vital. The commission must be responsible to the government and the government must be responsible for this work of administration. The hon. gentleman has said that, while this is the second time this Bill has been before us, we never had time before to consider it in detail. But, though we had no time to consider it, the hon. gentleman was one of the foremost of those who asked that we pass it without any consideration. He said that while, perhaps, there were some details of the Bill that he

could not agree with, in principle it was right. Now, this is an essential feature and principle of the Bill. So, I fear the hon. gentleman's opinion is on a par with that of many of those he quoted to-night as his authority, and their principal desire is to embarrass the government that is now endeavouring to effect reform.

Mr. NEELY. I think my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) is casting a very serious reflection upon many of the men who, probably in their lack of knowledge, voted to send him here. He undertakes to question the knowledge of the man in the west, who, for years has given consideration to this question. Probably my hon. friend has in his own constituency many men, tillers of the soil, who know a great deal more about the grain situation than he does. He tells us that this commission must be responsible to the government. Undoubtedly so. We all quite understand that feature of the case. The board of commissioners must act within the law; the statute that we pass is the thing that shall govern them. But my hon. friend has not answered my argument on the question of the rules and regulations of the board requiring the consent of the Governor in Council. The hon. gentleman did not look into the case as well as he might have done when he rose to correct me. He says that the clause in Bill (Q) is identical with the clause in the present Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I said it was the same in this respect.

Mr. NEELY. Section 21 of Bill 'Q' reads:

> The board may make rules and regulations, either with or without the approval of the Governor in Council, as hereinafter provided.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. NEELY. That is enough. If there is any ambiguity in the whole section I still maintain the position that last year this Bill was held up before a Committee of the Senate for many months; it was not brought down to this House until the dying days of the session. Hon. gentlemen opposite who were then sitting on this side of the House are very well aware of the fact that owing to the many other subjects which they introduced in this House for discussion, we found ourselves, in the dying days of the session, without having reached this very important measure and for that reason, because we had not the opportunity to discuss it in detail, there were numbers of us who were anxious to see the Bill passed even with some defects, because it went some distance at least towards satisfying the demands of those at whose instigation the Bill was introduced. I say that, whatever may have been the meaning of section 20 of Bill 'Q,' at least the first sentence would indicate that the board were to be given considerable latitude in making rules and regulations under Bill 'Q.' But under the present Bill they have no discretion; they must simply refer every rule and regulation for the government of the situation at the terminals and elsewhere to the Governor in Council. That is an intolerable situation which will not be any remedy of the present conditions, but will rather place us in the position where we will have a board of commissioners who have no authority to make any simple rule or regulation without referring to the Governor in Council, and who, because of that stumbling block in the way, may, in many cases, be seriously embarrassed in a rush season in carrying out their undertakings simply because they have to refer everything to the government at Ottawa.

Mr. OLIVER. In the discussion of this Bill we must keep before us the important question of the measure of independence of the board from the government. There is no doubt that the people who are looking for the passage of this legislation have in their minds an ideal condition whereby a board absolutely independent of political influence shall have full authority to deal with the grain question. I shall not say that that ideal can be carried out in the provisions of the Bill and have the Bill work satisfactorily, but it is an ideal which is held very strongly. Therefore, it is desirable in discussing the provisions of this Bill in detail that we should conform to that ideal so far as practicable while preserving the efficiency of the Bill. So, while I agree to this section passing, it would again be with the same reservation as I made in reference to a previous section that we would retain the right of consideration of this principle in the Bill with a view to securing as close conformity to the ideal held by the farmers of an absolutely independent board as possible, and failing in the other means, of course we might have an opportunity of expressing our views on the third reading.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend approaches the subject a little differently from the previous speaker, likely from the standpoint of a little more experience in the matter of governmental work. My hon. friend who spoke first simply catches at that ideal which has just been alluded to and presses it to a conclusion which, to my mind, might end in anarchy. It is possible to give too much power and make a commission too independent. After all there must be somebody whom you can bring to account and the body or the entity to be brought to account in the end is the government.

The only control that a parliament has over this matter is in the control they have over the government.

It is the intention of this Bill and of the government to give that commission even a greater degree of independence and freedom than was proposed by Bill 'Q'. Several things have taken place to-day which show the intention of the present government in this respect. Bill 'Q.' left all appointments to the minister absolutely without recommendation or other restriction. As amended by myself, the ultimate appointing power is placed in the hands of the minister or the Governor in Council but that was hedged and restricted by the fact that the recommendation would come from the board itself. That to my mind is about as far as you can go and keep the proper governmental control and at the same time keep the proper position between the public outside and the entity to be called in question if things do not go right. The government appoints the board in the first place and are responsible for the quality of the board. If the board turn out to be an all-wise board, without any imperfections or any weaknesses, the best thing to do would be to allow them to go ahead and be absolutely independent. But three men on a board are just as apt to develop weaknesses as 15 men at a Council Board or 224 men who review the Acts of the men at the Council Board. It seems to me that the only proper thing to do, whilst giving every range of independence that is possible to that commission, and making them wholly responsible for their work, is to keep the connection between that board and the government, and it is with that in view that this legislation has been undertaken and that I have endeavoured to direct it so far in its passage through the House.

Mr. KNOWLES. I agree with the principle advocated by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely). I did not detect in his remarks anything of that partisan spirit which the hon. member for Portage la Prairie saw. I do not understand where that was visible. It is true that the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), in fact all of us who were supporters of the then government, were ready to support Bill 'Q' as it was brought from the Senate. We believed that Bill 'Q.' would be better than the then existing circumstances, although not ideal. The time was limited, it was desirable to have it enacted into law in order that it might be before the people and might bring such benefit or profit as it could for the harvest and market season of 1911, and as the then Minister of the Interior said on May 19, when he introduced the measure, he did not regard it as perfect but he desired the opportunity of testing it during the season just passed to see in what respects it could be improved upon.

My hon. friend (Mr. Neely) is right in the principle he advocates. We have two great interests and there has been the bitterest feeling between them. There has been the greatest suspicion on the part of the grain growers—perhaps not always well founded—and this Bill is for the purpose of removing that as far as it is possible to do so. I submit to the minister that he will succeed in re-establishing confidence in the mind of the grain growers if he makes his board as independent of the government, and as free in its action as it is possible to make it. In the working out of clause 20, if the board has to communicate with the minister, and the minister in turn has to bring the matter before council and have an order in council passed there will be a most vexatious delay before the most trivial matter can be amended. Orders in council take time; it is not possible to get even a minister's approval of a suggested regulation right off the bat. There is a strong analogy between the Grain Board and the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. The Railway Board stands between the customers of the railways on the one hand and these great corporations on the other, their duty being to protect each against the other. I turn to the Railway Act and I find the Railway Board has power to make regulations without any reference to the Governor in Council whatever, and if the Railway Board which is only a block away from the Minister's ear do not have to get their orders approved, what justification is there for asking that a board sitting in Fort William or Port Arthur, must, perhaps in the rush season, send down to Ottawa to have their regulations endorsed by the Governor in Council. Can we not by analogy between the Grain Board and the Railway Board leave the Grain Commissioners to use their discretion and good judgment, as we leave the Railway Commissioners to do so. If you wish to guard yourself by providing an appeal to the Governor in Council as is done under the Railway Act, very well, but at all events do not impede business by making it a hard and fast provision of the law that every little regulation will have to be approved by the cumbersome system of an order in council passed in Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It does not work out quite as my hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) pictures it: that there is a rush hour and a rush day, and that some regulation has to be put in effect, and delay is caused by an appeal to the minister, and delay in obtaining an order in council. The Grain Board will draw up what rules and regulations it, in its judgment, deems best,

and in every case, or almost every case these regulations presented by three capable men would be passed by the Governor in Council. But you must always consider the possibility of something creeping in which, in the judgment of the government, and of the country may be, would not be in the public interest. This provision will cause the board to feel that their rules and regulations will have to be carefully considered, because they are to be reviewed, and in the second place, if a vicious rule should creep in through inadvertence or otherwise, it is possible to have that reviewed by the government and for the aggrieved parties to have their recourse. I would not like to place the Grain Board on exactly the same plane as the Board of Railway Commissioners, because, for power and scope of jurisdiction, the latter board does not find its equal in the world.

Mr. OLIVER. When my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), is making that comparison I would remind him that the Act says this board is to 'control' the grain trade of Canada, and on the authority of Sir Byron Walker, the grain trade of Canada amounts to two hundred millions this year, which is a financial responsibility far exceeding that which rests upon the Railway Commissioners. Then, the judgments of the Railway Commission affect a corporation, and one or more individuals doing business over certain lines of railway, but the Grain Board has to do with a commodity that makes the business of Canada in a larger degree than any other one thing.

The commission that is charged with the responsibility of controlling that trade has a responsibility which, I think, is not equalled by any authority within the limits of the Dominion short of the government itself.

I would like to say a word with regard to Bill (Q) which has been alluded to as imperfect and not tending towards the independence of the board to a greater degree than the present Bill. But in this particular section there are words which are contrary to that idea and exactly in line with the stand taken by my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) and my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) as to the necessity of the present regulations or as to the necessity of providing regulations for the very excellent kind of control by the board without reference to the Governor in Council. If my hon. friend will refer to section 30 of the Bill (Q) he will see that while the wording is I admit not ideal, the intention was—and may I be permitted to speak on that point—to exactly meet a condition which has been suggested by my hon. friend, namely, that while the regulations of the board should generally speaking be approved by the Governor in Council, the board still should have the power upon their own initiative, in order to meet a pressing case, to pass valid regulations without that reference. The clause probably was not perfectly drafted but it was intended to meet such a condition and to that extent it differs materially from a section of the present Bill. Furthermore it carries out the idea of an independent board to a greater degree than does section 20 and goes further towards meeting the actual conditions which must necessarily from time to time arise in the grain trade when quick action by the board is necessary in order to meet such conditions and save thousands of dollars to the people interested. But aside from the Bill altogether I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he should consider the desirability of empowering the board, as it was intended to empower it in section 20 of Bill (Q) so that it would have authority to take action in conditions of stress without reference to Ottawa.

Mr. AIKINS. My hon. friend from Moosejaw has cited as a parallel case the Board of Railway Commissioners, who may make rules and regulations. But those rules and regulations are subject to revision by the Governor in Council. The difference between the two is that before the rules and regulations can come into force in the one case they must be approved by the Governor in Council whereas in the other case they are subject to supervision and review by that body.

Mr. KNOWLES. No difference.

Mr. AIKINS. Not in some respects because both are subject to the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council takes the responsibility for the action of the Railway Commission to that extent. But there is another point to be borne in mind. The Board of Railway Commissioners is largely a judicial body; and if the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) will consider that point, he will find that in all the legislation dealing with judicial bodies they are empowered to make rules and regulations, so far as they are not judicial which they are not always, but sometimes are subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. The great principle which underlies democratic legislation is that the executive, as well as the legislative bodies are subject to the will of the people. Therefore, I submit that in the administration of the Grain Act, which is so intimately related to the business of a large section of the community, the people should have some control over the board through the Governor in Council, and the board should not be free to do what it likes between sessions of parliament. It was suggested that the board should be independent of the Governor in Council. That suggestion is

hardly feasible in practical politics. When the government of the day appoints commissioners, in some way perhaps occult—we may not exactly know how—the government of the day has control over the appointees, and it is far better that the government should be held responsible for all the actions of these appointees to the people by providing that their control must meet with the approval of the Governor in Council. Were these commissioners to be appointed from the party in opposition we might have an independent board to some extent; but until we shall have arrived at the millennium when those whom we appoint to office shall act without any consideration to the influences that may be exercised on them, we ought to follow the principle established by Democratic government and provide that these bodies which administer such important affairs must be held responsible to the government which has to account to the people.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think that the remarks of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) only emphasize the point I have made. The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that in the clause as it now stands, the Board of Commissioners will act very carefully because they know that everything they propose has to pass in review before the Governor in Council. But that same caution would be imposed, if we had a clause such as is found in the Railway Act, by which the regulations the Railway Commissioners may impose are subject to be disapproved by the Governor in Council. If this Act incorporated a similar provision, there would still be the fear on the part of these commissioners of their being checked by the Governor in Council, but they would be in a better position to deal more rapidly with urgent circumstances that might arise. If the hon. minister would draft his clause so as to keep that power of revision in the hands of the Governor in Council, he would still keep before the commissioners the fear of being overruled and in that way there would be a safeguard. My hon. friend from Brandon said that this board is altogether different from that of the Railway Commissioners. I think not. I trust that you will find just as careful a selection of the men on this new board by the new government as was made by the old government in the case of the railway commissioners. I can see no reason why the business entrusted to these grain commissioners should not be as carefully and efficiently administered as is the transportation business which is handled by the Railway Commission.

The Board of Railway Commissioners is not a judicial body in any large sense. As far as I remember only two of its members are legal men, one an ex-judge and the other a barrister. In the large majority of the cases their duties are not judicial, but executive. This will be a judicial body just as much as the Railway Commission is, with respect to their using their best judgment in the interests of the public; and if they be men carefully selected, able, impartial and above suspicion, which I do not question, I can see no reason why the interests intrusted to them under this Act may not be left to them, with just as large a discretion and as free a hand as the Board of Railway Commissioners have.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is a distinct line of cleaveage between responsibility and irresponsibility, and the method of responsibility will be fixed as fully by the method outlined by the hon. member for Moosejaw as by that proposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I challenge the hon. member for Edmonton or any other of the hon. gentlemen opposite to suggest a regulation that could possibly be made without the approval of the Governor in Council under Bill Q, which was introduced by the hon. member for Edmonton last year, that cannot be made under this Bill. The Board under clause 101 of Bill Q could make certain regulations for its own procedure, but under clause 102 of this Bill it can make the same regulations. There is no difference of principle between them, and I protest against any attempt on the part of the hon. member for Humboldt to suggest that he or his party stands in the matter of responsibility for anything different from what is embodied in this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I take it that a great deal is to be learned by the study of Bill Q, as it came to us last year. There was a lot of trouble taken in the consideration of that Bill, and the different interests seem to have been shaken together over and over again, and while everything was fresh in their minds the Bill came out. Those who framed this Bill thought it was proper and right to follow the lines of section 156 of that Bill with regard to regulations. I do not want to impart any party considerations to this Bill at all, but I do think it is fair to learn from the reasoned effort that was put into the consideration of Bill Q, and therefore to take those provisions that were embodied in it as the result of the examination then made.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 156 applies only to the administration of country elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is a most important part.

Mr. OLIVER. It certainly is a most important part of the Bill, and there is no part of that section which permits the action of the Board outside of the control of the Governor in Council. But as to section 20, the hon. member for Portage la Prairie declares that there is no provision in that section in Bill Q which in any way relieves the Board from the necessity of approval by the Governor in Council. I am going to accept his statement, but I will ask him to accept mine, that it was the belief of the late government that there were such words contained in that section, and it was the intent of the late government that those words should have an effect to the extent that I have stated, that is to say, that under circumstances of stress and urgency the Board should have authority to act without reference to the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). So it is under this Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not read section 20 in that way.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I quite accept the statement of the hon. member for Edmonton as to what was or what is his own belief. I would not like to be understood as accepting it as to what was the belief of the late government, much less what was the intent of the late government.

Mr. OLIVER. I must thank my hon. friend for his courtesy, I am sure.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I do not propose to go into the discussion as between the two Bills, but I have some interest in the progress of the idea of government by commission. Both in the United States and here the object ought to be to give the fullest power to the commission while keeping some string on it. If we gave the commission power to deal with this matter and had a clause to the effect that some acts of theirs should be subject to review, I believe the commission would be stronger and better. As we are going into government by commission, and as ministers complain of the extent of detail in their departments, we ought to put upon the commissioners we create and upon the officials as much responsibility as possible, subject to review of some kind. In the United States the power is often conferred altogether upon the president of the United States to name the commission, and while the commission makes all the regulations the President can bring them under review.

If there was a clause in this Bill providing that at any time the minister of the government could review and recall any act of the commission, I think it would relieve the department of a great deal of unnecessary trouble, and would give the commissioners greater confidence in themselves, and, while putting the responsibility on them would still hold them responsible to the government for everything they did. If the Act could be made more efficient in that way, I would suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that he have it drafted on these lines. Why should the Governor in Council be half the time occupied in putting a rubber stamp on the acts of a commission appointed to do something? Far better, far quicker administration would be got, and twice as much satisfaction would be given by taking the line suggested. I would not like to see a great commission of this kind checked, and all they did or proposed to do, sent to Ottawa for approval. Put the responsibility on these men. If they do not do their work satisfactorily, recall their decrees, and, if necessary, appoint better men. In this way we should be doing much as we have done in the case of the railway commission. We have increased the responsibilities of the railway commission from year to year, and have never had reason to regret it. The tendency is to increase their powers, while holding them to responsibility for the exercise of those powers.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the minister (Mr. Foster) take into consideration the redrafting of that section to cover the point of the possibility of action by the board independent of the Governor in Council in case of urgency?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I should be glad to take into account whatever work of the commission is necessary in that part of their duties arising from day to day, and which is, to a certain extent, the accident of the occasion. They must have latitude in that respect, and in that respect, I do not wish to hamper them. But in making the rules and regulations for the bonding, the licensing and the control of terminal and other elevators, they are dealing with something which is not the accident of the occasion, but is the very plan and system for the governance of these elevators. While one can ingeniously conjure up something that might occur requiring action which would not be allowable under these regulations, I do not think that that difficulty would arise in practice. We are conjuring up difficulties that do not exist, it seems to me.

Mr. OLIVER. The difficulties do exist and are liable to exist, and will require action. In dealing with the question generally, it has been found necessary, as will be seen in different places in the Bill, to allow for extraordinary acts of administration by the Warehouse Commission. And the same principle applies to this. I would like to see that provision placed right in

the Act, so that the board would be able to take urgent action on urgent occasions.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I should be very glad to consider that—

Mr. OLIVER. That is, to hold the section for consideration with that in view?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We could pass the section and I would keep the matter under consideration; and hon. gentlemen will have plenty of chance to—

Mr. OLIVER. And the Minister wishes the section to pass as it is?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, I would like to have the section passed.

Section agreed to.

On section 28,—present officers.

Mr. THOMSON. (Qu'Appelle). Does not the minister think these words: 'Wheat and other' are redundant? Grain includes wheat. It would include flax, and flax is usually treated in the Customs Act as a seed.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto). The Interpretation Act seems to cover the whole thing. Drop out 'wheat and other'.

On section 29, —oath of Inspector.

Mr. THOMSON. (Qu'Appelle). An officer is defined by the Act to mean and include inspector. If the Bill is left in that way, in one place it says that the officer may take oath before a certain person; in another place it says he should take oath before certain other officers, one section contradicts the other section.

Mr. AIKINS. Section 29 makes it obligatory that the inspector should take an oath; the other is simply an enabling clause.

Mr. THOMSON. (Qu'Appelle). If the minister wishes to have a notary public and a commissioner to be allowed to take oaths, and also to allow the secretary and the commissioner under Act to take oaths, why not use the term 'may' in each case? It leaves a question as to what is meant by commissioner.

Mr. CURRIE. In the province of Ontario we have commissioners for taking affidavits and we have notaries public, justices of the peace and commissioners for that purpose.

Mr. AIKINS. I would suggest that we refer back to section 16, and that there should be added 'where not authorized to be taken by another person', and adding after the word 'commissioner' in section 29, 'for taking affidavits in the provincial courts'.

Mr. KNOWLES. A man will have to go to Fort William and interview there a member of the board or a secretary to take his oath. Why not permit any oath required to be taken before any commissioner for the administering of oaths?

Mr. CURRIE. Might I suggest that section 16 be amended to read:

> Any oath the taking of which is hereinafter authorized or prescribed by this Act, may be administered by one of the commissioners, by the secretary of the commission, by a notary public, a justice of the peace or any officer authorized by statute to administer oaths.

Then you do away with the greater part of section 29, which would read:

> Every chief inspector or deputy inspector shall, before acting as such, take and subscribe to an oath of office in the form or to the effect following.

And leave out all reference to the commissioners because you have already provided that.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think that would be all right if it meets with the approval of the minister.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The oath is the thing that counts. We might allow that section to stand.

Section 29 allowed to stand.

On section 30—inspectors to give security.

Mr. McCRANEY. Does this mean that a bond must be given by some security company?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That would seem to be it.

Mr. McCRANEY. Who would bear the expense of that bond?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not know. I suppose it would come under the working of the whole Act.

Mr. KNOWLES. If the law calls for the giving of a bond, the man would have to pay it.

Mr. McCRANEY. Unless there is some reference to the matter, the man would probably have to pay for his own bond.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Unless it is arranged.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I certainly think he would have to pay for the bond under the ordinary reading of the Act. I am not sure but what he ought to pay for it.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Anyway this requires that he shall give the security.

Mr. KNOWLES. No doubt the government will get such competent men that the bond will not amount to very much.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Very probably.

On section 33—establishment of standards.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I would move to amend this section by striking out the words 'establish standards for' in the third line and substituting 'select samples of.' The Act provides for the establishing of standards in sections 105 and 107 and section 48 provides that the Grain Standards Board shall establish standards for the commercial grades. Subsection 2 of section 48 uses the express terms 'establish standards.' These sections are contradictory, and my amendment would cover what I think is the intention.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that there is any doubt that this section was intended to provide for the samples that will conform to the standards. Apparently the wording in Bill 'Q' was not clear, and it has been transferred into the present Bill in a form even less clear.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does it not mean that they shall meet to establish certain standards for the different grades?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). That is provided for by sections 105 and 107, for the ordinary grades and in section 48 we make provision for the establishment of commercial grades by the Grain Standards Board.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will let that stand.

Mr. NEELY. I would point out an apparent contradiction between this section and section 89. This section provides that the inspectors for the division shall establish standards not later than the 7th day of October. Why should there be any difference in the date? Our grain does not mature any faster in the west than it does in the east, and why should the sample of standard be selected a week earlier in the west?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I suppose there must be some good reason given for it.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). It must be a mistake.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). With the consent of the committee we will now adjourn consideration of the Bill, as some deputations have seen me to-day, and are to see me again in respect to it. I would like to make this intimation for the consideration of the House. At present in the west there are more or less large quantities of grain which, because of late threshing, or because it is not threshed yet, is damp and mixed with snow and ice, and that sort of grain is estimated at some millions of bushels. I am informed it must be removed to where it can be treated before the warm weather. Under the present law there is an elaborate and rigid system of furnishing the cars on the order principle, but there is no provision for doing the same in this case as is allowed in the case of grain which becomes heated in the elevator where relief can be given at once as the warehouse commissioner has authority to use his discretion to send cars sufficient to relieve the difficulty. I have strong representations asking that the same discretion be given to the warehouse commissioner under the existing special circumstances with regard to the grain I have mentioned. The representatives of the Grain Growers Association, who are here, were unanimously of the opinion that such discretionary power should be given as soon as possible, and if, on consideration, it seems to be the best thing to do, I shall ask the House to amend the Act so as to give that discretion at once to the warehouse commissioner. It seems to be a humanitarian way of dealing with the situation, and I don't see there can be any objection to it.

Mr. OLIVER. When will the amendment be brought down?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will consider the matter, and if I find it necessary I shall probably submit it next Thursday.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

House in committee of supply.

Battleford public building, $10,000.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. minister give us information as to the progress of that building?

Mr. MONK. This is to cover the heating apparatus. The building is completed.

Battleford North public building, $10,000.

Mr. MONK. This is a revote to make provisions for the purchase of a site for a public building for post office and customs purposes. We intend going on with this building without delay as there is a very active demand for it.

Calgary—customs examining warehouse, $200,000.

Mr. MONK. This is a very large item but the values of property have gone up very fast in the west. There seems to be great demand for increased accommodation for these offices, and sites are very expensive in Calgary and all the western cities. This vote of $200,000 is towards the purchase of a site and

the erection of a customs examining warehouse.

Mr. OLIVER. The present building in Calgary is occupied partly by the post office and partly for customs purposes. Is it the intention to use that building for customs purposes entirely and to erect a post office building somewhere else?

Mr. MONK. That is the intention.

Mr. OLIVER. Is there anything definite as to the location of the new post office?

Mr. MONK. No, nothing definite.

Mr. OLIVER. The item as it stands in the estimates is rather misleading if the information given to me is correct. If a new site is to be bought for the post office and a new building erected, it will surely cost a good deal more than $75,000, while if the old building is to be changed into a customs building, $200,000 will not be required for that. It looks to me as if the amounts have become displaced.

Mr. MONK. I do not think so. It is intended to purchase a site for the examining warehouse.

Mr. OLIVER. As far as I can judge, it will cost $100,000 to get the site for a post office. If the vote of $75,000 is intended to meet the requirements of the post office, it will be absolutely inadequate.

Mr. MONK. There is nothing decided yet as regards the site.

Mr. OLIVER. As far as I can judge, it would cost $100,000 to get the site, and you would be left with an inadequate sum for the erection of the post office.

Mr. MONK. This, I think, merely provides for the purchase of the site of the examining warehouse and to start the building.

Mr. OLIVER. In the former estimates there was an item for the erection of an immigration building in Calgary which is apparently left out of these estimates. The immigration building at present used in Calgary is entirely inadequate and is not creditable to the Dominion government. There is a very urgent need for a new building, and I would strongly urge the minister to make even a larger appropriation than was in the former estimates for that purpose.

Mr. MONK. I will make a note of my hon. friend's statement.

Calgary—new post office, $75,000.

Mr. MONK. This is a revote, nothing having been spent of the vote of last year.

Mr. KNOWLES. If $200,000 is required to purchase a site for an examining warehouse and to start the building, certainly more than $75,000 is required for a post office site, which must necessarily be in a more central position. It seems to me the respective amounts are out of proportion.

Mr. MONK. It may be there is some mistake; if so, we will try to correct it. I fancy that the reason is that the old site of the post office may be used for the erection of a new one.

Mr. KNOWLES. There is a building on the site now—a four story building, I think; certainly not less than three stories.

Mr. MONK. It is absolutely inadequate for the service.

Mr. KNOWLES. Is it intended to tear it down and use the site again?

Mr. MONK. Either tear it down or remodel it completely.

Mr. OLIVER. The only thing I desire is that the minister deal with the matter promptly and liberally because the necessities of the case are very urgent.

Edmonton—new drill hall, $50,000.

Mr. OLIVER. In what position does this matter stand? I understand the city has made the offer of a site, and I am rather anxious to know that this money, voted and re-voted, is to be expended.

Mr. MONK. It is intended to expend this sum without delay. The city of Edmonton as my hon. friend knows, purchased the site on the Hudson's Bay Company's reserve. We have a considerable number of regiments in Edmonton. I can only say that it is intended to use this money. The city having purchased the site, it would be, no doubt, a part of our contract to proceed with the erection of the building without delay.

Mr. KNOWLES. I desire to bring before the minister the question of the Moosejaw armoury and drill hall. For three or four years past an item has been in the estimates for the commencement of an armoury in that city. The reason that the work was not proceeded with is that the city was to donate the site and there were conveyancing difficulties in the way of securing the place. Last year, the site was secured and the way was opened for the work of construction. Much to my surprise, in these estimates, the first since it was possible to make the vote efficacious, I find that the item is dropped. As I have said, it appeared for three or four years, beginning at $15,000 and going up to $30,000 as the needs of the city grew greater. I have here the Moosejaw 'Morning News' of January 23, 1912. This is a paper which supports the present government. A deputation was sent from the Board of Trade of Moosejaw to interview the government. I do not know that they interview-

ed the Minister of Public Works, but they certainly saw the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes). The following is from the account of the interview with the chief spokesman of the delegation of four who came to Ottawa:—

Mr. W. B. Willoughby, who went to Ottawa as a member of the Board of Trade deputation, returned to the city yesterday afternoon. Interviewed by the 'News,' he declined to make a general statement of the result of his visit, as it is his intention to report to the Board of Trade.

He intimated, however, that as a result of the deputation's interview with the Minister of Militia, Moosejaw was promised a $75,000 armoury and drill shed.

Is it the intention, therefore, to provide in the supplementary estimates for such an armoury and drill shed as is alleged in this paper to have been promised?

Mr. MONK. I did not have the advantage of meeting that deputation. Of course, if the site has been furnished to us after negotiation by the civic authorities, I should imagine the government's duty would be to erect the armoury as soon as possible. There will be supplementary estimates; and I am anxious to satisfy, as far as possible, the claims of the country. But I am not the sole arbiter of either the main or the supplementary estimates. I tell the hon. gentleman only what he, no doubt, already knows when I say that there are very great demands this year for the equipment of harbours and other matters in connection with transportation; and although it is necessary to put our militia on a proper footing and provide armouries as far as possible, it might be argued that the necessities to which I have referred are more pressing. I will make a note of what the hon. gentleman says. I am not in a position to say what the supplementary estimates will contain.

Mr. KNOWLES. Could not the minister give some reason why the item is dropped after having been recognized by the government and the House for so many years?

Mr. MONK. It is done under the pressure of the urgent needs of which I have spoken. The opening of the Panama canal, it is supposed, will create a demand for much additional shipping on the Pacific, and we have been urged very strongly to improve our western ports which are now inadequate. On the great lakes the demand is the same, and so it is for the ports on the Atlantic. That is the only reason I can think of.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will the hon. minister consult with the Minister of Militia and Defence with regard to this alleged promise, and inform me, on some later occasion, whether such a promise was made, and if it will be duly implemented?

Mr. KNOWLES.

Mr. PARDEE. In the estimates for 1911-12, there was an item of $17,500 for the Sarnia armoury. That is omitted from the estimates before the House. The minister (Mr. Monk) says that a good many of these items for armouries have been left out because of the needs for expenditures on the aids to navigation. I may point out that the appropriation for Sarnia harbour has also been cut out of these estimates. I should be glad, at the proper time, to hear an explanation of this.

Mr. MONK. As to the armoury and the harbour improvement, that is under consideration, and I hope provision will be made in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. McCRANEY. In connection with the armoury at Moosejaw, I would ask the government what its policy is with reference to acquiring free sites for armoury and drill hall purposes.

I understand from the discussion that has taken place that the city of Moosejaw is making a free grant to the government for such a purpose. I would like to know whether it is the policy of the government to erect drill halls in all places which give free grants to the government, and if that is the policy, is it also the policy of the government to decline to erect drill halls in other places until free grants are made to the government?

Mr. MONK. The policy of the government on that point has not come up for consideration or discussion; the government has not yet had occasion to go fully into the matter and adopt a policy upon that point. But I may inform my hon. friend that my own opinion, so far as I have been able to form an opinion upon the subject, is that we should be prepared to supply armouries where the city goes to the trouble and expense of providing the grant of a site. I would even go further, and say that where public buildings are wanted, and the city is in a position to offer us the grant of a site, we should be prepared to respond by providing the building, where conditions suitable for the erection of such a building exist. We are continually having a great deal of difficulty in those matters, very often prices are put up for the site. I favour the idea that where the municipality offers a site for a public building or an armoury, we ought to be prepared to meet the city authorities half way.

Mr. McCRANEY. I agree with my hon. friend that it is desirable if cities or towns can make free grants of sites that those grants should be accepted by the government, and that the government should do what it can towards the erection of drill halls or armouries. There are some cities which are better circum-

stanced than others in possessing lands which can be used as sites for armouries and drill halls; and the case of the city of Moosejaw is one in point. Last session I asked a question in the House, at page 3,281 of 'Hansard,' whether any free grant had been made by the Dominion government to the city of Moosejaw; and the answer which I received from the then Minister of the Interior was that 2,152 lots had peen patented to the city of Moosejaw as a free grant by the Dominion government, under an order in council dated 6th April, 1903. What I want to point out is that such a city as Moosejaw, which received a grant from the Dominion government of 2,152 town lots, is in a position to make a free grant for such a purpose, and may well be expected to do so. I might also mention the city of Regina, although it is not before us in this item. I understand that Regina has also made a free grant to the Dominion government for such a purpose. In the same question which I asked last session, I got an answer from the Minister of the Interior that the Dominion government had patented to the city of Regina 4,863 town lots; and in addition to these lots, 285.55 acres of the unsubdivided portion of the townsite of Regina were revested in the Crown and subsequently patented to the city of Regina. I want to point out to the minister that if the city of Moosejaw and the city of Regina are in a position to make free grants to the government, and may be properly expected to do so, there are other cities in the Northwest which have not received grants from this government, and which cannot be expected to make free grants for such purposes. I appreciate what the minister has said that there is danger of the government being held up. But I am sure that the municipal authorities in each case may be relied upon to assist the government in the purchase of sites. In my own city of Saskatoon a site was purchased, composing about an acre of land, and having on it one of the best houses in the city, which could be used for temporary purposes. The price paid by this government was $47,500, a large sum. I have no doubt that if the government wished to part with that property to-day, they could sell it for a sum in excess of that amount. But I would much prefer, instead of this being sold, that an additional quantity of land adjoining the present site be purchased, and I did recommend to the late Minister of Public Works that an additional property, which I think is available there, be purchased. I must say that in my own experience with the ex-Minister of Public Works, no request was made to the city of Saskatoon for a grant of land for drill hall purposes; and I assume that he had in mind the fact that the case of Saskatoon was different from that of Moosejaw and Regina in the respects I have mentioned.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to point out that the city of Lethbridge donated some lots to the government for the purpose of erecting an armoury, and there has been a vote for the last couple of years for that purpose, but it has been dropped this year. Now Lethbridge is anxious to have an armoury, its city council appropriated certain lots for that purpose, and there is a good deal of disappointment on account of the vote not being in the estimates this year. I may say in connection with the recent militia conference held here, that the view was expressed that the only way in which we can stimulate interest in the volunteer militia in western Canada is to provide these buildings, so as to bring about social surroundings for the men who go into volunteer service in the different battalions of the militia. In the city of Lethbridge they have established a battery of field artillery, but they are practically without a place for their drill and for their equipment, and have been expecting from the government an armoury by reason of the special vote recently passed. I would urge the Minister of Public Works to consider the matter of drill halls in western Canada from this standpoint, as I think it will stimulate interest in the militia, and encourage the officers who are taking part in the work of the field battery and infantry corps, in their efforts to build up a good strong force there. My city is in very much the same position as pointed out by the hon. member for Moosejaw, only we have gone so far as to make a grant of land to the Dominion government, and are waiting for an armoury to be constructed. It is a very valuable property that has been granted to the government for this purpose, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will consider this matter when the supplementary estimates are being prepared.

Mr. MONK. I listened with attention to what has been said by the two last speakers and certainly will give heed to their observations. We intend to satisfy the population of the northwest as soon as possible. with regard to armouries. There is no doubt that we want our militia properly organized and that we must proceed in the way indicated. But my hon. friends must remember that a great many are called and few chosen in the matter of estimates. We try to provide in every part of the country as far as the present resources of the Dominion admit. I must say that the demands for improvements in connection with transportation are the main

cause that this year many of these items are left out.

Humboldt public building, $25,000.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would ask the minister's attention to the matter of a small public building provided for in the estimates of the late government and renewed in his own estimates for this year but not included in these estimates. This is for the construction of a telegraph office, post-office and North-west Mounted Police station at a place called Gravel, 75 miles south of Moosejaw. The money was voted, the late government committed themselves to this work and the new government did so by renewing the estimates for the present year, but there is no provision for the coming year. As a matter of fact the contract has been let and signed and up to a few weeks ago there was no thought of recalling that contract. That contract will, of course, hold good in law. The vote will lapse in the spring and there is no provision for going on with the work.

Mr. MONK. If the contract is let, the government is committed and will have to provide in some way for the payment of the contractor.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will the minister give me the information in regard to this particular vote in the near future?

Mr. MONK. I will.

Mr. NEELY. The vote for this public building at Humboldt was in the estimates last year. During the summer the lands agent at Humboldt pointed out to me that proper provision was not made in the plans prepared by the Public Works Department for the Dominion Lands service in that new public building. Three services were to be housed by this building, the post-office, the Dominion Lands office and the port of entry. The agent at Humboldt who, although he is a good Tory, was appointed by the late Minister of the Interior and who is a good servant as well, called my attention to this omission. I asked the Interior Department to take the matter up with the Public Works Department and have the defect in the plans remedied, but I have had no information as to whether or not such a change has been made. Would the minister ascertain whether the necessary representations have been made to his department?

Mr. MONK. I shall do so. This building is being erected not only for the post-office and customs, but for a public lands office, and I think therefore provision must have been made as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. MONK.

Lethbridge public building, new, $100,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have no objection to offer to this public building but I would impress on the minister that we have been looking for this post office for some time, and are in absolute need of it. The floor space in the post office in the city of Lethbridge, with a population of 10,000, is about half the size of Room 16.

Lethbridge is a growing city, and the post office accommodation there is at the present time a disgrace to the country. A site has already been purchased and I would ask the minister if he will proceed with the erection of the new post office at once.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Buchanan) is very fortunate in what has been provided for his constituency, there are others not so well served.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What is the total estimated cost of the Lethbridge post office?

Mr. MONK. About $200,000.

Mr. WARNOCK. Does the government intend to erect a new post office at Macleod this year? The post office accommodation in that growing city which is becoming quite a large railway centre is utterly inadequate. The late government purchased a site and I would ask what the present government intends to do?

Mr. MONK. As soon as our resources will admit of it we will provide for the want mentioned by the hon. member.

Regina—armoury and drill hall, $50,000.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Have the plans been prepared for this building?

Mr. MONK. I think so, but I cannot say positively now.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). What is the total estimated cost of this armoury?

Mr. MONK. I cannot say at the present moment, but these armouries generally cost between $50,000 and $100,000.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I know the late government had plans prepared in the department for an armoury estimated to cost $130,000, and the other day the Minister of Militia told me in the House that it was not the intention of the present government to carry out these specifications because such a building would not be sufficient to meet the needs of an important city like Regina.

Mr. MONK. That must have encouraged my hon. friend.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). It did, and I am anxious now to know how much more than $130,000 is to be spent by the present government on that armoury and drill hall. I hope the minister will get me that information soon.

Mr. MONK. I shall endeavour to.

Strathcona public building, $30,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This building is now almost completed and it was the intention of the late government to put a clock in the tower. Will the present Minister of Public Works carry out that intention?

Mr. MONK. I cannot say positively that we will put a clock in the tower, but we will endeavour to do so. We are getting prices from England for town clocks, and if we conclude arrangements we will endeavour to secure a sufficient number to meet all the exigencies of members in respect to public buildings throughout the country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are these clocks not manufactured in Canada?

Mr. MONK. They are not. They are made only in England and in the United States, and I think the cheapest can be got in England.

Weyburn public building, $15,000.

Mr. KNOWLES. The contractor for this building was at one time ordered to stop work, and I would ask the minister if he has since given the contractor instructions to proceed.

Mr. MONK. I am under the impression that the work on that building is at present proceeding.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will the minister ascertain and make sure of that?

Mr. MONK. I shall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The late government purchased a site for a building in the town of Camrose and an appropriation appeared in the former estimates to erect a building there, but that vote has been withdrawn from these estimates. What is the intention of the government with respect to the Camrose public building?

Mr. MONK. If the site has been purchased we will keep it and endeavour to utilize it.

Mr. OLIVER. The late government provided $25,000 in the estimates for an immigration building at Calgary, which showed that it was impressed with the necessity of a substantial building for that purpose in Calgary. I urge upon the Minister of Public Works the desirability of providing for the erection of that building in the supplementary estimates. I also wish to know if it is his intention to proceed with the public building at Athabasca.

Mr. MONK. I shall make a note and give my hon. friend the information later.

Mr. WHITE (Alberta). I would ask the hon. minister to give me some further information regarding the votes for public buildings in Vegreville and Lloydminister. Last year there were sums voted for public buildings at these points, but these items have been dropped from the estimates of this year. I put a question on the order paper asking what were the intentions of the government regarding these buildings and why they did not appear in the estimates for 1912-13. The answer given to me was that the government would proceed with them as soon as circumstances would permit. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to explain what he meant? Vegreville is a central distributing point for the mails for miles on either side. It was expected last year that this building would be erected. A site was purchased and the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) promised that the work would begin last year. I was, therefore, much surprised to find no provision for it in the estimates.

Mr. MONK. All I can say is that we have a great many places which require public buildings, and it is impossible to supply them all. We are only to-day beginning to provide for public buildings in some of the older provinces where there has been necessity for them since the last 25 years. In my own constituency, a public building there has not yet been finished, and I am asking for a vote to finish it. It was unfinished in 1896 inside and outside. It has not yet been furnished with a clock, although there is a place specially prepared for one. As soon as possible I will provide for the two places mentioned. But I can only provide for a certain amount of works.

Mr. WHITE (Alberta). Might we hope that the minister will place an item in the supplementary estimates of this year to go on with this work?

Mr. MONK. Hope springs eternal in the human breast.

Mr. WHITE (Alberta). Of course the town of Vegreville has only a population of about 1,000, but a great deal of valuable mail matter passes through the post office there. That post office is now in the centre of a frame building, and the people and the postmaster are very much afraid lest great damage might be caused to a large amount of postal matter there through fire or other cause.

Mr. MONK. I shall make a note of my hon friend's suggestions.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to emphasize what my hon. friend has said. He has hardly enlarged sufficiently on the importance of this particular point. It is a railway junction. A branch of the Canadian North-

ern leads to Calgary from the main line, and it is a distributing point for the mail to a large territory to the north extending not less than a hundred miles through a settled country. Its importance therefore, as a mail distributing centre, is altogether out of proportion to its population.

Public buildings, British Columbia, $724,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I notice that British Columbia is the only province in which in 1912-13 there is a vote in excess of 1911-12. Is this a tribute to the victory of the hon. minister's friends there in September last, or is there any real necessity for these buildings?

Mr. MONK. I am surprised that my hon. friend should ask such a question. The prospective opening of the Panama canal, it is expected, will increase business immensely in Victoria and Vancouver.

Mr. OLIVER. If the increase of vote goes by the increase of population, my hon. friend has not looked over the records carefully, because I find that whereas the increase in population in Alberta has been a larger percentage than anywhere else in the Dominion, the appropriation for public buildings has gone down considerably, while that of British Columbia has gone up. I think we might have another explanation from my hon. friend.

Mr. MONK. The only other explanation is the law of compensation. My hon. friend knows that British Columbia has not been very generously dealt with in the past few years. This is a government of retribution and of justice.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend would amend that statement by striking out the word 'justice,' he would be more accurate.

Mr. NEELY. I would like to emphasize the statement expressed by the hon. member for Edmonton with regard to the treatment of the prairie provinces in these estimates. In the estimates for 1912-13 the total for public buildings for the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, which are represented in this House by 17 members, is $746,000, while the amount for British Columbia alone is $724,000, almost an equal amount to that for these two provinces. I do not think there is anything in the argument that the province of British Columbia has not been justly dealt with hitherto, because I find that in the estimates for 1911-12 the amount for British Columbia was $538,000, while the amount for Saskatchewan and Alberta together was $813,000. In other words, British Columbia was given a great deal more than half of the total for Saskatchewan and Alberta. I would not like to attribute the large vote this year for British Columbia to the fact that it is represented in this House by a solid phalanx of Tories, but I think the public generally in our prairie provinces may come to the conclusion that they are being penalized because they sent so few supporters of the present government to this House.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend's statement were carried over the past four or five years, I think he would find that things are pretty fairly equalized.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BORDEN. moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a personal explanation on a question privilege re the case of smuggling referred to in the 'Montreal Star' of the 12th and 19th instant. In its issue of the 29th instant appears the following:

> Ottawa, January 29.—In the House this afternoon, the Hon. J. D. Reid, Minister of Customs, will give an affirmative answer to the following question put by Mr. G. H. Baker, of Brome
>
> (1) Has the Minister of Customs taken cognizance of an article which appeared in the Montreal 'Star' of January 12, under the caption 'M.P.'s name is mentioned in a smuggling case'?
>
> (2) Are the statements, as communicated to the Department of Customs, substantially as alleged in the said newspaper article?
>
> To both queries the answer will be 'Yes.'

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I know nothing about the purchasing of those goods, nor the sending for them until the day following the seizure; and I am in no way responsible for this transaction. I was not aware of the bringing of those goods into Canada, and had no connection with the transaction directly or indirectly.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 31, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 89,) to incorporate the Bank of Saskatchewan.—Mr. Knowles.

Bill (No. 90,) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill (No. 91,) respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill (No. 92,) respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 93,) respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia (Limited).—Mr. Buchanan.

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

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That the name of the Hon. H. S. Béland be substituted for the name of Mr. Fortier as member of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and that the name of Mr. Fortier be substituted for the name of Hon. H. S. Béland as member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON OLD AGE PENSIONS.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the special committee to inquire into an old age pension system for Canada, as set forth in the resolution of this House passed on the 24th day of January instant, do consist of Messrs. Bradbury, Buchanan, Burnham, Carroll, Currie, Goodeve, Guthrie, Jameson, Macdonald (Pictou), Mondou, Verville and White (Leeds).

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That it be resolved, that a message be sent to the Senate to inform their honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of more equally dividing between the two Houses of Parliament the initiation of private and public legislation, with a view to curtailing the length of the sessions; and more particularly to prevent in future the custom known in parliamentary parlance as the 'railroading' of important measures at the end of the session, and to devise means by which such a result could be obtained; and that Messrs Aikins, Barnard, Bennett (Simcoe), Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Essex), Emmerson, Kyte, Sevigny, and Wilson (Laval), will act as members on the part of this House on the said Joint Committee.

He said: The resolution which was sent to this House by the Senate is to be found in the Votes and Proceedings of the 26th instant. No doubt it has already come to the attention of my right hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

THE WRIT FOR SOUTH RENFREW.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I ask leave of the House to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the vacancy in the electoral district of South Renfrew, and to submit this proposition:

Pursuant to Rule 39 Mr. Clarke (Essex) proposes upon a motion to adjourn the House, and with its leave, to discuss a distinct matter of urgent public importance, namely: The question of the vacancy in the representation in this House of the electoral district of South Renfrew and of the delay in the issue of a writ for an election to fill the vacancy.

Leave granted.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of discussing this matter I move that this House do now adjourn. The matter to be discussed is one, I submit, of urgent importance to the interests of this country, namely, the vacancy which has existed in the representation in this House for the electoral district of South Renfrew for nearly two months, and the delay, for which some person must be responsible, in the issuing of the writ in order that the electors of the riding may have their undoubted right to a representative in parliament. It seems to me that the long delay of this matter is a direct violation of the spirit, and I am inclined to think, of the letter of the law in this respect. When we refer to the House of Commons Act, section 5, the procedure is very plain, so plain, one would think, that the writ would issue in a case of this sort almost automatically. That section provides that:

In case of a resignation the Speaker shall forthwith——

I emphasize the word 'forthwith.'

—address his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a writ for the election of a new member, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall issue the writ accordingly.

With commendable promptitude, upon receiving the resignation, you, Mr. Speaker, did issue your warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 7th December last, and so notified the House that you had issued your warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a writ. I am sure that if the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery had been supplied with the information required from another source he also would have been commended for his promptness in this respect, but instead of that we have gone nearly two months and the writ has not yet been issued. The reason is one arising in consequence of the Act which provides the

duty to be done by the government before the writ can be issued and that duty is to fix the nomination day and name the returning officer in order that the writ may be issued. That has not been done.

Hon. gentlemen opposite realized that for a breach of the law it would be necessary to give some reason. Two reasons, if they may be called reasons, have been given for this great delay. The first reason was given by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid). He went up into the riding of South Renfrew. He could not very well afford to say: We are doing this for the purpose of keeping this riding open; he found and realized the necessity under the law of giving some reason why the electors had been deprived of their rights and why the government had not done their duty in enabling them to send a representative to this House. I only need to refer to the reason, or the pretext, which he gave and I will take it from the organ of the hon. member himself, the Renfrew 'Journal.' This is the reason which that paper reports him as giving:

Dr. Reid said the Liberals had been unfair and ungenerous in regard to the acclamation of Mr. Borden in Carleton county some years ago. They had held back the issuing of the writ until after the House met so as to keep the Conservative leader out as long as possible.

A statement more conspicuous for its reckless disregard of truth, I think, it would be difficult to find. But, as I said before, the hon. gentleman realized that he must give some reason and he had to resort to this which he calls a reason for the extraordinary delay. What are the facts in regard to that? He cites as a precedent the matter of Carleton in the year 1905. In that case Mr. Kidd, who had represented that riding since the general election, tendered his resignation in this House and it was accepted on the 20th day of January, 1905. The by-election was held on the 4th February following, and the hon. member (Mr. Borden) was introduced into the House on the 7th day of February. So that, within eighteen days of the time the resignation was placed in the hands of the Speaker the hon. gentleman took his seat in this House. If that precedent had been followed in this case, after this House had resumed at the close of the Christmas vacation, south Renfrew would have had its representative sitting here in parliament. I have always thought that when a new government was elected it would be an improvement upon its predecessor, that instead of copying the vices and errors of its predecessor it would avoid those and imitate its virtues. That has not been the case with the present government. We have had it in other instances, in the matter of patronage and in the matter of advertising for tenders. When they are pressed for reasons they give as their precedent what they call the vices of the former government instead of what they call its virtues. It seems to me to be a true saying that the evil which men do lives after them, and that the good is often interred with their bones; so that it would appear that if there were any evils connected with the former government those evils are living after them and are being imitated by their successors. It is all the worse in this particular case because, on account of the fewness of the vices of the former government, the hon. Minister of Customs has had to resort to fiction in order to procure some vices. Not only does he base it upon facts but he invents a condition of affairs and then follows that invention which is not founded upon the facts when he says that he is imitating a state of facts that never did exist. I have been wondering who the prototypes of the members of the present government were. Most statesmen have some prototype, some great exemplar, that they are proud to follow. I know that my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has chosen the late Mr. Gladstone. He has often referred to him. I have searched through the history of many statesmen and there is only one that I have discovered that I think I might call the prototype of the present government. He was a Secretary of State many years ago. His name is Nicholas Machiavel. He had doctrines. I cannot say that I have found many men who have adopted the doctrines of that Secretary of State. But it is quite evident we have some followers of that gentleman in the present government. What were some of these doctrines which are being followed? One was that when a new prince was created he should immediately, by fair means or foul, put out of existence any person who might stand in his way. That is being followed. A man who ought to be in this House, a man of experience in this House, but who might be in the way of some hon. gentlemen is proposed by a majority of the people of that constituency but hon. gentlemen opposite immediately adopt the doctrine of Machiavel and try to put him out of the way.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). He is not in yet.

Mr. CLARKE (South Essex). And my hon. friends seems to relish the fact that he is not in.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Oh, no.

Mr. CLARKE (South Essex). His prototype had some other characteristics. One was that a prince or a ruler should not be

altogether good—some parts good, but, if necessary to save his life, then he should have some parts bad. I find in the composition of this Cabinet there are some parts that are bad and they find it is necessary to hold their names and their positions in order to do some things that are decidedly wicked, as instanced in their conduct in this very matter.

Another characteristic was that they must appear to be good, the hon. Minister of Customs goes up to Renfrew, but he does not give them the wickedness that is in his heart and say: we are going to try and kill Graham, but he says: there is a reason, they did not treat the present leader of the government correctly in a former instance and that is a good plausible reason, I will conceal the wickedness in my heart and say we mean to be just as good as they were.

Then there is another reason, perhaps the most far-reaching of all, that a prince, in order to rule well, ought to go to a preceptor who is part man and part beast. I do not know but what we have an illustration of that here, because when the hon. member went to Renfrew he spoke with the tongue of a man, but when, in this House, he is confronted by what he said there and the falsity of the statement, he takes the part of the beast and sits dumb in his seat.

The only fault I find with the hon. leader of the government (Mr. Borden) is that he should have allotted this wing of the government to the province of Ontario. I think the premier province of this Dominion deserved better at the hands of the Prime Minister than for him to have chosen the followers of this eminent statesman from that province. I do not think they represent the ideals of that province, and I think that an apology is owing by the Prime Minister in that respect. Who are the men who are the disciples of Machiavel? You can scarcely think that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), is responsible for this state of things. He has been a gymnast in his day, but I have heard him here as the apostle of the strictest virtues when he sat on this side of the House and, with the mellowing influences of age, I cannot think that he would be responsible for the subverting of the law for the sake of depriving a constituency of its right.

One cannot think that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes) who comes from that province would be guilty, because who is there more valiant in fighting for fair-play and justice than he is? If he is true to himself he will call out the militia, and see that right is done and that the muzzle is taken off the people of South Renfrew.

I know that my hon. friend from western Ontario, the Minister of Labour, (Mr. Crothers), cannot be guilty. These are not the ideals or the principles of western Ontario. He would not be a true representative of that district if he did not disavow the attempt that has been made here to gag the electors of a prominent constituency in this province. Then the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. White)—much is expected of him. He represents the people who stand for the rights of all parties, for justice and right in this country. He comes from a party in which he was trained up in those principles and I think that the hon. member has it in his heart and if he is allowed will say that those schemes shall not prevail in the province of Ontario, and that common decency and right will be observed.

Then if these are not the disciples where are they? There are only two left from the province of Ontario, one is the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), and he appears perhaps to be the leader in this respect. Then we have left only the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane). The Minister of Railways and Canals so far has exhibited more of the dumb portion of the ruler, because he does not say much in this House, but, none the less, he is credited with representing a very strong element of action. The lion is a very strong animal although he does not speak. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals came down here with a very strong reputation given to him by his former leader, Sir James Whitney, in the province of Ontario, and from my personal acquaintance with him I did not expect that he would be a disciple of this great statesman of whom I have spoken. But circumstances are suspicious. These are the two, I am afraid, who are to be credited with being the authors of this mischief which has been perpetrated. The Minister of Railways and Canals has, within the past week, appointed a commission to investigate the deportment of the Liberal candidate in South Renfrew, Hon. George Graham, a man who ought to be on the floor of this House when his administration is being discussed, and a man than whom no one is better fitted to watch in this House the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), in his dealings. If the hon. the Minister of Railways was as courageous a man as he is reputed by his former leader to be, he would say: Give me the very strongest critic you have, give me the man who knows most about my department, let him come in here, and let him watch my every movement. But that is not the case here; instead of inviting criticism from the man most able to critise instead of assisting, or at any rate giving fair-play so that that man may come into this House, we find this effort to prevent him gaining a seat in order that

the House may not have the advantage of his assistance and experience.

Another thing points to the Minister of Railways in connection with the Minister of Customs, and it is not at all satisfactory. I again refer to the hon. member's organ, the Renfrew 'Journal.' That paper says:

A Low appeal from a Cabinet Minister.

Dr. Reid then turned his attention to the good roads movement advocated by the Conservative government at Ottawa, and the bald way that he handled this topic disgusted all decent men—who look for something higher than this kind of talk from a cabinet minister. The burden of this part of Dr. Reid's speech was to the effect that South Renfrew should vote for Dr. Maloney and the Borden government would then spend money in this district for good roads.

It is a little significant that when the Minister of Railways announced the Roads Bill in this House he stated that it was the intention to turn the money over to the provinces, but after this election contest became warm, we find he adds a little clause to the Bill providing that in addition to turning the money over to the provinces the government may spend it themselves. That is the provision of the Bill. Then we find his associate going into the riding of South Renfrew and saying: Vote right and then we will spend this money right in order to help those who vote for us. That is practically the result.

Then leaving that reason, if it may be called a reason, I have another, given by the hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden), only two days ago, and I think that a great deal of the virtue which might have existed if this reason had been given six weeks ago, is lost when we remember that although day after day the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), has inquired why the writ was not issued in South Renfrew, no suggestion of any obstacle was ever given until two days ago when the leader of the government said there was some trouble about voters' lists. There is no trouble about voters' lists in the organized districts of the province of Ontario, there is always an official list. Section 6 of the Dominion Elections Act provides:

For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province, the voters' lists shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those prepared for the several polling divisions established, and which, on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election, were in force, or were last in force, under the laws of that province, for the purposes of provincial elections.

Does the hon. member not know that lists are made up every year in Ontario, except in the cities where registration takes place? Previous to an election there is always a list that can be appealed to. The law is so framed that whenever there is an election there is a list that can be used. If a list has been revised within 60 days then the list to be used is that of the last year, the list last revised, so that although there may be a few straggling municipalities in South Renfrew where the lists were late in being revised that is not a sufficient reason to deprive that riding of its representation, because the list which is in force represents substantially the electors of the district.

We cannot at any particular time get out a list that will represent every person. All the men who are on the voters' list do not vote. If you look at the last returns for South Renfrew, you will find that only 70 per cent of those on the list voted. If the writ had been issued on the 7th of December, when the Speaker issued his warrant, all the municipalities containing the larger part of the vote had their lists for last year revised. The shifting vote is generally in the towns. In that district there are two towns—Arnprior and Renfrew. The lists for 1911 had been revised in those two towns. They had also been revised in the township of McNab, the next most populous district in the riding, and they have been revised in many other districts. So that the election could have been gone on with. Where the lists had been revised in time, they would have been used, and where they were not revised 60 days before the nomination, the previous lists would have been used, which is the case in every election. Take the last three Dominion elections. In 1904 the lists for that year could not be used except in one or two instances. The same was the case in 1908. It was the same in 1911, when, in my constituency at any rate, not one list of that year was used, but the list which had been revised in the previous year. Why was not this objection raised when the Cabinet Ministers, upon taking office after the last general election, went back for re-election. They took office in October. The lists in October were exactly in the same position as the lists in South Renfrew, outside of North Toronto, where the lists were revised before the election, it being a city. Take the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. White); if that rule had been applied, he would not be in the House yet. The same is true of the hon. members for Victoria and Haliburton, West Elgin, and Nipissing. Was there any suggestion in those cases that a writ could not be issued because the lists for this year were not ready? If the lists for this year were not ready, the elections would have been held under the lists of the preceding year. Why is there this discrimination? Why, in order to expedite the entry of these gentlemen into the House, did you use the lists of 1910, when you refuse to a member

of the opposition the same right, even though almost all the lists in the riding have been revised for 1911. But even if you waited for the lists for 1911, the writ would have been issued by this time. I believe the list for the most outlying district was revised on the 12th of January; 60 days would bring the date of the nomination to the 12th of March; so that there is no reason why the government should not issue the writ for that date if they think that a sufficient reason for withholding the representation in this House. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not a good reason. If that reason is applied, you might say, if we waited until midsummer, that there were still some people who ought to have a right to vote—some young men coming of age—and therefore you should wait for the next list so they could get on, and after that, wait again for someone else to get on the list; so that it would go on ad infinitum. I think the lists that are at present available do represent the riding. I suppose the changes that would be made would not be more than 20 in a riding of 7,000 electors. The reason advanced is one that has not been followed in other cases, and to which little weight should be attached. The result is that this riding is disfranchised. The candidates are in the field and the electors are ready, but they are gagged; they have not the right of free men. The time is slipping away, no doubt with the purpose that no member shall be sent to represent that riding. I believe that in all fairness the Prime Minister should issue the writ, as he is in honour bound to do, in order that that riding may have its representative in parliament.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, we have listened to a most notable example of what the girl in the play called 'excellent fooling,' because the hon. gentleman who is inspired by these virtuous and worthy sentiments is one who sat in this House day after day, week after week, and month after month, when periods exceeding by four times the one in this case had elapsed, and he was as dumb as the animal to which he has just referred. I am bound to say, with regard to his somewhat confused statement about men and animals, that a certain dumb animal, which spoke on one notable occasion when it stood still in the road, uttered words much more to the point than those which my hon. friend has uttered this afternoon. He seems to be under a misapprehension as to how long the county has been unrepresented. For what length of time does my hon. friend compute the period?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). From December 7.

Mr. BORDEN. I want to tell him that the representative of the riding of South Renfrew drew his sessional indemnity up to the 31st day of December, and I presume that during that period the county may have been fairly regarded as being represented.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Does the hon. gentleman deny that the Speaker issued his warrant on the 7th of December?

Mr. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman deny that the member for South Renfrew drew his sessional indemnity up to the 31st day of December? Now, my hon. friend has used some strong expressions in the course of his remarks. He has told us that the riding of South Renfrew has been gagged, and he has posed as the champion of common decency and right. Does he know that his own leader sat for a whole session in parliament, when the government he supported denied this city the right to be represented here? Does he know that he sat in parliament during all that time and never lifted up his voice against what he now describes as an outrage? My hon. friend will perhaps remember that. He has expressed the aspiration that this government shall be an improvement upon its predecessor. I am sure that we would deserve to be turned out of office instantly if we do not come up to that standard; and I venture to think we will improve on it to such an extent that the people of this country will realize the distinction without any mental effort whatever.

It will be interesting, as my hon. friend has provoked this discussion, to go into the record of the late government with regard to this matter. It would take up too much time to go into all the instances in which the time during which constituencies were not represented in this House was greater than it is at present, but I may give a few of the constituencies in which the time that elapsed between the issue of the Speaker's warrant and the election was twice as long as in this case. I will begin with just a few illustrations and ask my hon. friend, as I go on, what he thinks of the efforts at gagging allowed by his leader to take place on those occasions. My hon. friend has spoken of my hon. colleague the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) sitting dumb in his seat. May I ask my hon. friend a very pertinent question? Why did he sit dumb in his seat when those outrages, to which I am going to allude, occurred?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I do not know what the cases are.

Mr. BORDEN. Let me tell my hon. friend. There was the case of Beauce in which the Speaker's warrant was issued

on the 30th of August, 1911, and the writ on the 10th December, 1911, leaving the representation vacant during a period of 111 days. Then there was St. James division, Montreal, where the warrant was issued on the 30th August, 1901, and the writ on the 19th December, 1901, leaving the representation of that constituency vacant during 111 days. There was also the riding of Addington, for which the warrant issued the 30th August and the writ on the 19th December, 1901—a period of 111 days. In the constituency of L'Islet the warrant was issued on the 30th August, 1901, and the writ on the 19th December, 1901—a period of 111 days. For the election in the county of Montmagny the warrant was issued on the 27th May, 1908, and no writ was issued before dissolution. Take the case of Saskatchewan, where Mr. Lamont resigned on the 5th September, 1905, the warrant was issued the 20th December, 1905, and the writ on the 16th January, 1905—a period of 118 days. Then there was the constituency of Assiniboia West. Mr. Scott resigned on the 29th August, 1905, the Speaker's warrant was issued on the 7th September, 1905, and the writ on the 16th January, 1906, a period of 119 days. I did not hear the eloquent voice of my hon. friend raised in any of these cases to denounce the government for the outrage of delaying the issue of the writs such a protracted period.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). In most of the cases with which my hon. friend has just dealt, I was not a member of this House, and consequently could not have spoken, and in the others I understand the House was not in session.

Mr. BORDEN. Perhaps then my hon. friend will tell us now what he thinks of these delays. I would like to state here that from the 7th of December last until the 10th of January this House was not in session as the session was adjourned during that interval. That is a point my hon. friend seems unfortunately to have overlooked. Therefore, if his logic is to be accepted, there has only been a vacancy since the 10th of January last. I do not know whether I make the point clear to my hon. friend. Take another case, that of Vancouver, in which Mr. McInnes resigned on the 12th of May, 1900. The Speaker's warrant was issued on the 21st of May, 1900, and no writ was issued before dissolution. Thus in this case a period of 141 days elapsed during which that constituency was not represented. In the case of North Grey, Mr. Horsey, its former representative died in July, 1902, the Speaker's warrant was issued the 6th September, 1902, and the writ on the 31st January, 1902—a period of 147 days. There is further the case of the city of London. Mr. Hyman, its former representative, resigned on the 11th of April, 1907, the Speaker's warrant was issued on the 20th of April, 1907, and the writ on the 29th of October, 1907—a period of 157 days. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke, Essex) was in the House on that occasion and the House was in session. Perhaps he will be kind enough to tell us what he thinks of that long delay. In York, New Brunswick, the election was voided on the 11th of June, 1901, the warrant was issued on the 21st of June, 1901, and the writ on the 5th of December, 1901—a period of 167 days. In North Simcoe, its former representative (Mr. McCarthy) died on the 11th of May, 1898, the Speaker's warrant was issued on the 4th of June, 1898, and the writ on the 19th of November, 1898, a period of 168 days. In the case of Lisgar, in which the election of Mr. Richardson was declared void, the writ was issued on the 20th of July, 1901, the Speaker's warrant on the 7th of August, 1901, and the writ on the 27th of January, 1902, a period of 173 days. In Durham West, in which the election of Mr. Thornton was annulled, the Speaker's warrant was issued on the 21st of June, 1901, and the writ on the 19th of December, 1901, a period of 181 days. Take the case of Bagot county, its former representative, Mr. Dupont, died the 12th of March, 1898, the Speaker's warrant was issued on the 20th of April, 1898, and his writ on the 22nd of November 1898, a period of 216 days. In West Huron, its representative, Mr. Cameron, was appointed Lieutenant Governor on the 30th of May, 1898, the Speaker's warrant was issued on the 4th of June, 1898, and his writ on the 31st of January, 1899, a period of 241 days. In West Hastings, Mr. Corby resigned the 1st of April, 1901, the Speaker's warrant was issued on the 3rd of April, 1901, and the writ on the 19th of December, 1901, a period of 260 days. In the case of Winnipeg, Mr. Jamieson died the 21st of February, 1899, the Speaker's warrant was issued on the 29th of March, 1899, and his writ on the 2nd of January, 1900, a period of 279 days. In the case of St. James Division of Montreal, the election of Mr. Brunet was annulled on the 11th of March, 1903, the Speaker's warrant was issued the 3rd of April, 1903, and his writ the 27th of January, 1904, a period of 299 days.

I think there is only one conclusion at which this House can arrive and that is that my hon. friend must have sat in this House during the period in which these delays in the representation of these constituencies took place without knowing anything about them, because otherwise his voice would have been raised, as the champion of decency and right to prevent

these constituencies being gagged as he now declares they were.

Let us take one other little illustration for the benefit of my hon. friend. He might be good enough perhaps to convey it to the gentleman who is the Liberal candidate in South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) because that gentleman was responsible for the very delay to which I am going to refer as he was a member of the Ontario government at that very time. I will give him some dates, if his nervous system will stand it, although, I am sure, it will produce a most profound shock.

The Ontario general election took place on the 29th May, 1902. Mr. Thomas W. Munroe was elected for North Renfrew—the adjoining riding to the one under discussion—by a majority of 459. He died two days afterwards, on the 31st of May, 1902. The Speaker informed the legislature on the 23rd of March, 1903, that a warrant for the writ had issued. But the Prime Minister of the government of Ontario—Mr. Graham being a member of that government—would not permit the writ to issue, and rejected Mr. Matheson's motion for a writ on the 31st March, 1903. There was a letter from Mr.—now Sir James—Whitney, to the Premier on the 6th November, 1903, and the election took place on the 26th December, 1903, exactly 18 months and 26 days after the vacancy occurred.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). If the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) will allow me, I think he is mistaken in saying that hon. Mr. Graham was a member of the Ontario government at that time. I think the right hon. gentleman ought to point out, too, that all this occurred during the moribund days of a thirty-year old government, and also that the electors severely censured them.

Mr. BORDEN. Some of these instances to which I am referring occurred when the late Dominion administration was moribund;—I am bound to admit that they have that excuse, whatever it may be worth. I was under the impression that Mr. Graham was a member of the government; but I withdraw that. But, I take it, he was a member of the House, and of course his voice was heard in indignant protest at the delay caused by the government. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke, Essex) can give me that assurance. Cannot he? (after a pause) I am awaiting assurance from my hon. friend that Mr. Graham's voice was heard in indignant protest against this.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I did not understand that the hon. gentleman was waiting. He gives me credit for omnipotence and omniscience.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not give the hon. gentleman credit for either omnipotence or omniscience—certainly not for omniscience in view of some of the statements he has made this afternoon. Let us look for a moment at the actual facts of the case. My hon. friend seems inclined to challenge the statements I made with regard to the matter. I will give him the information that has been furnished me from official sources. The following is a statement showing when the lists for the several townships, etc., came into force:—

Brougham township	Sept. 30, 1911.
McNab township	Sept. 30, 1911.
Bagot and Blythfield township	Oct. 31, 1911.
Adamston township	Nov. 7, 1911.
Griffith and Matawatchan townships	Nov. 10, 1911.
Horton township	Nov. 10, 1911.
Radcliffe township	Nov. 30, 1911.
Raglan township	Nov. 29, 1911.
Brudenell & Lyndock townships.	Dec. 14, 1911.
Sebastopol township	Dec. 14, 1911.
Grattan township	Dec. 21, 1911.
Haggarty & Richards townships.	Dec. 28, 1911.
Sherwood township	Jan. 15, 1912.
Renfrew town	Sept. 22, 1911.
Arnprior town	Oct. 16, 1911.
Killaloe station, village	Oct. 11, 1911.
Eganville town	Nov. 22, 1911.

The lists for Sherwood township were irregular, and, if I understand it, will have to be sent back to the judge; and it is a little difficult at present to say at what date they can be regarded as being in force. From the list I have given the hon. gentleman the House will see that, with the exception of two or three of the townships of South Renfrew, new lists were ready to be used if a little delay could be had. It was expected that all the lists could be used but, on account of the unfortunate error made in one township to which I have alluded, it may not be possible to carry out that purpose in its entirety. A further consideration is that many of the men in the riding are absent and are working in parts of the country that are very inaccessible at the present time; and it might be more desirable and convenient, so far as they are concerned, that the election should take place a little later in the winter. However that may be, I hope we shall be able, during the present week, to give consideration to the date at which this election should be held. I had not all the information on the former occasion of the discussion of this matter, but I think that I have all the information now except in regard to the one township indicated. If it had been possible to hold a meeting of the council to-day, there might have been an opportunity to consider the matter then. I hope it may be considered before the end of the present week.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East). Mr. Speaker, it is recognized as an indication of a poor defence in any case when resort has to be had to abuse of the plaintiff's

attorney. That is exactly what my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has been doing. Nor is it any better to appeal to the tu quoque argument, but that is the only defence that he has been able to bring forward on the present occasion except in one thing to which I will refer in a moment. He has stated that the late government were very much to blame in not holding the election as soon as the warrant of the Speaker was issued. But in any of the cases which he has mentioned, with the exception of perhaps one or two, I do not remember that any complaint was made by any member of the then opposition that the writ was not issued. My hon. friend knows sometimes vacancies have taken place at times when neither one side nor the other is anxious to have an election. He has cited the case of the vacancy that took place last session. The election did not take place; and for good reasons. The hon. gentleman did not complain at that time, because we were all under the impression that there would be a general election, and so a by-election was unnecessary. He referred to my own case. I sat here for one whole session as the representative of two constituencies. That is quite true. In 1908 I was elected both for Quebec East and for the city of Ottawa. I sat during the session after the election without making my election of one constituency to represent. But I am not aware that my action was challenged by my friends or by anybody else.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was challenged the following session. And immediately that was done, I made my choice of one constituency and an election was held in the other. More than that, we were under the impression that the rules of the House of Commons required a member in such circumstances to make his election. But the Speaker ruled that no such rule was in force. And when we undertook to revise the rules of the House, I being then Prime Minister and Chairman of the Committee on Rules, we put in a rule whereby a member elected for two constituencies should be bound to select one of them within a given time after the election. That is the situation so far as my personal record goes. But what is the record of my hon. friend who now occupies the position that I occupied as Prime Minister in carrying out reforms which he advocated when sitting on this side of the House? He introduced a Bill while he was leader of the opposition to provide that there should be an automatic issue of the writ the moment the warrant of the Speaker had been issued. He has the opportunity now to bring into effect what he preached in opposition. The lists have been amended. The issue of the writ is not automatic, but it was up to the right hon. gentleman on the 8th of December to issue the writ in order to carry out the rule he preached when on this side. Seven weeks have elapsed and not a thing has been done nor has the writ been issued.

So the tu quoque argument can be turned against my hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN. Would my hon. friend support such a Bill?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I say that if I did wrong, I have been castigated for it. But my hon. friend said a moment ago that he would not deserve to be here if he did not do better than we did. Not only has he not done better than we did, but he is doing far worse. I will say, however, to his credit, I say frankly to my hon. friend, I believe that if he were to follow his own inclinations, his own better judgment, the writ for South Renfrew would have been issued long ago. I believe that he has received his inspiration from behind, that inspiration he has followed, and followed it not at all to his credit. I believe, nay I know, that if he were to follow the advice, the wish and the pressure of his friends in the riding of South Renfrew, the writ would have been issued before to-day. But there is some sinister influence at work upon my hon. friend, and up to this day he has not had the courage to resist that evil influence. He has listened to the voice of the serpent, he has not listened to the voice of the true men of South Renfrew. This is not the first time that such an occurrence as we have to-day has taken place. My hon. friend has referred to vacancies which have taken place, in regard to which the government have been dilatory in issuing writs for an election. But there is all the difference in the world between the causes which have been cited by my hon. friend, and the case in hand. The case in hand is quite different. Mr. Low was elected on the 21st of September to be the member for South Renfrew. Mr. Graham, a member of the old government, was defeated. Mr. Low resigned for the well known and avowed object of giving a chance to Mr. Graham to be elected, under those circumstances. This has happened before. Important members of the cabinet have been defeated, members that belonged to a government have lost their seats. But it never happened until this day that, under similar circumstances, the government of the day refused to pave the way for an opponent to come into the House. It has been stated in the press which supports the right hon. gentleman that the government owes us no favour. We ask for no favour in this matter. If the government want to oppose the election of Mr. Graham, they can do so. All we ask is fair play, play the game fair. Let us give a chance to the electors of South Renfrew to elect a representative. If it be the will of the government to oppose Mr.

Graham, they can do so. Now I submit to my hon. friend, is that fair? Is it right? Is it playing the game to refuse to issue a writ to fill a vacancy there, in order to prevent Mr. Graham from becoming a member of this House?

I have been in this House a longer time than my right hon. friend, I have sat opposite to Sir John A. Macdonald, and I say to my right hon. friend that when he acts in this way he does not follow the example that was set by Sir John A. Macdonald. In the election of 1882 Sir Richard Cartwright was defeated. Mr. John McMillan was elected for the riding of South Huron. In the month of November, 1883, Mr. John McMillan resigned his seat for the purpose of giving Sir Richard Cartwright an opportunity of entering this House. He resigned on the 23rd of November. On the 30th of November, the House not being in session, the Speaker issued his warrant. The government of that day, presided over by Sir John A. Macdonald, issued a warrant for an election in South Huron, so as to give Sir Richard Cartwright an opportunity to become a member of this House. The writ was issued on the 10th of December, ten days after Mr. Speaker had issued his warrant. The election took place on the 27th of December, and Sir Richard Cartwright was elected by acclamation. There was no opposition offered to him by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. Sir, times have changed. Sir John A. Macdonald is no longer at the head of the Liberal-Conservative party. I am afraid that his traditions are gone also. If the traditions of fair play which actuated Sir John A Macdonald were still in the minds and hearts of the men who guide his party, this delay would not have taken place, there would have been an election, and Mr. Graham would now be in this House.

Mr. BORDEN. What about Mr. Foster in 1903?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware of that.

Mr. BORDEN. I am; because I went into the riding and campaigned for him when he ran in North Ontario, and when the whole force of the Liberal party was sent in there against him. And he was not elected.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that anybody resigned his seat in his favour. There was a vacancy, and, therefore, it was an open fight. We are here to fight one another. Let me say again to my hon. friend that he may oppose the election of Mr. Graham if he wants to do so; but what I complain of is that he will not allow us to have an election. He can fight Mr. Graham if he chooses; that is his own business, I have nothing to say as to that. It might be more graceful to allow him to be elected by acclamation; but we do not ask for any courtesy or any favour. We simply ask the government to play the game fair, and that is what we are entitled to. But my hon. friend says there are some old lists which were not in force. It has been shown by my hon. friend from Essex that in the province of Ontario there are lists available all the time.

Mr. BORDEN. Then why did the right hon. gentleman desire to introduce legislation in 1908 to make new lists, because there were others not more than a year old prepared for the province of Ontario?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That was not for the old province of Ontario, it was for the unorganized districts. There are no lists in the unorganized districts, but in the organized districts there are lists all the time available. If they are more than sixty days old they are not in force.

Mr. BORDEN. But there were lists in the unorganized districts.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, there were lists, they were about a year old, but my right hon. friend thought they would not do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the very ground which is taken by the hon. gentleman to-day, that the lists are old. All the lists at present available in the riding of South Renfrew were revised in the month of October, and the month of September. On the 4th of December, when the local elections took place, the only new lists were those revised in September in the townships of Brougham, McNab and in Renfrew. These were in force, all the others were not in force, and the election took place, therefore, upon the old lists. If the arguments of my hon. friend were to be taken seriously, there would be no election at all in the province of Ontario, because at the present time the lists are all old, and there are no new lists for this year. I am sorry to see that my hon. friend has taken that position. But if he will play the game fair, he will give us an opportunity of meeting him in South Renfrew. Once more I repeat that if the government followed the advice of their own friends there would be no opposition to Mr. Graham's election in South Renfrew. But if there is an election, and it is for the government to say whether there shall be one or not, we are ready for it. It is the duty of the government to issue the writ immediately. When I called the attention of my right hon. friend the other day to this matter he said it was under delibera-

tion. What have they to deliberate upon? It is a simple ministerial duty to issue the writ, and if my right hon. friend had been true to himself he would have issued the writ long ere this.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs). I wish to say a few words on this matter, since my name has been mentioned by the hon. gentleman who has moved this motion (Mr. Clarke, Essex). I see that the right hon. leader of the opposition is very wrathy over this matter. I can understand that he should be wrathy; in fact, he has not got over the result of September 21. On that day, many members of his government went down to defeat, Mr. Graham was one of them, he was rejected by the electors of Brockville.

Now, the right hon. leader of the opposition appeals for fair-play in this case. We want fair-play too, and the electors of South Renfrew want fair-play. I would like to know if the electors of South Renfrew shall have a right to say who shall represent that constituency or not. In this case the right hon. gentleman, through Mr. Low, decides that Mr. Graham shall represent that constituency without giving them an opportunity of saying whether he shall or not. A deal was made through Mr. Low. I suppose that the right hon. gentleman said to Mr. Low: You resign and Mr. Graham must represent that constituency whether the electors want him or not. There was no convention called in order to give them the right to say whether he should be the choice of the Liberal party. Then, in addition to that, Mr. Low was elected on September 21, to represent South Renfrew. We did not ask him to resign; he might have continued representing the constituency. The people supposed that he was qualified to represent the constituency, and, therefore, why did he resign? He was told before he resigned that he should not have resigned at that time. It was pointed out to him that there were hundreds of men up in the woods, who were present at the election of September 21, and who would be put to the expense of coming back home to poll their votes if he resigned at that particular time. Surely these people should be taken into consideration by the leader of the opposition, and those behind him who seem bound to take advantage of the absence of these people, and try and force an election on, and perhaps elect Mr. Graham. I feel that the people of South Renfrew should have an opportunity of saying whether Mr. Graham or any other person should represent the constituency, but at the same time I believe that the game should be fairly played, and that the election should take place on the latest list. By waiting a short time we can get this list. The leader of the opposition is bound to try and force this election on the list of 1910 when he knows that hundreds of men are out of the constituency and cannot cast their votes if it is held under that list. He also knows that there are hundreds of men not on the list of 1910, but who have been residing in the constituency during the past two years, who will not have a vote if the election is held as the right hon. gentleman desires it to be. These people's names will appear on the very latest list, and in addition, the men who are away will be back by the 1st of March, and have an opportunity of polling their votes. The right hon. gentleman had it in his power to keep Mr. Low here or to open the constituency. I do not want South Renfrew to be unrepresented any longer than is absolutely necessary, but I want to see that the people of that constituency who are absent shall have the right to vote, and not be disfranchised. The right hon. leader of the opposition quotes Sir John A. Macdonald's action as a precedent. He is very late in following in the footsteps of Sir John A. Macdonald. During the whole time that he was leader of the government he never followed that great leader —not in any one case. He cannot give one instance where he followed the example of Sir John A. Macdonald. The government have no desire to oppose the election in South Renfrew any longer than is necessary in order to get a vote on the latest list. We do not fear the result. Mr. Graham will likely be allowed to go back to Brockville again the same as he did after the election of September 21. The leader of the opposition wants to rush this matter through in the hope that a vote will be taken in such a way as to secure Mr. Graham's election. I do not think he expects him to be elected. The hon. ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lemieux) went up to Eganville and threw up his hands because he said: If you do not take him here we are going to take him down in Quebec and give him a seat. The ex-minister is quoted in a newspaper, and the other day he quoted an item in a newspaper with regard to myself and tried to make out that it was true. I came to the conclusion that the leader of the opposition was holding Quebec east and sitting for two seats in this House in order to give Mr. Graham a seat in Quebec east. That must have been the reason because, otherwise, the hon. ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lemieux) would not have made that statement. The leader of the opposition is trying to insinuate that we are withholding the election for some reason. I have felt that we should not go into the election just at this moment, or until we could get

the list in proper shape, or the latest list. I would like to see it held on the latest list if possible. I would like to see these men given an opportunity of coming down from the woods and also that those on the latest list should be able to vote at this election if an election is to be held. The candidates are out now and there is no doubt of an election being held. It is not a very long time and I do not think it is unreasonable that a sufficient delay for this purpose should take place. Therefore, I do not think that the government are entitled to censure in any way for the very few days that have elapsed since the seat became vacant.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N. B.). Mr. Speaker, I only want to refer to one statement made by the right hon. leader of the government (Mr. Borden) and that is the statement made to the effect that Mr. Low had drawn his indemnity to the end of December. It must have been made for one of two reasons, either to try to make the people of the country believe that Mr. Low did not resign on the 7th of December, or for the purpose of the statement being used in the coming by-election to the prejudice of Mr. Graham because he is being supported by Mr. Low. I want to point out that I fear the right hon. gentleman has not taken the trouble to look up the law upon the subject. Mr. Low did exactly what probably 90 per cent of the members of this House do. He received a cheque on the 7th or 8th of December for his indemnity for the month of December. I do not know by what authority these cheques are issued because by section 34 of chapter 10 of the Senate and House of Commons Act it is provided that

> The said allowance may be paid on the last day of each month, to the extent of $10 for each day's attendance, but the remainder shall be retained by the clerk or accountant of the proper House, until the close of the session, when the final payment shall be made.

By the courtesy of the officials in some way, I presume, these cheques were issued on the 7th or 8th day of December. We all know that before a member can receive his indemnity he makes a declaration that, 'I have been in my place in the House for the time during which the House has been in session with the exception of so many days a certain number of days when I was ill within ten miles of the city of Ottawa.' Mr. Low would make the same declaration which every other member of this House made and section 35, subsection 2 provides what are the days of attendance in arriving at the computation.

> Each day during the session on which there has been no sitting of such House in consequence of its having adjourned over such day, or on which the member is in the place where the session is held but is by reason of his illness unable to attend any such sitting as aforesaid, shall be reckoned as a day of attendance at such session, for the purposes of the indemnity.

Therefore, when Mr. Low made the declaration on the 8th of December that the law required him to make, the accountant of the House issued his cheque automatically and Mr. Low was absolutely entitled to it. I think that the right hon. leader of this House is getting down pretty small when he makes a statement of that kind for the purpose of making campaign material in the coming by-election.

Mr. BORDEN. The statement I made was absolutely accurate. I had it verified and I do not know what my hon. friend makes out of it. Does he say that the county was not represented during that period?

Mr. CARVELL. No, I say it is pretty small politics for the Prime Minister of Canada to play.

Mr. BORDEN. I can only say that I regard a remark of that kind, coming as it does from my hon. friend, as the highest compliment I could get.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell). Before this motion is put, I also desire to draw attention to the continued practice of the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) in defending the course which the government has taken in this case by resorting to the tu quoque argument. In order that this government may do something original, may get some small measure of policy of its own before the country, I would suggest that the time of the House might be saved if a certain space of time were allotted on some set day in which all these tu quoques could be set forth and then from that time forward we could hear something original from the government, something that they have done themselves.

The argument advanced by the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) as to Mr. Low having drawn his sessional indemnity on the 7th of December as an argument for the writ not being issued, is, I submit, completely negatived by the fact that you, Sir, issued your warrant on the 7th of December, declaring that there was a vacancy and addressing it to the proper officer who, in turn, would have issued another process were it not that he was restrained from doing so by not receiving the proper instructions from the government.

The leader of the government (Mr. Borden) sought to draw a parallel between my hon. friend, the member for Essex (Mr. Clarke) sitting dumb in this House when delays in other cases took place and his Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) sitting dumb when his conduct in regard to this

election was brought to the attention of the House by the right hon. the leader of the opposition, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a few days ago. Let me point out to the hon. leader of the government that there is a vast difference between the two cases of sitting dumb. In the case of the hon. member for Essex, the most that could be said against him was that if he did sit dumb when these delays occurred, he was merely open to reproof as one of a hundred odd members supporting the then government. But it is vastly different in the case of the Minister of Customs. His veracity was directly challenged, he not only sat dumb when the proofs in refutation of his statement were adduced, but to-day he rose in his place and did not seek to refute the facts advanced by the leader of the oppostion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in refutation of his statements in South Renfrew. Out of that comparison the member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) comes with flying colours indeed. But the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) to-day stated that his only reason for desiring a delay in this case was the state of the voters' lists, that there were a great many men up in the woods. Is it not rather singular then, when the hon. the Minister of Customs was airing his eloquence in South Renfrew, that reason never occurred to him? Is it not strange that the first time we hear that from the Minister of Customs is after he has been in South Renfrew, after he has urged as a reason for the support of his candidate the expenditure of road money and other matters calculated to interest the electorate at the time of a by-election? Is it not strange that for the first time we hear this afternoon from the Minister of Customs that his real reason for the delay in this case is the state of the voters' lists, and the fact that there are hundreds of men in the woods, about whom he is so solicitous that he desires to prolong the delay in order to give them an opportunity to vote. The instances of delay cited by the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) may or may not be pertinent to this case. One could only be sure of that if he investigated each case and ascertained whether or not parliament was in session at the time. If parliament was not in session then the cases would not be pertinent

However that may be, in the last analysis it resolves itself into another of these tu quoque arguments which does little credit to a leader of a government having such a powerful majority as the right hon. gentleman.

After all, the point raised by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) remains untouched and unanswered. The hon. member for South Essex pointed out that under the law there is always a voters' list available for an election in the older parts of Ontario. If the new list is 60 days old, that is the list and it is used. If it is not 60 days old, then, according to section 6 of the Act, the list last in force is used. As the right hon. the leader of the opposition pointed out, it is open to the government to use the lists used in the provincial election in December last. But they choose not to do so and want to create the impression that by reason of the present state of the lists, which are not complete in that county, the election cannot be brought on. If that argument were to be admitted then all elections in Canada, both general and by-elections, would be made dependent on the state of the voters' lists, and not upon the action of the government of the day. In other words, an election could be put off indefinitely owing to the delay, neglect or incompetence of municipal clerks in Ontario in not sending in lists in due time. The falsity of that argument is apparent when it is stated. The law is specific, there is a list available and I submit that from what I have heard as to the reasons in this case, it never entered the minds of the government until two days ago to charge as a reason for delay in going on with this election that the lists were not ready. Having regard to the large number of electors on the list in South Renfrew and to the fact that the list for only one township is still in doubt, I say that my hon. friends are deprived of the very reason they advanced for not proceeding with this election. As a matter of fact, the list which was sent back for revision was sent back because of a mere typographical error, one that is obvious on its face. I am advised that the court was held yesterday or to-day for the revision of that list and it will be back in the hands of the clerk of the Crown in Chancery either to-day or to-morrow. It bears date of January 15, and will be in force from that day, so that to-day, if the right hon. the leader of the government were so willed, he could issue the writ for this election. In view of what has been said and of the obvious duty of the government, I venture to express the hope that the writ will issue without any further delay.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

THE OCEAN LIMITED.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. When were the so-called Ocean Limited trains, known as trains No. 199 to 200, first put in operation on the Intercolonial railway?

2. At the time of the inauguration of these trains, was there an order issued prohibiting the transportation of official and private cars by said trains?

3. If so, when was such order recalled or repealed, if it were repealed or recalled?

4. Has the said prohibitive order been in operation during the years 1910 and 1911? If not, when did it first cease to be in operation?

5. What number of such official or private cars were transported during the said year 1910?

6. How many of such cars were transported by said trains during the year 1911, and on how many occasions were cars of the officials of the Intercolonial railway transported during the past season?

7. Were there any occasions when two of such official cars of the Board of Management were hauled on any one of such trains?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The Ocean Limited trains were first put in operation in July, 1904, No. 200 leaving Montreal July 3rd, and No. 199 leaving Halifax July 4th.

2. Yes.

3. The order was not recalled or repealed, but in special cases official and private cars have been put on these trains. The first occasion there is any record of, being the Governor General's car on August 4, 1904, from Lévis to Montreal.

4. See answer to No. 3.

5. Thirty-two cars, as follows:

1910.

No. of times attached to	No. 200.	To 199.
G.T.R. 'Muskoka'	3	1
D. & H., 'Miniola'	3	0
Official Govt. No. 28	7	2
Official Govt. No. 37	3	2
C.P.R. official car No. 2	1	0
Official Govt. No. 34	5	4
Private Pullman 'Olivet'	1	1
Official Govt. 'Ottawa'	1	0
Private Pullman 'Conroy'	1	1
Private Pullman 'Signet'	1	1
I.C.R. 'Campbellton'	1	3
Private Pullman 'Constitution'	1	0
Nat. Trans. Ry. 'Transcona'	1	0
Official Govt. No. 35	0	1
Private Pullman 'Plymouth Rock'	0	1
Private Pullman 'Oceanic'	0	1
B. & A. official No. 490	0	1
Que. & Lake St. John Ry. 'Kamagamie'	0	1
St. L. & T. Ry. 'Frisco' No. 502	0	1
Private car 'York'	0	1
Private car 'Cornwall'	0	1
H. & S. W. Ry. No. 201	0	1

1911.

	200	199
G.T.R. 'Muskoka'	4	1
Official Govt. No. 28	3	0
Official Govt. No. 37	5	3
Official Govt. No. 34	5	3
Official Govt. 'Ottawa'	3	0
Private Pullman 'Signet'	0	1
I.C.R. 'Campbellton'	2	2
Son. Ry. No. 105	1	0
Nat. Trans. Ry. 'Transcona'	3	6
G.T.R. 'Bonaventure'	1	1
Private Pullman 'Federal'	1	1
Q.C.R. 'Sherbrooke'	1	1
Official Govt. No. 35	5	7
Private Pullman 'Sunset'	1	0
N.T. Ry. 'National'	9	4
Official Govt. No. 139	1	1
Private Pullman 'Rocket'	1	0
P.R. Co. No. 180	1	0
C. B. & Q. No. 93	0	1

Cars of officials were transported 31 times, which number is included in the above statement.

7. No.

EMPLOYMENT OF J. E. LAFORCE.

Mr. DELISLE:

Has J. E. Laforce, farmer, of the county of Rimouski, been appointed immigration agent by the government? If not, does he hold any employment whatever in the service of the government, and what is his salary?

Mr. ROGERS. As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, no.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the Minister of Railways and Canals aware that Alfred Couture, of Causapscal, one of the employees on the Intercolonial railway, has been dismissed without investigation?

2. Has an investigation been asked by said Alfred Couture. If so, has it been refused?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. No.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What was the date of employment of Truman Gass as cleaner in the Intercolonial railway shops at Truro, N.S.?

2. On what date was this man dismissed, and why was he dismissed?

3. At whose instance was he dismissed, and was there any investigation?

4. If so, was any charge proven against Mr. Gass?

5. How many cleaners have been taken into the employ of the Intercolonial railway at Truro, N.S.., between the 10th day of October, 1911, and the 25th day of January, 1912?

6. What is the name and date of each appointment?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Truman Gass was first employed as cleaner at Truro, on the 20th October, 1910, but only as a temporary employee.

2. He was dropped on the 30th November, 1911, as he failed to pass the doctor's examination and could not become an employee in accordance with the Provident Fund Act.

3. There was no charge preferred and no investigation held.

4. Answered by number three.

5. Eight cleaners have been taken into the employ at Truro between the 10th October, 1911 and the 25th January, 1912.

6. Roy Campbell, November 20, 1911 Edward Nichols, November 23, 1911; George Stewart, December 4, 1911; Chas. Chute, December 6, 1911; Oscar Macdonald, December 9, 1911; Foster Dart, December 11, 1911; Harry McLeod, January 3, 1912; Wm. Scothern, January 11, 1912.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) :

1. Has the Postmaster General been requested to dismiss from office Mr. Charles McEachern, postmaster at West Tatamagouche, Colchester county, N.S.?
2. If so, upon what grounds are such requests made, and has Mr. McEachern been dismissed?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. (a) On the ground of active partisanship and inconvenient site of office.
(b) No. Matter under consideration.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has W. W. Payson, postmaster at Deep Brook, Annapolis, N.S., been dismissed?
2. If so, what are the charges upon which he was dismissed, and was any opportunity given the accused to disprove them?
3. Who asked to have the dismissal made?
4. Will the Postmaster General grant an inquiry into the truth of the charges?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2, 3 and 4. Charges of active partisanship have been preferred against the postmaster and the matter is under inquiry.

THE PRINTING BUREAU.

* Mr. MURPHY:

Have the weekly consultation meetings between the King's Printer and the heads of the several branches at the Printing Bureau been continued since October 10, 1911?

Mr. ROCHE:

No.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. Have any changes been made in the duties of any of the employees of the Printing Bureau since October 10, 1911?
2. If so, what are the names of the employees affected by such changes?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. Norbert Larochelle and William Wallace.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—INQUIRY OF JEFFREY BOURQUE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the government aware that Mr. Jeffrey Bourque, of Lac au Saumon, P.Q., a switchman in the employment of the Intercolonial railway, is said to have sustained serious injuries in the discharge of his duty at the Intercolonial railway stationyard at Campbellton, N.B., on the 17th November, 1911?

Mr. COCHRANE.

2. Has any claim for damages, or request for steady employment been made to the government by the said Jeffrey Bourque, or any other person on his behalf by reason of the said accident?
3. Has any report been made to the government or Railway Department by any of the Intercolonial railway officials in connection with above accident? If so, when, by whom, nd what are the contents thereof?
4. Has the government or Railway Department paid any damages or offered any settlement, or any steady employment on the intercolonial railway, to the said Jeffery Bourque, or does it intend to do so? If so, when.

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. Yes. By his father P. Bourque, in letters dated November 19th, 1911, December 1st, 1911, January 17th, 1912, also a letter addressed to the Honourable Minister from Mr. H. Boulay, M.P., recommending that something be done in the case of Mr. Bourque's son.
3. Yes. By telegraph message dated 17th November, 1911, the date of the accident, from the General Superintendent, addressed to the chairman of the Managing Board, stating that while yardman J. Bourque was assisting weighing car in Campbellton yard early this morning and holding on side ladder, struck switch approaching the scale and was thrown under wheels of car, cutting his right arm off.
4. No damages have been paid nor settlement offered. Bourque is not yet able to work; he has been paid weekly benefits from the date he was injured as follows:—Three dollars per week in addition to which the Insurance Association will pay hospital expenses and for surgical attendance at Campbellton. The payments will be continued until he is able to go to work, provided time does not exceed 26 weeks.
The Managing Board has under consideration the matter of providing Mr. Bourque with employment when he is able to return to work.

THE CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

When does the Minister of Agriculture expect to pay the balance due to the census enumerators?

Mr. BURRELL:

Payment of the balances due census enumerators is being made as rapidly as is practicable. It is expected that it will be completed by the end of February.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. SEVIGNY:

1. What sums have been paid since 1905, by the government or by the Transcontinental Commission to Mr. Edmond Taschereau, notary, of Quecbec?
2. For what reasons were such sums paid?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1:—

January 21, 1907	$ 677 21
September 14, 1907	745 48
March 18, 1908	520 00
May 15, 1908	746 00
July 18, 1908	1,419 91
September 25, 1908	1,449 35
November 23, 1908	1,965 39
July 12, 1909	1,300 00
July 19, 1910	949 24
September 20, 1911	600 49
September 26, 1911	532 95
September 26, 1911	3,061 45
	$13,968 37

2. Legal expenses in connection with right of way.

Mr. SEVIGNY:

What sums have been paid, since 1908, to Messrs. Alexandre Taschereau, Arthur Cannon, or to the law firm of Taschereau, Roy Cannon, Parent and Fitzpatrick, Quebec, by the government or by the Transcontinental Commission?

Mr. COCHRANE:

Statement of amounts paid to Mr. L. A. Taschereau since 1908, by the National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners:

March 1, 1909	$1,276 50
August 10, 1909	660 00
December 20, 1909	555 00
March 30, 1910	489 50
September 19, 1910	427 50
October 17, 1910	250 00
November 17, 1910	186 23
November 21, 1910	255 00
March 25, 1911	330 00
April 19, 1911	423 50
August 4, 1911	372 00
September 27, 1911	400 00
January 26, 1912	473 00
	$6,098 23

To Mr. L. A. Cannon since 1908: December 22, 1911, $126. Nothing was paid to the firm of Taschereau, Roy, Cannon, Parent & Fitzpatrick since 1908, by the National Transcontinental railway.

Amount paid by the Department of Railways and Canals for the Intercolonial railway since 1908, to Taschereau and Cannon is $250.85. To the firm of Taschereau, Roy, Cannon, Parent & Fitzpatrick since 1908, $792.79; to L. A. Taschereau, $97.20.

Mr. LAVALLEE:

1. What position does Mr. A. E. Doucet, civil engineer, hold on the Transcontinental railway?
2. What is his salary?
3. What are his functions?
4. Was it his duty to fix the sites for stations along the line of the Transcontinental railway within the district under his control as engineer?
5. Has he so far selected the sites for such stations in the county of Bellechasse?
6. After having determined upon the sites for such stations has he changed his mind and selected other locations for such stations?
7. What are the stations that have been thus changed?
8. When were they changed, for what reasons, and at whose request?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. District engineer, district 'B.'
2. $400 per month.
3. Has charge of location and construction of district 'B.'
4. It was his duty to recommend the location of the stations in conjunction with the assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway.
5. Yes.
6. No.
7. Answered by No. 6.
8. Answered by No. 6.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all minutes of proceedings, records, orders, instructions or other writings made and had, or given or authorized to be made, had or given by the Board of National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, from the date of the appointment of Mr. R. W. Leonard, as a member of the said Board and chairman thereof, to the present date; also of all letters, telegrams, instructions or other documents made or had or passed, since the said appointment by and between the Minister of Railways and Canals, or other members of the government or by any person by authority of the government and the said chairman of Board of National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, or the secretary of said Board; also of any orders in council relating to the appointment of an assistant chairman or an assistant to the chairman of said Board, together with a copy of all letters, papers, instructions or documents relating thereto; as well as a statement of all payments of moneys in the way of salaries or compensation made to the incumbent of the office of assistant chairman or assistant to the chairman of said Board, and of all papers, letters or instructions made, written or received by the said minister or the said chairman relating to or in any way connected with the payment or authorization of said salary or compensation.—Mr. Emmerson.

For a copy of all papers, statements, letters, telegrams, statement of claim and application, minutes of the evidence taken on any investigation held, with all reports thereon, and all other documents in any way relating to a claim of Earl Ash, for damages caused by and resulting from the destruction by fire of property owned, occupied and possessed by the claimant, alleged to have been caused by fire and sparks from a locomotive of the Intercolonial Railway of Canada, and operated by said railway.—Mr. Emmerson.

For a copy of all letters, complaints, telegrams, evidence, reports, or other papers, relating to charges against Robert Leithead, James Blair, Duncan Gillis, and Calvin McKenzie, all employees of the Intercolonial

Railway, in the county of Pictou, for partisanship and to the investigation of said charges.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of the letters patent relating to the office of Governor General of Canada, of the commission issued to the present Governor General, and of the instructions accompanying the same.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports and other documents in relation to the mail contract service between Stellarton station and the post office since October 1, 1911, and as to the cancellation of the contract for said service with the present contractor.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, reports and other documents in relation to the mail contract between River John railway station and the post office, and between River John and Hodson, respectively, since October 1, 1911, and as to the cancellation of the contract for said service with Elijah Logan and the making of a contract for the same with one Gannon.—Mr. Macdonald.

TELEPHONES IN RURAL POST OFFICES.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). moved:—

That, in the opinion of this House, wherever a telephone system exists, or is hereafter established, in any rural section of Canada, a telephone should be placed in each post office in such sections by the Post Office Department.

He said: Before this motion is dealt with I would like to make a few remarks. It has always been the pride of Canada that we should have a first class postal service in every part of the country. I think the efforts of every government since confederation have been directed towards this end, and the resolution I am moving this afternoon has for its object the giving of better mail accommodation to the farmers in the rural districts of our country.

For many years we had but one telephone system in Canada, the Bell. It was found that telephones became a necessity as years went on, and to-day they are a paramount necessity in every part of the country. In many parts of Canada other telephone systems have been established in competition with the Bell system and assist in giving a better telephone communication to the farmers in different sections of the country.

In Peel county one township council has issued bonds and constructed its own telephone system, and is reaching almost every house in the township. This applies also to many other counties in Canada. The result is that the farmers have the advantage of a telephone in their homes. My resolution provides that whenever such a system is operated either by the Bell Telephone Company or by any other company, the Post Office Department shall connect the post office in that section, at the expense of the government.

Mr. COCHRANE.

The salary paid to the country postmaster to-day is so small that in some cases postmasters are unwilling or unable to put a telephone in their houses for the accommodation of the farmers.

As this House is well aware, the question of a better salary for country postmasters has been the subject of discussion for many years; complimentary to the late government, I may say that they increased the salary of the rural postmasters, and, to that extent, received the approval of the people of this country. I think it should be the aim of the government now in power to further increase the salaries of the postmasters in rural districts.

Some hon. members. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. That is one of the objects of this resolution. It is not my idea that the government should put in a telephone system where one does not now exist. I simply propose that the government should go over the field and where telephone systems are in operation have the rural post offices connected up at the expense of the government. I think it would be in the interest of the people of this country if that were done.

Mr. NESBITT. Would the hon. gentleman allow me a question? Would you propose to increase the salary of the postmaster or postmistress where telephones are put in? Of course, the telephone would mean extra work.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a fair question, and one which should receive consideration.

As I said a moment ago my aim is to assist the government, if they require assistance in this way, or rather to impress the government with the fact that under this resolution they would have an opportunity of increasing the very small salaries which are now paid to the rural postmasters throughout the country.

My hon. friend's question, if I understand it correctly, assumes that if such a policy were adopted by the government, and telephones were installed in the different post offices, it would increase the labour of the postmasters in these post offices. That is very likely true, although personally I do not think it would be very much more labour for the postmaster, if, for example, a farmer living within a mile or so of the post office should call up on the telephone and ask if there was any mail in the office for him. I do not think it would take much more of the postmaster's time to answer the telephone than it would to entertain the farmer for half an hour if he came down to find out whether there was anything in the post office for him.

Mr. NESBITT. They do both.

Mr. BLAIN. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that the farmers do not complain a great deal about going to the post office when they receive mail, but they do complain of the number of times they travel themselves, or send somebody, and come home without anything. That is exactly what I wish to avoid.

I think it is only fair that when the enterprise of the people in a rural section of this country has reached the point where they will invest their own money to have a telephone system, that the government should join them and see that the postal system of the country is connected up with the telephone system. I think that is a reasonable request, and one which should appeal to the judgment of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

In the large centres of population they have a daily delivery. In smaller centres they are close to the post office, and somebody is passing it almost every day, therefore, the task of going for the mail is not a very serious one, and is not at all comparable with what they have to meet in the rural districts.

I am not asking in this resolution that the government expend its money in the construction of telephone systems. That has already been taken up in some places by private enterprise. In some of the provinces it has been dealt with by the provincial governments. I do not ask that this government should appropriate a large amount of money for this purpose, but I do ask that we simply follow the people—not lead the people in this instance—and where they have telephonic communication, the government should join with them and see that the post offices are connected with the telephone system, so that there may be a good and efficient service.

At the present time most of the farmers in these rural sections can call up their storekeepers, or their neighbours. If that be true, I say it is in the interest of the farmer, and calculated to make the home life on the farm more acceptable, that the government should see to it that the post offices in these sections are connected, so that the entire system would be perfect and up to date.

I do not think that the resolution is one which requires any extended remarks from me. This is a matter which has had consideration in this House in former years. At the last session I had the honour of directing the attention of the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to the matter, and he was good enough to say he thought it was worthy of very serious consideration. Now, I am quite sure he is still of that opinion.

I am not going to press the question on the government. I realize it has been in office but a short time, and has had many things to face and deal with. I am not going to be over anxious, but in these days of people demanding a better postal service, I think the time is opportune to take up this subject.

There are a good many sections of the country to which this resolution would not apply, but, in other sections, even in the province of Ontario, there are still many places where they only have a mail three times a week, and in some cases only twice a week. In fact, in some places not at all, as my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) says.

I have many facts and figures which I could cite, but I do not think I should take up the time of the House with them. However, if my hon. friends on both sides of this House will support this resolution, simple as it is, I think they will receive the approval of the rural districts of our country.

In conclusion, I simply wish to move the adoption of the resolution, and direct the attention of the goverment, and more particularly of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) to an earnest and thoughtful consideration of the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. My attention has been drawn to this resolution, and after looking up the authorities I must say my verdict is that the resolution is out of order inasmuch as it implies the purchase and putting in of telephones, which must be paid for out of the revenues of the country.

Mr. PELLETIER. If the House is willing, we might allow the discussion to go on by consent. This is a matter of public interest and one of considerable importance. At all events, the debate on it will probably be adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I would be bound to rule on it, for two or three reasons. In the first place all proposals to this House calling for the expenditure of public money must come from a minister of the Crown and not from a private member. Also, the consent of the government must be given to the consideration of such proposals. The second reason is that all resolutions which involve a charge on the public revenue must be considered in Committee of the Whole House, not by motion, as it is proposed to do in this case. 'Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure,' page 567, third edition, says:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost to any purpose that has not been first recommended by a message of the Governor

General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is proposed.

The constitutional provision which regulates the procedure of the Canadian House of Commons in this respect applies not only to motions directly proposing a grant of public money but also to those which involve such a grant.

It is clear to me that if this motion carried it would involve such a grant.

A member who has not received the permission of the Crown has not been allowed to move the House into committee on a resolution providing for the purchase and exportation by the government of certain depreciated silver coinage.

Then with regard to the other question, I find this in 'May's Parliamentary Practice,' speaking of the authority of the Crown:

By a standing order, 20th March, 1866, 'This House will receive no petition for any sum relating to public service, or proceed upon any motion for a grant or charge upon the public revenues, whether payable out of the consolidated fund, or out of monies to be provided by parliament, but what is recommended from the Crown.' And this rule is extended, by the uniform practice of the House, to any motion which, though not directly proposing a grant or charge upon the public revenue, involves the expenditure of public money.

The purchase of these telephones would clearly involve an expenditure of public money. For these reasons I should be obliged to rule that the motion is out of order.

Mr. PELLETIER. The only thing I want to make clear is that I did not raise any objection.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose there will be no objection in allowing the discussion to go on. I did not propose to press the resolution, it was my intention to withdraw it. I appreciate what the Speaker has said, and I do not wish to violate the rules. If necessary, I would ask that the resolution be allowed to stand, until such time as I could move an adjournment in committee, so as to bring it within the rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the motion has now been ruled out of order, there is nothing before the House.

NATIONAL MEANS OF COMMUNICATION.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved:

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

He said: My object in asking for the appointment of this commission is to obtain definite data and statistics with reference to these great public utilities. In the Halifax platform, which was issued in August, 1907, the present Prime Minister of Canada used the following words:

It has been demonstrated in Great Britain that telegraphs and telephones can be successfully operated in connection with the Post Office Department. I see no reason why a similar system should not be inaugurated and carried out successfully in Canada. Few people realize that at the present time Canada owns and operates 6,586 miles of state telegraph lines. These lines have not been remunerative for the reason that they have been established in thinly settled portions of the country where private enterprise could find no adequate return. If we are prepared to invest national capital in thinly peopled and unremunerative localities, why should we hesitate in those portions of the country where operations can be carried on at a profit? I do not forget the necessity that our great railways must be equipped with telegraph and telephone lines, nor do I forget the principle of justice to invested capital which I have already invoked. Having regard to these considerations our policy should include the establishment, after due investigation, of a system of national telegraphs and telephones under conditions which shall be just to capital already invested.

I feel satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that out of the Halifax platform have already come many great reforms in the Dominion of Canada, but none greater than the proposed legislation. I think we should go about acquiring these great public utilities under the common-sense business methods, and there is no question in my mind that if they were nationalized they would become a source, not only of revenue, but of great advantage to the people of Canada. There are five great means of transmitting intelligence in this country: The telegraph, the telephone, wireless telegraphy, cables, and the post office. All these means of transmitting intelligence are of vital importance to every man, woman and child in the country. It is, therefore, our duty to investigate and gather statistics with regard to these important facilities, with a view to nationalize them, and make them part of the Post Office Department of Canada. I propose to give some reasons for asking for this legislation. For the past five years I have given considerable time and attention to gathering statistics with regard to these great national undertakings. Knowing as I do the success that

has attended the nationalization of these utilities in foreign lands, I feel confident that the time is not far distant when the people of Canada will demand, at least, that an investigation be made with a view to placing these utilities under the Dominion government. In the platform of the right hon. the Prime Minister, which I have quoted, he refers to these utilities. He calls attention to the fact that we had in Canada at that time over 6,000 miles of telegraph lines that were not remunerative. To-day we have 8,000 miles of telegraph lines, owned, controlled, and operated by the Dominion government; and these telegraph lines, instead of being a source of revenue to the government, cost this country last year the sum of $270,000. We have over 600 offices for the management of these telegraphic enterprises. The largest telegraph company we have in the Dominion of Canada, namely, the Canadian Pacific railway, control, own and operate over 12,000 miles of pole lines, and over 76,000 miles of wire; and their income, after paying all expenses, amounted last year to the handsome sum of $1,270,000.

That amount, according to the books which the Canadian Pacific Railway placed at the disposal of the railway commission within the last few weeks, shows that they only invested in that enterprise, $6,600,000. You can readily see that within six years, by that method of calculation, the amount of capital invested would be returned to them in dividends. You will find that the Canadian Pacific Railway have been able to reaudit the statement of the audit office as placed before the railway commission. They have tried to show that there are certain charges which should have been included in the statement of the investment which came from their own audit office, but after investigating that you cannot come to any other conclusion than I have that, in so far as these statements are concerned, they are not worthy of consideration and that the actual income from the investment of $6,600,000 amounted last year to $1,270,000.

Let us take the next greatest telegraph company we have in the Dominion of Canada, the Great Northwestern, with its 17,000 miles of pole lines and its 50,000 miles of wire. They have been able to cover up their earnings to a very great extent because a large portion of their stock is held in the United States and the enterprise is controlled and operated from that point. If you take into consideration all the other telegraph lines in the Dominion of Canada—and when I say that, I am speaking in reference to the telegraph lines of the railways—you will come to the conclusion that the Canadian Pacific Railway own, operate and control nearly half the miles of pole line and more than half the miles of wire in Canada and if that company are able to place before the Railway Commission figures which go to show that they have only invested $6,600,000 in the enterprise, it is not too much to expect that if we were to attempt to purchase all the telegraph lines and wires in Canada the cost should not exceed $13,000,000 or $14,000,000. But then, you would have control of the telegraph wires that operate our railways; so that you have to take from that the wires necessary to operate the railway systems. When you came to figure it up you would find that you could not possibly invest more than, say $10,000,000, in order to enable you to own and operate the commercial telegraph lines. Ten million dollars is not such an enormous amount when you take into consideration the rates which have been charged against people in the east and in the west and at the same time the manner in which this public utility has been conducted. In addition to that the Canadian Pacific railway are paid through our Own Cable board $65,000 per annum in connection with the cable service, which would help to pay the interest on our own capital.

Now, I desire to refer to the telephone companies and to call your attention to the fact that we have 460 independent telephone companies in Ontario while, in the Dominion, it is estimated that we have in the neighbourhood of a thousand telephone companies. In the United States they have 15,000 independent telephone companies operating over 4,000,000 phones and costing, as they claim, over $400,000,000. The independent telephone companies in our country are practically on their knees to the great Bell Telephone Company, especially in the eastern provinces and the proposal that I have to make to parliament is that we should own the trunk lines of telephone, that these trunk lines should go to the independent companies and let the municipalities or the independent companies own, control and operate these lines and make them local concerns. After investigating to some extent the operation of telephone lines in different foreign countries I find that the most feasible plan, as far as Canada is concerned, is that we should at once either take over the trunk lines and operate them or else build trunk lines in Canada in connection with the telegraph lines because we must recognize that the telegraph and telephone should go hand-in-hand. Wires that are used for one service can readily be used for the other. The provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta own and operate their own telephone systems. We should, at the earliest possible date connect up the eastern trunk lines with that great northwestern country and with these great western provinces so that we will be able to assist in such a way as would be possible, did we own, as we should, the telegraph and tele-

phone lines running through that western country.

Mr. McCRANEY. Does the hon. gentleman propose that this parliament should take over the lines which are now under the control of these three western provinces?

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). I have no such proposition in my mind. I do not think it would be advisable for this government to go into the different municipalities in Canada and attempt to own, control and operate these lines. In many foreign countries they have systems whereby they do control, own and operate all the telephone and telegraph lines in those countries, such as Germany, but in other places, where they own and operate trunk lines and where they have connected them up with the municipalities they find that it is an altogether better system and that the conditions which arise in the different municipalities are such that they have an altogether better service.

We have in Canada some twenty-five wireless telegraph stations. Some years ago the late government entered into a contract with the Marconi Company for the construction by that company of a number of wireless stations in Canada. The Marconi Company agreed to build these wireless stations for $5,000 each and to include in each station comfortable homes for the operators in charge. From a return which I asked last year we find that these stations have cost Canada from $10,000 to $20,000 each and that in addition to this we are paying tens of thousands of dollars to the Marconi Company to operate a large proportion of those wireless telegraph stations. But we are in this position with regard to these great utilities. As far as the telegraph system is concerned we own and control the lean end of it, the productive end is turned over to the great monopolies. It is the same with the telephone system. You find rural districts doing their utmost to gather together a sufficient number of people to organize independent companies in rural districts in order that they may have some of the comforts which accrue from a telephone system. But the productive end of the telephone system is owned, operated and controlled by the Bell Telephone Company in Ontario and Quebec and in some of the eastern provinces by other telephone companies.

The wireless telegraph stations are in much the same position. I want the House to recognize that we have some twenty-five wireless telegraph stations in Canada costing from $10,000 to $20,000 each. Fifteen of these stations are controlled by the Marconi Telegraph people. They are the profitable end of the wireless telegraph stations. The unprofitable end of that whole system is operated by this government at a very great loss. I am a firm believer in wireless telegraphy being taken over as a public utility and placed under the control and operation of this government in order that not only our shores may receive the splendid advantages that accrue from having these stations established there but that, in the not far distant future, we may have stations throughout the Dominion of Canada and that the long distances that separate our east from our great west may be overcome by a system of wireless telegraphy.

I shall also endeavour to place before the House a number of statistics with reference to parcel post systems in European countries. The position of the parcel post system is similar to that of the other utilities to which I have referred. Our Post Office Department does the unprofitable end of the carrying of parcels in this country, the profitable end is done by the express companies, and they are able to pay dividends of 100 per cent and 200 per cent on their capital. The unprofitable end is done by the Post Office Department, but as soon as it gets up to a few ounces in weight the postal rate begins to be prohibitive and the express companies step in and take the remunerative end of the parcel post. I have no desire to urge upon the House the need of establishing a parcel post for Canada; I shall only urge the need of establishing a parcel post system in the rural districts, what you might term a rural parcel post. This parcel post system will be confined to rural mail or stage routes and only there so that the great departmental houses will not have the advantages that many of the people of our country are inclined to think they might have if we had a general parcel post system for the Dominion.

I trust that my good friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) will not think I am encroaching on his duties as Postmaster General, in placing this resolution before the House. I hope that this commission, if it is appointed, will have the privilege of gathering in other lands material that will be of untold benefit to the Post Office Department of Canada, and that they will report to the Postmaster General on the important matters of rural free mail delivery and parcel post in other countries. Our present system of rural free mail delivery is not only extravagant, but it is breeding contention and strife in the different districts in which it is in operation, and I would throw out as a suggestion to the Postmaster General that the time has come when the Post Office Department will have to make a separate branch for this service and place over it a man who is not only competent, but is willing and ready to further the interests of rural free mail delivery in Canada. I believe that

many of the inspectors in the department to-day are not anxious to further the interests of rural mail delivery, they do not like to assume the added responsibilities that it entails. I sincerely hope the day is not far distant when the Postmaster General will undertake these reforms, and that he will see that these inspectors will do their duty in this regard and will carry out the wishes of the people in reference to this great national undertaking.

I would like to place before the House some figures with regard to the telegraph systems of Canada.

Canada owns in government-owned telegraphs and cables, 8,406 miles, of which 8,150 miles are telegraph lines, or land lines. She has 603 offices, and the number of messages sent in 1910-11 amounted to 249,915. The expenditure in 1910-11 amounted to $432,970.04, while the revenue amounted to only $169,585.15, leaving a deficit of $263,384.89.

The Canadian government get the lean end of the telegraph business. In the same way they get the lean end of the cable, telephone and postal business, while the monopolies have control of the profitable end of these systems.

Note the fact that the Dominion has 603 offices with only 8,000 miles of line, while the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, the only one that competes with the Canadian Pacific railway in extent of mileage, own, as they did in 1910-11, 11,234 miles of pole lines, and 50,092 miles of wire line, and sent 2,907,495 messages, having only 1,183 offices, or less than double the number of offices run by the Canadian government, and send three times as many messages.

The Canadian Pacific railway in that year operated 12,257 miles of pole lines, with 76,175 miles of wire, sending messages to the extent of 3,431,493, and the total number of their offices is 1,372, or a little over double the offices now operated by the government.

The Western Union, the third largest of the chartered companies, in 1910 had 2,639 miles of telegraph pole lines, with 11,024 miles of wire, sending 551,764 messages, with 217 offices.

The North American Telegraph Company, Limited, in 1910 operated 605 miles of line and 783 miles of wire, and sent 38,015 messages with 83 offices.

The Grand Trunk Pacific railway in 1910 operated 1,699 miles of pole lines, 5,081 miles of wire, and 71,154 messages, with 73 offices.

The Algoma Central railway in 1910 had 130 miles of line, 174 miles of line wire, sent 3,639 messages, and had only four offices.

The Temiscamingue and Northern Ontario railway in 1910 had 265 miles of pole line and 1,865 miles of wire, and sent 131,106 messages with twenty-two offices.

The total number of miles of pole line owned by all the companies in Canada is 28,729.

The total number of miles of line and wire operated by telegraph, telephone and cable companies in 1910 was 145,997.

The total number of messages taken and delivered over all these lines, not including press messages, was 7,134,665.

The total number of offices was 2,934.

You will readily see that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company own and operate nearly half the total number of miles of pole line in the Dominion, and over half the miles of wire, and send nearly half the messages; so that with an estimate placed before you by that company of less than seven million of dollars as the value of their pole lines, lines of wire, etc., the estimate I have made of $15,000,000 would be more than sufficient to purchase all the telegraph lines in existence in Canada to-day. The annual charge for this amount of money at three per cent would be $400,000. In order to make the proposition pay interest at three per cent on $15,000,000 you would need a surplus of $400,000 per annum. The surplus of the Canadian Pacific Railway telegraphs operating half the proposed mileage has been over one million per year on the average for the past six years. If, on the other hand, we were to buy the Canadian Pacific Railway system and charged them so much for operating their trains over that system, the government getting the rest, there would be a still greater revenue. At the present rates of messages the government could count on a profit of one million dollars per year. So on an investment of $7,000,000 the government could count on having their money returned in at least six years, or the earnings could be applied to a reduction of rates.

I have some figures which have been placed before the Railway Commission within the last few weeks by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I will ask the House to be allowed to place them on 'Hansard.'

Mr. PELLETIER. I do not think the House would object to my hon. friend placing these figures on 'Hansard,' as they are most interesting.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I appreciate what the Postmaster General has said. These are copies of statements taken from the audit books of the Canadian Pacific Railway telegraph line, showing the commercial end of their business.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Estimate of Value of Plant.

Pole line and equipment	$3,897,238 39
Wires	2,190,965 37
Cables	275,044 11
Call box system, Toronto to Montreal, &c., 4,865 boxes at $7 each.	34,055 00
104 linemen's equipment at $138.25.	14,378 00
37 gang's equipment (G. and B.) at $646.49	23,920 13
Instruments	119,149 40
Batteries and dynamos	50,559 00
Furniture	41,109 00
Material in stock	50,000 00
	$6,606,421 40

Summary of Miles of Lines and Canadian Pacific Railway, estimate of Value.

	Miles.	Cost.
Atlantic division	1,047	$332,141 42
Eastern division	1,642	466,806 14
Ontario division	1,873	566,722 86
Lake Superior division	1,117	519,700 67
Manitoba division	2,333	636,792 19
Saskatchewan division	1,349	333,308 91
Alberta division	1,448	476,750 33
British Columbia division.	1,299	565,011 87
Miles of pole line	12,108	$3,897,238 39
C.P.R. Tel. miles of wire	75,872	

This averages $321.87 per mile for poles and cross arms, including labour. $44.25 for one wire gives actual cost of 1 wire.

STATEMENT OF C.P.R. REVENUE OF TELEGRAPH BUSINESS.

Earnings.	Year ending June 30. 1906.	1907.	1908.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Local and C.P.R. proportion of conjoint	1,016,505 16	1,243,276 16	1,173,859 33
C.P.R. proportion of conjoint checks	441,937 86	414,542 71	296,747 23
Press	78,329 13	83,218 98	81,319 52
Markets	5,005 32	5,217 47	3,586 13
Guaranteed Messages	3,059 60	3,835 42	3,700 59
Cables, (C.P.R. proportion)	52,793 92	61,874 14	63,658 90
Premiums and tolls on money transfers	5,273 04	7,034 05	7,729 63
Connections	2,982 57	2,774 18	3,173 69
Leased wires	60,557 17	55,333 80	55,793 02
Pole rentals	8,160 68	8,342 36	7,910 04
Weather reports	10,886 65	11,226 59	11,024 34
Sundries	2,067 50	2,515 35	12,177 72
Total	$1,687,558 60	$1,900,444 39	$1,713,219 82

Earnings.	1909.	1910.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Local and C.P.R. proportion of conjoint	1,300,564 22	1,550,255 21
C.P.R. proportion of conjoint checks	295,807 85	346,963 22
Press	76,683 96	79,775 55
Markets	5,859 31	5,385 22
Guaranteed messages	3,851 03	4,529 99
Cables, C.P.R. proportion	63,735 34	79,479 39
Premiums and tolls on money transfers	8,307 26	9,741 97
Connections	5,166 14	3,731 39
Leased wires	66,398 50	73,043 95
Pole rentals	7,910 04	16,645 27
Weather reports	11,024 34	10,806 84
Sundries	12,177 72	1,180 00
Total	1,855,785 71	2,171,518 00

Mr. ARMSTRONG (E. Lambton).

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPH LINES.

Earnings, Years 1885 to 1910 (Audit Office Statement of Earnings, Expenses and Net figures).

Period.	Earnings.	Expenses.	Net Earnings.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Year ending June 30, '11	2,467,042.30	1,196,899.08	1,270,143.22
" " " 30, '10	2,171,518.00	1,057,783.35	1,113,734.65
" " " 30, '09	1,855,785.71	933,137.61	922,648.10
" " " 30, '08	1,713,219,82	887,534.41	825,685.41
" " " 30, '07	1,900,444.39	882,640.87	1,017,803.52
" " " 30, '06	1,687,558.60	728,762.24	958,796.36
" " " 30. '05	1,423,662.33	635,432.50	788.229.83
" " " 30, '04	1,316,609.87	590,722.89	725,886.98
" " " 30, '03	1,230,982.01	547,438.15	683,543.86
" " " 30, '02	1,045,926.06	492,902.88	553,023.18
Six months to " 30, '01	451,749.71	218,295.29	233,454.42
Year ending Dec. 31, '00	912,775.18	463,516.05	449,259.13
" " " 31, '99	943,639.54	489,807.64	453,831.90
" " " 31, '98	989,327.57	457,097.36	532,230.21
" " " 31, '97	764,640.41	377,576.69	387,063.72
" " " 31, '96	642,397.03	336,030.71	306,566.32
" " " 31, '95	592,672.05	302,261.34	290,410.71
" " " 31, '94	604,817.75	342,411.52	262,406.23
" " " 31, '93	633,634.31	335,736.80	297,897.51
" " " 31, '92	648,973.92	345,986.39	302,987.53
" " " 31, '91	629,092.07	328,707.66	300,384.41
" " " 31, '90	549,422.44	288,697.36	260,725.08
" " " 31, '89	459,962,44	241,757.76	218,204.68
" " " 31, '88	407,932.30	207,952.76	199,979.64
" " " 31, '87	345,159.19	180,794.89	164,364.30
" " " 31, '86	105,467.72	50,619.25	54,848.47
" " " 31, '85	85,465.19	19,692.15	65,773.04

They want to re-audit the Audit Office figures.

NOTE.—The above statement of 'expenses' does not include the following:—

(a) Expenses for salaries and material carried in accounts of Railway Departments.

Should not in any event.

(b) Expenses for salaries and material carried in Railway Maintenance Appropriation Accounts.

No reason to do so.

(c) Rental of offices occupied by Telegraph Department at Vancouver, Lethbridge, Calgary, Revelstoke, Moosejaw, and Fort William, no charge being carried on the books of the railway company against the Telegraph Department.

Help each other anyway.

(d) Rental of right of way on railway company's property.

Railway company has to have the telegraph system.

(e) Interest on capital invested. Have to invest capital to run railway.

(f) Proportion of expenses of general management, auditing, purchasing, engineering and law departments, which are borne by the railway company, and no proportion of which can be actually allocated to telegraph department.

Works both ways. Only a portion of latter should be charged.

Now, let me take up a little of your time in calling your attention to the discrimination in rates on the part of this great company; and I wish it to be distinctly understood that I do not wish to antagonize that company in any particular. I give this statement merely to demonstrate to the House the advisability at least of investigating this whole question. I am satisfied that if that is done, we will come to the conclusion that these rates are exorbitant and unfair, especially to the people of the western provinces. I hope the day is not far distant when our telegraph rates to the western provinces will be one-half what they are to-day or even a great deal less, and I believe we could have them so if we had national-owned telegraphs. Let me call your attention to the following rates:

From Montreal to Toronto, 333 miles, 25c.

Brandon to Moosejaw, approximately 265 miles, 40c.

Moosejaw to Swift Current, 175 miles, 40c.
Regina to Saskatoon, 160 miles, 40c.
Ottawa to Windsor, 482 miles, 25c.
Regina to Calgary, 480 miles, 60c.
Quebec to Toronto, 513 miles, 25c.
Brandon to Swift Current, 375 miles, 60c.
Quebec to Windsor, 720 miles, 25c.
Brandon to Calgary, 705 miles, 60c.
Rimouski to Windsor, 900 miles, 25c.
Winnipeg to Edmonton, 800 miles, 75c.
Halifax to Schreiber, miles, 60c., with a relay at Sudbury and Montreal.
Halifax to Thessalon, 75c.

The last two are practically over the same wire. These figures go to show that discriminations are not in northwestern Canada alone.

Mr. CARVELL. Are the rates the hon. gentleman has quoted all over the same lines or do they cover other lines?

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). They are the Canadian Pacific railway lines and the Great North Western.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Can the hon. gentleman give us a comparison between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Great Northwestern on one side and the government telegraph lines on the other?

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). The government telegraphs are all in outlying sections—on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, in the Yukon and elsewhere. The government operates the unprofitable sections so far as telegraph messages are concerned; the profitable end of the business is operated by the companies. The telegraph companies carry a message from Quebec to Buffalo, about six hundred miles, for 35 cents, for which the Canadian Pacific Railway or Great Northwestern get only 17½ cents. Take a message from New York to Chicago by Canadian Pacific Railway. They send it to Montreal, and relay it there. That is, the Canadian Pacific Railway carries the message 2,000 miles with a relay and gets 37½ cents. But if that message is to be delivered in Montreal, saving the relay and 550 miles to Chicago, the Canadian rate will be 75 cents. I feel confident, from the examination I have made with reference to the cost of telegraph lines, not only in the Dominion of Canada, but in other parts of the world, that a good round return could be made on rates such as 25 cents from Halifax to Winnipeg, and 50 cents from Halifax to Vancouver. Some western rates are the following:

Windsor to Sydney Cape Breton approximately 1,400 miles, 30c.
Regina to Sudbury, 1,150 miles, $1.00.
Moosejaw to Ottawa, 1,700 miles, $1.00.
Ottawa to Moose Man, 1,550 miles, $1.00
North Bay to Moose Man, 1,275 miles, $1.00.

Messages for similar distances in eastern Canada cost 30 cents.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (E. Lambton).

Now, I think it worth while to call to the attention of the House to the position taken by the Postmaster General of the United States within the last few days. The Postmaster General has announced, so far as he is personally concerned, a policy of taking over the telegraph lines in the United States, stating at the same time that these lines would cost $250,000,000. Assuming that practically all the telegraph lines in Canada could be taken over at the price I named some time ago, this means that the Postmaster General of the United States is prepared to pay $12 per head more to acquire the lines in the United States than would be necessary for us to pay to acquire the lines in Canada. The Postmaster General of the United States distinctly states that he will be able to cut one-third off the rates in that country, even though paying so large a sum for the lines. If he can do that with the tremendous amount of water in the investment how much better off we shall be in comparison. The United States rates are practically the same as those in Canada, the rates in their west and in our west being particularly much alike. The rate of 25 cents from Windsor to Quebec was established some years ago by statute. In the United States they have a law under which government messages are sent at 1 cent a word up to 1,000 miles with a minimum of 20 words. Canada has not any government rate arrangement with the large companies. At the rate I have just quoted, the government of the United States would be able to send a message from New York to California for 40 cents for 20 words, and from Washington to Florida at 40 cents for 20 words.

We are too apt to think that the companies interested in our telephones are Canadian companies. But you will find that the bulk of the stock of each of the principal companies is held in the United States and that the companies are operated from New York. There is not a British owned cable between the motherland and Canada, every one of the cables being owned and operated by men in New York. The Mackay company is not an operating company; it is only a holding company for the postal Telegraph and Commercial Cable and many others. In 1907, they had a controlling interest in the Bell Telephone Company of the United States, and over 38 per cent of the stock of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada is owned by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company of the United States. Heretofore, on complaint of a particular body, these monopolies, such as the telegraph, telephone and express companies, would sometimes make reductions gratuitously; but now that they are compelled to go before the commission, no reductions are made in

their rates without the public appearing before the Railway Commission and fighting for their rights to the bitter end. When the people of Canada appointed the Railway Commission, they did a just and wise thing. But we must remember that from the time of its establishment, any individual or body wishing to have rates lowered on telegraphs, telephones or railways has had to go before the commission and claim this redress. Not one of these public utilities will grant concessions to the public gratuitously.

The purely domestic business of the Canadian Pacific Railway telegraphs increased to from about $575,000 in 1906, to over $1,200,000 in 1910, or 110 per cent in four years. The estimates of last year's business is over $1,400,000, being an increase in five years of over 143 per cent on domestic business alone.

Mr. PELLETIER. Is that net or gross?

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). Net. Surely the figures I have given are an argument in favour of government ownership. Now, it has been found by experience, particularly in large businesses, that the lowering of rates does not necessarily mean a loss of revenue. The Dominion postal rates were lowered in 1896 from 3 cents to 2 cents, and the increased volume of business resulting was sufficient to make up for the sacrifice on the sale of individual stamps. If the tolls of the telegraph companies were arbitrarily cut down by one third, it is safe to assume that the increased volume of business would more than compensate for the anticipated loss. There is no more wear and tear on the wire to send a message 10,000 miles than there is to send it 500 miles. Mr. Kent, the electrical expert of the Canadian Pacific Railway telegraphs, stated last week that a copper wire was practically indestructible and that an iron wire would last for 30 years. Two messages are generally sent over one wire and sometimes as many as four. They can send a telephone and a telegraph message over the same wire at the same time, and I understand that two telephone messages can be sent over the same wire at the same time. The telegraph, telephone and cable can use the same wire if necessary. The Canadian Pacific Railway has ten copper wires between Sudbury and North Bay and six copper wires between Fort William and Winnipeg. Running into Winnipeg from the west they have eleven copper wires and eighteen iron wires, and from the east and south, seven copper wires and eight iron wires. This gives some idea of the extent of the business in and out of the city of Winnipeg.

The western provinces depend largely upon their telegraph messages; for all are aware the telephones are owned and operated by the several provinces, and they are unable to further the messages east as we should like to have them furthered. In Manitoba they have been compelled to build a copper wire for their provincial line to connect with Minneapolis and Chicago. From a national standpoint it is our duty to see to it that messages are sent to our provinces at the lowest possible cost, and in that way bind together the provinces of the Dominion.

The Canadian Pacific railway leases a through line from Montreal to Vancouver to the British Cable Company Board for $65,000, a portion of which is paid by the Canadian government. The cost of copper wire of 210 lbs. to the mile, including labour of stringing and placing the wire in position is $44.25. The cable wire across the continent, 2,906 miles at $44.25 a mile would mean $128,590 for one line of wire. The Canadian Pacific Railway's submarine cables with three conductors cost nearly $2,000 per mile. This is the value placer on it by the Canadian Pacific railway. This, apparently, is the cable line between Vancouver island and the mainland, 67.58 miles, valued at $129,000. The property of the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company called the commercial end of their business, does not cost them very much to own and operate in addition to what they would be compelled to pay to keep up the telegraph lines in order to run their railway. Hon. members will have observed advertisements in various magazines calling attention to the night letters which the telegraph companies offer to send at half price; I have in mind particularly an advertisement in the Saturday 'Evening Post' of March 17, 1911, which cost the telegraph company over $700. They would not be likely to place that advertisement unless they expected a return from it. It all goes to show that these companies handle the business at a great reduction on their present rates. The Postal Telegraph Cable Company in the United States is the land side of the Commercial Cable Company. Both are included in what is known as the Mackays. The Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company operates the Canadian end of the Mackay Company's telegraph and telephone lines. A telegraph pole can carry 48 wires easily. The average over all the Canadian Pacific Railway lines is only about six wires to a pole. The Canadian Pacific Railway telegraph lines make an average of 100 per cent on outlay each year; in other words, their operating expenses were less than 50 per cent of their income.

Now, I have no doubt that those who oppose the resolution will cite the condition of affairs in the old land. But when we consider the enormous amount of water in the purchase of the telegraph and telephone lines there, we can hardly wonder that the system has not been placed on a paying basis as yet. But if you consider the

splendid service they are giving there, and improving year after year, you can hardly but see that in a few years a satisfactory state of affairs financially will be shown. They have developed an excellent system and a uniform rate of 1 cent a word with a minimum of 12 cents. The government of Great Britain was obliged to pay £10,000,000 for the privately owned lines, though they were notoriously not worth more than one-quarter of that sum.

Now, a question may arise as to the right of way of the telegraph lines in our country. Surely after the great investment we have made in our Grand Trunk Pacific and its right of way from ocean to ocean, it cannot be disputed that we have some rights, at least to having a right of way, in the northland. In the province of Ontario we have the provincially owned railway, and in the eastern provinces we have the Intercolonial railway. And I am satisfied that the different municipalities through which these poles would be likely to run would be only too glad to have the Dominion of Canada take over, own, and operate the trunk lines of telegraphs and telephones in our country.

Now, let me call attention specially to telephone matters. I am sorry to say that in gathering information on this subject I have been unable to get sympathy or support from the census and statistics branch. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will shake up some of the dry bones in that department and see if it is not possible to get information with regard to telephones. I asked the census and statistics branch to furnish me with information on this subject and received this reply, dated January 25:

> In replying to your request over the phone, I am sorry to say that no statistics of any kind with respect to telephone lines in Canada are collected by the federal government.

There is no doubt in my mind that Sir William Mulock, when Postmaster General, seriously contemplated taking over the telephone lines. Had the government done so they would have saved to the people millions of dollars that have been paid to monopolies, and by extending those lines into rural districts, the people would have derived an immense advantage therefrom. The two volumes which are at our disposal in the library are full of material dealing with the independent telegraph lines. The constant plea of these independent telephone companies is that the government should do its utmost to connect them with the trunk lines owned and controlled by the government. In the province of Ontario we have 460 independent telephone companies, every one of them practically on their knees to the Bell Telephone Company. The Bell Telephone Company, instead of going into the rural districts and going up and down the side roads and concessions, are doing nothing but holding down their monopoly. The outcome is that the people who are living in the rural districts and who are most in need of telephone communication are compelled to put their hands in their pockets and build their own lines. Therefore, I feel I am justified in urging this government to investigate this great national utility, with the view ultimately of owning and operating trunk lines, and connecting them with those independent companies, giving the people a service that will make them happier and more contented. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that in the rural districts of the eastern provinces there are fewer people than when confederation was organized? Do you realize that in the province of Ontario within the last ten years the population has decreased over 100,000 in the rural districts? In my own county there are 5,000 less people than there were ten years ago. Notwithstanding all the advantages which they now enjoy, the lure of the cities and the towns has taken these people away from their farms. I am confident that for every dollar that is spent in assisting the people in the rural districts to become more happy and contented, the government will derive an income of $5 at least.

Now let us look further into this telephone business. There are 15,000 independent telephone companies in the United States operating 4,000,000 telephones, with a capital of $4,000,000. Public opinion will endorse any measure taken by this government to remedy the existing grievances. So far the rural telephone systems have been doing the pioneer work in building telephones in rural districts. In Germany the telephone system is in the hands of the imperial government and the whole of it, with the exception of Bavaria, Wurtemburg and Baden is managed from Berlin. The same rates and the same regulations apply to all places of all sizes with respect to their location. This policy might not be wise to establish in Canada as it would retard development in parts where it is greatly needed. In Denmark every village has its telephone exchange. These are connected by trunk wires. With the others the rates are very much lower than in Germany. The systems in the Danish towns and villages are managed locally either by their town council or by companies. In Great Britain, Glasgow, Hull, Portsmouth, Brighton, Swansea and the State of Guernsey, they have been working under license from the Postmaster General, but are now taken over. These telephone exchanges have shown great activity and are in a most flourishing condition. In France, Austria, Belgium, Spain and Portsmouth the system and management is centralized,

and the results are not as good as when a system such as I am proposing is placed into effect.

Of course in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan the local governments would have control as they have to-day over municipal telephones but we could and would connect them at once with the east. Our people should have a voice in the rules and regulations under which telephones and telegraphs are administered in their respective districts. The conditions which prevail in Quebec might not agree with those in other provinces in Canada. The citizens of Port Arthur and Fort William are served in this way by a system which, I understand, is only half the cost of the Bell system.

To-day Canada is practically in the hands of private monopolies so far as telephones and telegraphs are concerned. These monopolies are giving an indifferent service in many instances in order that they may pay interest on the capital. The utility of the telephone is impaired because it cannot be used in combination with the telegraph and with the service. There is no question in my mind that this government are justified in combining these services. The telephone system is an essential feature in business and professional circles, also in rural districts it is a very great blessing, and is bound to continue extending in fields of operation and usefulness.

Surely if Conservative England, with her large cities and extensive business can make a success of government owned telegraphs and telephones, how much more may we expect the people who universally favour their extensive use. The price in England was determined by arbitration in case the government and company differ. In 1892 the British Isles entered into an agreement to build trunk lines in order to assist their people in the management of an independent company. In 1906 the larger companies were glad to submit to arbitration at a reasonable price at which these facilities could be purchased.

If the Bell Telephone Company's plant cannot be purchased at a fair market price aggressive competition will soon make them willing to entertain the proposals. Telephone wires and instruments are worth nothing more than junk prices if not in use. The Bell Telephone Company is all powerful to-day and can charge any rate it pleases for long distance messages and when established in cities and towns soon creates a complete monopoly.

Let me remind you hon. gentlemen of the fact that a great many foreign countries are equally interested in telephone systems and have nationalized them and made a great success of it. Surely we Canadians do not wish to appear before the world as weaklings in regard to this matter and say that we are unable to cope with such a question. Among these countries I might mention Great Britain, Denmark and Belgium. Great Britain operates her whole system of telephones and telegraphs since the first of the present year. Denmark operates the long distance lines.

Belgium the entire system. Germany the entire system. Austria the entire system. Bavaria the entire system. Australia the entire system. State of Victoria the entire system. State of Tasmania the entire system. New Zealand owns the long distance system. Cape Colony the long distance and local exchange. Norway the greater number of the trunk lines. Holland the interlocal lines. Switzerland and Russia nearly all the trunk lines. Sweden the trunk lines. Straits Settlement and Natal the interlocal lines.

Practically every one of these lines have been able to show a substantial surplus. The charges made for a three minute conversation over sixty miles in different countries is as follows:—Canada, 35cts.; Great Britain, 18cts.; New Zealand, 12½cts.; Norway, 9½cts.; Denmark, 9½cts.; Switzerland, 10cts.; Bavaria, 12cts.; Belgium, 19½cts.; Russia, 26cts.; Australia, 24½cas.; United States practically the same as Canada.

There is no place in the world where telephones are so cheap and so numerous as in Stockholm, the capital of Sweden. There are more telephones in Stockholm than in Berlin or London, and it is said more than in Paris. The total number of instruments in use is nearly fifty thouand to a population of three hundred thousand people. You can find a telephone in every shop, and in almost every house in the city. Also in the parks and on the street corners. On lamp posts are little booths similiar to those used for police boxes in our cities. They work automatically. You drop a coin worth three cents in the slot and then you ring a bell for connecting. The long distance phones and all the lines outside of two or three of the principal cities belong to the government and are operated by the post-office department. The telegraph system is also owned by the government which charges a uniform rate of fifteen cents per ten words to any part of the country. The postal telegraph and telephone systems of Norway are all under government control, and both are much cheaper and more efficient than the systems in Canada. With the exception of Switzerland, Norway is more abundantly supplied with good offices than any other country in the International Postal Union. The rural telephone is one of the modern blessings winning its way among the farmers, and once established, will stay. In many parts of our country to-day each concession has its line and is proving itself under services one of the economical developments of modern times.

The conditions of affairs in Canada are such as could demand our immediate attention. When you find the province of Manitoba compelled to build a copper wire line from Winnipeg to the boundary line connecting there with the Northwestern Telephone Exchange Company, and forming a direct line through service from Minneapolis to Chicago in order to reach our eastern provinces surely it is time for us at least to investigate. In addition to this there are few farmers phones in the province of Manitoba that cannot be connected with Winnipeg.

In 1910 no less than 1,481 miles of long distance telephones were added to the system. The number of subscribers in that year increased by 8,336, nearly half of which increase was in the rural districts among the farmers. Hon. gentlemen opposite may complain possibly of the position taken by the Manitoba government in order that they may compel those who are living in the cities and towns to pay a reasonable portion of the running expenses of the system, but it would be well for them possibly to look into the system that has recently been inaugurated. Why should the large industrial centres, such as Winnipeg, with their offices and stores that require a very greatly extended and expensive service for their accommodation, be given the same rates as those which are given to people living in the rural districts? I should say in justice to the provincial government of Manitoba that they are to be complimented on the manner in which they have extended the lines into the rural districts, because there is nothing which will help to enlighten and educate the people of the province more quickly than will the telephone line being extended as it is being extended in Manitoba. As the Manitoba government have already stated, within five years time practically every man living in the rural part of the province will be given telephonic connection with the city of Winnipeg. I am sure it will be a great satisfaction when that is done. In Portugal telephones are being taken over and worked by the government. There is a report which has recently come from Lyons, France, where exchangeless telephones have been given a trial. They have been able to show a remarkable increase in the number of messages that can be delivered within a given time, and a great saving in the number of persons employed in the various offices of the country as a result of the introduction of this system. The reduction in the number of officials in the offices has been so great that there has been very strong objection to the adoption of the system throughout France on that account. But, that is the only objection to it. There are 2,380,000 telephones in Europe including the figures for Russia in Asia, and about 6,870,000 in the United States alone, without including Canada, and the whole of South America. 'The National Telephone Journal,' of London, England, has recently published some interesting statistics regarding telephone development in Europe, from which the following summary is taken:

	No. of Telephones in use.		Population per Telephone.
	Jan. 1, 1908.	Jan. 1, 1909.	
German Empire	768,266	851,319	71
Great Britain and Ireland	528,763	565,854	77
France	178,518	194,159	202
Sweden	150,948	156,000	34
Austria-Hungary	108,457	124,825	209
Russia	97,643	113,000	1,322
Switzerland	64,953	69,122	44
Denmark	60,825	67,339	38
Norway	19,398	53,726	43
Italy	44,834	53,721	625
Holland	43,449	48,134	117
Belgium	34,818	38,503	188
Spain	18,545	19,500	955
Roumania	.....	11,500	573
Portugal	.....	5,000	1,085
Luxemburg	.....	3,000	82
Bulgaria	.....	2,039	1,970
Servia	.....	2,057	1,306
Greece	.....	1,500	1,733
Iceland	.....	500	152
Total	.....	2,380,798	168

The Bell Telephone Company of Canada, operating in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, in a report issued within the last few months, state that they have in their own service a telephone per 27 of the population, or with their connecting companies, a telephone per 25 of the population. The Bell Telephone Company of Canada on the 24th February, 1910, presented their annual report in which it is stated that the number of instruments now earning rental was 114,000 and miles of wire 48,000. If their lines are only connected up with the 320 independent companies yet unconnected in the province of Ontario, where we have 460 independent companies altogether, and with the 500 companies in the other provinces you can readily understand the position that these independent companies will be placed in. It has only been recently that the Bell Company would even connect up with the local companies in the municipalities. I need scarcely call the attention of the House to the struggles that have been made in many of the cities and towns in Ontario in order to obtain a reasonable amount of justice from the Bell Telephone

Company in the matter of connections. Not only that, but I can show you where the Bell Telephone Company make excessive charges against independent companies when they do connect with them. There is no doubt in my mind that every one of these independent companies will be willing to be placed in connection with the trunk lines of telephone in order that they may extend their service.

You can send a telegram of ten words anywhere in Holland for 10 cents and for each additional word six-tenths of a cent. A five-word despatch to Great Britain costs only 25 cents and one to the United States 40 cents and upwards per word. The telephone rates are equally low. Every city has a good service with the wires on street towers 100 feet high, so that they rise far above the houses.

Telephone connection between New York and Denver, a distance of 2,011 miles, without recourse to relay stations, was opened for commercial purposes on May 9, 1911. On this line three persons can talk to Chicago, and a fourth to Denver over two sets of wires and simultaneously eight separate telegraphic messages can be sent over the same wires to Chicago and two others to Denver and all without any reference, through what is called 'The Loaded Phantom Circuit.' While Mayor Robert W. Sphere, of Denver, Mayor Carter Harrison, of Chicago, and Mayor James C. Dahlman, of Omaha, Nebraska, were having a three-cornered conversation ten telegraphic messages were passing over the same wires. In order to obtain this the Telephone company had men climb every one of the 87,000 telephone poles between New York and Denver and change the 285,000 insulators from glass to porcelain.

I merely wish to call your attention to this fact to show the advance that has been made along the lines of improvement, in telephone matters within the last few years. It emphasizes the advisability of the appointment of a commission to go to foreign lands, investigate these different public utilities, and bring home information with regard to the latest and most improved systems in order that we may be in a position to establish the best possible telephone and telegraph system in our country. I called attention a few moments ago to the fact that wireless telegraphy in our country was a necessity and that it should be government owned, controlled and operated.

The more I have investigated the matter the more convinced I have become that the government of Canada should at once take over these wireless telegraph stations, and own, control and operate them. The agreement between the Marconi Company and the Dominion is as follows:

The company are permitted to construct stations and to install therein their systems of wireless telegraphy, and to build houses, furnish them for operators suitably for the requirements of the station, for the sum of $5,000 for each station.

As I have said they have spent from $10,000 to $20,000 on each station. The governments of Australia and New Zealand have decided to establish a system of wireless telegraphy which will be under their control and which will embrace the various routes to the British islands.

I feel that the time has come when Canada can no longer afford not to be the owner of a cable line or two cable lines between our shores and the motherland. As I have said, all the cables between the mother country and Canada to-day are owned, controlled and operated from New York. The cost of a cable to England would not exceed $5,000,000 and it will be seen that it would be an advantage to us as a nation to own and operate a cable ourselves and not be urging and begging and pleading with Great Britain to give a portion of the $5,000,000 towards the building of a cable. There is no question in my mind that it would be a profitable investment from the start, and that we could give a rate of one half the present cable rates. Such a cable would greatly strengthen the bonds between Canada and the motherland. If the thousands of British immigrants who are going into our northwestern provinces, could be placed in cable communication with their friends at home, at a very cheap rate, it would tend to greatly cement the friendship between the people of our country and those at home. The advantage of direct and cheap cable communication between the grain merchants of Winnipeg and Liverpool are obvious. Such a cable would tend to bind together the provinces of Canada and the empire as a whole.

To show the probable effect of such a cable system I wish to place before the House the history of postal rates between Canada and Great Britain. When the Canadian government took over the post office in 1851 the charge on letters passing between Canada and Great Britain was one shilling per half ounce. In 1868 a reduction of 50 per cent was made and the rate became sixpence per half ounce. Two years later a further cut of 50 per cent was made and the rate became threepence or six cents per half ounce. In 1875 there was a slight reduction from 6 to 5 cents per half ounce. That rate remained in force until 1898 when the Canadian government obtained the inter-Imperial Postage Commission and on Christmas day of that year the imperial postal rates came into operation. In 1907 the rate was still further re-

duced to two cents instead of three cents a half ounce.

The reduction of cable rates has not kept pace with the requirements of Canadian life. Cables are used to-day only for the transaction of business, and then only when the urgency of the case compels the senders to ignore the cost of cables. The Commercial Cable Company in New York said that not more than one per cent of the people of that country use the cable. Surely this is an argument in favour of this country taking over the cable system if after 50 years of cables owned by these great companies only one per cent of the population of our country, or even of the United States, are able to make use of these cables to any extent. Governments, great merchants and great news agencies can look after themselves, but for every reason, social, commercial and political, the cable should be made available to a greater proportion than one per cent of our people. Owing to competition between different companies in 1885 and 1886 the present rate on cables was cut in two, to 12 cents a word. Charles Bryce, the author of a standard work on submarine telegraphs, informed a departmental committee in London in 1902, that the business doubled in that period. Mr. Bryce, owing to his connection with the cable companies, has had exceptional opportunities to gather information, and I am prepared to accept his conclusions. Thus if, in the years 1885, 1886 and part of 1887, the cable companies having their wires between Canada and the mother country, were able to cut the rates in two and to double the amount of business they did in those years, the project of a state-owned cable with reduced rates is worthy of consideration.

People will refer to the Pacific cable as an instance of a government carrying on a service at rates less than are necessary to meet the expenses. We cannot take that view of the Pacific cable. It has had to make its way in the face of strong opposition, but it has advanced from year to year. In 1908 the Pacific Cable Board paid all expenses of management and of maintenance, and had £15,000 remaining over, which they applied to interest and sinking fund account. In the case of the Pacific cable it is the same old story of the Dominion government owning and operating to a certain extent the lean end of the cable business, while the profitable end of the business, between Canada and the motherland, is owned, controlled and operated by the monopolies. So we should take this into consideration when we have the matter under advisement.

The American and the British governments will not allow foreign governments to land cables on their shores. This is because a government may control and regulate a private corporation but not a foreign government, and the consequent difference of opinion may mean war. The scheme of having the Canadian government lay an Atlantic cable to England is not open to this objection; the very opposite is the case. It would strengthen the bond between the different parts of the empire. Personally I am opposed to a state-owned cable to the motherland being under the control of any government but the Canadian government.

We can command such a tremendous amount of business at once. There would be no speculative uncertainty as to whether it would pay to reduce the rates by one-half at once.

I believe that Canada should have a free hand in the management of this important public utility. It would be both in her own interest and in the interest of the empire. Canada is almost the only country that has no business entanglements with the cable companies. Great Britain is almost bound hand and foot with these companies, and Australia has intimate relations with the Eastern companies. With Canada's known desire to have the rates as low as good business would permit she could be depended on to keep lowering the rates just as the increase of the office warranted it. Standing on Cape Bonifacio, Newfoundland, a part of the British Empire which has not seen its way clear to become part of Canada, as yet, the Atlantic is of less width there than at any other parallel from the British Isles. The breadth of the ocean increases rapidly until by the time it reaches New York and Philadelphia it is double the width in the parallel lines that it is to the north. The passenger boats or ferry boats ply from shore to shore with just such regularity as if it were only a navigable river. The path of the steamers is known as the King's Highway. In no part of the world are there so many submarine cables. We have almost instantaneous communication from continent to continent. Year by year the facilities of intercourse, both by steamship and by telegraph, are increasing, and all this should tend to bind closer than ever the members of our British possessions. The provinces of Canada are bound together by one trade, one tariff and one common nationality. May we not look forward to the day when the islands beyond the seas, both on our east and west coast, which belong to Great Britain, will become a great Imperial Union, and thus cement the bond of Imperial Unity.

It does not require any argument to prove that the railway and electric telegraph, and wireless telegraph and cables are the most perfect means of communication in military manœuvres and inter-imperial protection. These are the best means of distributing information, and a British system would make the colossal systems of Great Britain independent of the lines passing through

foreign countries. The Pacific cable has proved to be a bond of imperial unity. I believe the day is not far distant when every British citizen will be within reach of what might be called the Empire Cable. Every person in the motherland, in Canada, in the East and West Indies, in South Africa, in Australia and New Zealand, would be free to exchange thoughts one with the other as readily and almost as cheaply as we do by telegraph at present with friends in the neighbouring cities.

The day when British-owned cables shall encircle the globe is not far distant. The bond of empire may be described as consisting of four divisions:

(1) From the United Kingdom to the Pacific, embracing a cable across the Atlantic and land lines through Canada.

(2) A cable across the Pacific from Canada to New Zealand and Australia, with land lines through Australia to the Indian ocean.

(3) A cable across the Indian ocean from Australia to South Africa, with a branch from Coco's Island to India.

(4) A cable from Cape Town to the United Kingdom via Ascension, the West Indies and Bermuda, with a branch to Canada.

The proposal to establish the first of these four divisions has for some time been before the Canadian people, and I feel warranted in saying that it is regarded with much favour, and I feel confident that if the Canadian government should proceed at once to nationalize the telegraph service between London and Vancouver it would be accepted with general satisfaction throughout the Dominion. This would go far towards establishing a system of Empire-girdling, state-owned cables and telegraphs in an unbroken chain around the world. It would lower the charges to a minimum to all over-sea messages. It would provide a double means of communication at low uniform rates between the mother country and any one British colony. It would be of the highest importance to the commercial and social life of the British people around the world. It would at once promote the consolidation of the empire and prove an indispensable factor in imperial unity.

Should we not welcome such an outcome? Could anything but good follow such a condition in the empire and all parts of it? The establishment of the Pacific cable, the most important of the sections in the world by six governments co-operating as a union, was a great step forward, and its value to the empire can scarcely be overestimated. If Canada owned its land lines and the Atlantic cables, it would complete the Imperial system between England and Australia.

The six countries, with the cost of cabling from Vancouver to Australia to New Zealand, are as follows:—New Zealand, New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, each one-ninth. Canada and the motherland, each one-half the remaining five-ninths. The whole capital amounted to £2,000,000 or $10,000,000, which was found by the Imperial Treasurer, and the six co-operating governments arranged to make good each their share by terminable annuities which included sinking fund and interest, and amounted to £77,545 per annum for Canada. It was shown by the Auditor General of Canada that the Pacific cable is not only self-sustaining, but that its earnings are employed in part to pay off the original capital expenditure.

If the returns be examined, it will be found that there has never been any loss in working the cables. The working expenses include all salaries, and all outlays in London, and at the several cable stations between London and Australia, also a cable ship and a provident fund for the benefit of employees.

Two routes have been proposed, one from Ireland to Newfoundland, the other via a northern route via the Faroes Island and Greenland to Labrador. It is considered by some prominent experts that it would be necessary to lay down two cables, assuming that both go from Ireland to Newfoundland. The capital cost of the two cables is estimated at £1,000,000 or $5,000,000. The following tables give the estimated cost of two such cables, including provincial collecting and transmitting offices, the service to be capable of handling one-sixth of the total existing Atlantic traffic:—

Working expenses at cable stations and offices	£40,678
Contingencies, canvassing, advertising, travelling expenses and rent for offices	9,000
Provident fund	1,065
Repairs	7,000
Renewal fund	15,000
Use of patents, repair and renewal of instruments, &c.	2,000
Total	£74,743

Here is an estimate of the earnings:—

Present Atlantic traffic, 3,500,000 messages. A 50 per cent reduction of charges should produce 25 per cent. increase of traffic, which would make 4,375,000 messages. The average length of messages at ordinary rates may be taken at ten words; cable tolls at 4½d. This would equal £820,312.

If state cables secured one-seventh of the total traffic, the earnings would be £117,186 plus £26,000. Australian traffic equals £143,186.

Assuming the earnings to be £143,186, and the working expenses, including renewal funds, £74,743, the excess of earnings over expenses would be £68,443.

A sinking fund for repayment in fifty years of £1,000,000 capital and interest at

three per cent. would be £38,500, thus leaving a good balance.

The expert who prepared these figures believes that the present rate of 5d. per word now exacted by the Atlantic companies for paper messages might be reduced to 3d. or even 2½d. per word. The capacity of the two cables in plain words would be 14,550,000 words per annum. The estimates above of revenue are only based of 6,250,000 words.

Cheap cable communication is one of the pressing needs of the Imperial system, and we have waited long enough for a reform which is undoubtedly practicable.

Within the last few months meetings of the stockholders of the Anglo-American Telegraph Company and the District United States Cable Company, the only two British companies, have been held, and the agreements whereby they lease their trans-Atlantic Cables for ninety-nine years to the Eastern Union Company, an American concern, have been ratified. Thus passes out of the hands of Great Britain, control of any of the Atlantic cables. In future the two rival United States organizations, The Commercial Cable Company, (the Mackay concern) and the Eastern Union will conduct cable communications between Great Britain and America. The Anglo-American Company was the pioneer in laying submarine cables in America. Is this likely to inure to the benefit of the Canadian people? According to recent reports, the Western Union, in buying out the Anglo-American, agreed to pay the latter 3½ per cent. on a capital of $35,000,000. The Anglo-American had only four working lines, the value of which could not exceed $8,000,000. We will help to pay for the water. You can easily see that with the Western Union Company purchasing these two cable companies, practically $35,000,000 for a system that did not cost over $8,000,000, it will be compelled to pay for years to come interest on that watered stock, so that instead of expecting any reduction in cable rates from these companies we may depend upon it that they will maintain their rates, and unless we as a nation, build a Canadian cable to the old land, we cannot expect to receive the advantages of a cheap cable service.

We were told a few years ago that rural free mail delivery could not be made a paying investment in the Dominion of Canada, or that it would be a very great tax on the resources of the Dominion. I have here a statement in connection with the rural mail delivery routes in the Dominion of Canada for the period ending December 31, 1911, from which it will appear that in the last four years the total increase in the cost of mail service, including the cost of service of rural delivery boxes, amounted to $335,089.20. That is only a little over $80,000 per annum, and, serving as it does, approximately 100,000 people we cannot help but feel that the rural free mail delivery is a distinct advantage to the people of the Dominion. The statement I refer to is as follows:

STATEMENT in connection with Rural Mail Delivery Routes in the Dominion of Canada for the period ending December 31, 1911.

Division.	Number of Routes authorized.	Number of Routes on which authorized rate was accepted.	Number of Routes on which authorized rate was refused.	Total number of Box-holders reported.	Cost of Service of Boxes for Four Years.	Increase in cost of Mail Services for Four Years.	Tota Increase in cost of Mail Services (including service of Rural Delivery Boxes) for Four Years.
					$ cts.		
Prince Edward Island.	54	32	10	989	3,593 76	12,791 16	16,384 92
Nova Scotia	19	13	4	413	1,480 00	2,642 92	4,122 92
New Brunswick	52	27	3	1,177	4,028 48	17,560 24	21,588 72
Quebec	12	9	3	104	415 00	2,231 00	2,646 00
Montreal	17	11	3	326	1,241 00	7,100 32	8,341 32
Ottawa	27	9	7	675	2,774 00	13,940 28	16,714 28
Kingston	53	28	12	2,079	8,132 00	20,772 00	28,904 00
Toronto	112	51	28	3,694	14,434 00	42,776 24	57,210 24
London	225	103	52	8,134	31,381 00	115,857 00	147,238 00
North Bay	3	3		30	109 00		109 00
Winnipeg	30	17	10	277	858 00	7,333 92	8,191 92
Moosejaw	8	8		134	363 00	1,300 00	1,663 00
Saskatoon	4	4		49	133 00		133 00
Edmonton	14	12	1	259	793 00	1,863 00	2,656 00
Calgary	10	8	1	123	363 00	78 40	441 40
Vancouver	8	4	3	264	1,013 00	6,479 88	7,492 88
Victoria	11	7		119	438 00	10,913 60	11,351 60
Totals	659	346	137	18,846	71,549 24	263,639 96	335,189 20

I wish to take up a little time of the House with reference to parcel post because I think the easy exchange of commodities and merchandise between the producer and consumer is far from being perfect in Canada. Comparing our progress in this regard by that made by such countries as England, France, Germany, and other lands makes us appear away behind the times as compared with them. The Canadian in Europe can send home to any part in Canada a parcel weighing two and a half times more than the Canadian limit, and for about one-third less in cost than the home rates. In other words, the world's parcel union package unit is eleven pounds to the parcel, carried at the rate of twelve cents per pound, whereas the Canadian unit is five pounds to the package and carried at a cost of sixteen cents per pound. The citizens of Canada are entitled to utilize the advantages of their post-office system, the same as the men engaged in other lines of business. The question is frequently asked: What is parcel post? It is merely the extending of the weight of the package now carried in Canada to a considerable extent in order to meet with the public demands. In Germany many farmers deliver special products by post, such as chicken, butter, eggs and like products. Germany makes money out of parcel post. Canada does the unprofitable end of the parcel carrying business, and watches the express companies do the profitable end. Last year over 225,000,000 parcels were carried by the post office department in Germany of an average weight of eight pounds. If we had to build our post offices out of the revenue of the Post Office Department as they do in England, and many other countries, we would devise some way to do at least part of the express business of the country.

The proposition I have to offer would only advise what might be called The Limited Parcels Post, confined exclusively to rural districts and delivered on rural mail routes only. Such parcels must have their origin on or at the start of a rural mail route. Why should express companies be given a monopoly on the profitable parcel carrying trade while the postal department contents itself with the least profitable? Why should the government give foreign four-pound parcels a rate of 60 cents, while we must pay 80 cents regardless of distance? Why is a package carried at any rate up to eleven pounds in our mails, if mailed in a foreign country, when we can but mail five pounds and even then pay 33⅓ per cent more? The express companies pay one and two hundred per cent profit, while we are doing the unprofitable end. It is claimed that the great mail order or catalogue houses are behind the parcel post in order that they may flood the country with their goods to the injury of the small retailers.

The parcels post system in England has not tended to create catalogue houses, nor has it in Germany or other countries tended to prosper great departmental stores. It has done three things and done them effectively. It has eliminated costly and extravagant express monopoly, and has greatly accommodated the general public consumer, retailer and wholesaler. Absence of a parcel post enables the railway companies through companies called express companies, to eliminate and prevent all regulation in one branch of our transportation, and in the meantime the government has not extended to us the low rates, and the liberal conditions of such a service between our own towns and amongst themselves. It turns over to foreign countries the facilities of our expensive postal department and furnishes the service to foreign citizens at the low rates which are denied us. Great Britain has a most serviceable parcels post. Also Australia and New Zealand have had for years a thoroughly modern colonial, intercolonial and foreign parcels post, these advantages have been enjoyed by the people of the colony even to the most remote districts through which the mail service penetrates. In all of the many publications from Australia and New Zealand, or by the officials of these colonies I have not been able to find a sentence to the effect that the local merchants of these colonies have been in the least injured by their business by catalogue houses. In fact as the catalogue houses are unknown in those countries, they have a modern parcels post, it would appear that instead of the modern parcels favouring catalogue houses the very opposite is the case. American dealers have found that they can ship light weight packages of shoes to Mexico much cheaper by parcels post than by freight. For an ordinary package weighing fifteen pounds in Germany the charge for sixty-two miles is sixteen and two-thirds cents. Germany has been handling parcels post for many years. In France they have a splendid system of parcels post; plants and shrubs, live creatures, boxes of cigars, oysters, cotton, oil paper, and an endless number of things are carried. Great Britain gives the railways fifty-five per cent of the gross receipts from such parcels as are railway borne. This of course excluding the great number received and delivered in the same city. The railways are paid over five million dollars per annum from this source. The balance goes to the Post Office Department.

Great Britain and Ireland handled last year 113,230,000 parcels. This being double the number of fifteen years ago and about two and one-half for each of the total population. The average postage was a trifle under ten cents. Parcel rates within the United Kingdom are three-tenths or six cents for not over one pound. Eight cents for not over two pounds. Ten cents for not over 3 pounds and so on up to 21 cents for eleven pounds. The regulations in Canada as to parcels are apparently designed to prevent their carriage by post. Here parcels cost 11 cents per pound and the limit of weight is five pounds, although absurdly enough to contrast between some two dozen countries and our own. The rate is only twelve cents per pound and the limit is eleven pounds. The five pound package in Canada at the high charge of sixteen cents per pound makes a charge of eighty cents for a package that would be carried in England for twelve cents, and our own package would go to England for 60 cents. Further the many limitations as to the kind of things accepted makes it no wonder that the average weight of packages here is only one-third of a pound.

That a rural parcel post would be of material advantage to the retail merchant in competition with mail order houses is seen at once when it is pointed out that the latter, at the proposed general parcel post rate of 12 cents a pound would be obliged to pay $1.32 for sending an 11 pound package to a rural route patron, a difference in favour of the local storekeeper of about 10 cents a pound, or $1.07 on an 11 pound package.

The parcel post rates in England are as follows:

1 lb.	3d.
2 "	4d.
3 "	5d.
4 "	
5 "	6d.
6 "	
7 "	7d.
8 "	8d.
9 "	9d.
10 "	10d.
11 "	11d.

Those who claim that an increase in the weight limit would work an injury to country merchants appear to have the impression that mail order business houses now deliver their goods extensively through the postal service, and that this practice would largely increase if the recommendations which have been made become law. Upon a moment's reflection it would be perceived that the present rate of 16 cents a pound ($16 per hundredweight) as well as the proposed rate of 12 cents a pound ($12 per hundredweight), are alike prohibitive on practically all lines of merchandise. Mail order houses make their shipments usually by freight or express and would continue to do so.

With the adoption of new conveniences of life by urban residents and the ever-increasing attractions of the city, especially potent in their influence upon the younger generation, the importance of affording farmers and ruralities generally every legitimate advantage becomes more and more apparent. The free rural delivery has improved materially and intellectually the life of great numbers of people. Is it too much to ask that the department shall make a further use of this important system, a use which, while adding appreciably to the postal revenue, will directly and vitally benefit every man, woman and child within reach of a rural route. The country man would have the necessities of life delivered at his gate at an average of 2 cents a pound, thereby facilitating and increasing consumption. Rural patrons will telephone to town for half the things they want—for hardware, groceries, and dry goods—and in turn will send to town butter, eggs, cheese and vegetables. A great saving of time to many branches of industry will be possible under the general extension. I approach the matter purely as a parcels post extension that should give postal patrons a quicker and cheaper service. In England the produce of agriculturists goes forward to London and other big English cities in tremendous volume. Fresh fish despatched from seaport towns to the large hotels, are delivered with celerity; meats, cheese, fruits, vegetables and freshly laid eggs in mail packages under the 11-pound limit form a very considerable factor in the commerce of the Kingdom. In Germany, where the rates are even cheaper, lads away from school send their soiled linen home by mail to be washed, and it is returned to them in the same conveyance. The Swiss service is cited much as one of the most efficient and satisfactory in Europe. The mountain villages and resorts of that industrious little country receive a large portion of their supplies by post, as a maximum weight of 110 pounds is carried within a radius of 62 miles. Belgium's parcel post has even a higher weight limit than Switzerland, for it accepts articles of 62 kilograms, or about 132 pounds, in one package, and puts no limit upon the size, except that unwieldly packages are subject to an extra charge of 50 per cent. Germany and Austria maintain the 50-kilogram limit. The first named country enforces the 50 per cent extra charge for unwieldly articles. It also has what is called the 'zone system' The French parcels post law requires presentation at the railway station. Some other European countries, like Great Britain, require it to be delivered at the post office. A table of

the parcels post charges of several countries follows. It shows the maximun weight carried. The minimum charge collected, and also the charge for an 11-pound package, the limit of many of the parcels post countries.

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

Mr. BORDEN. If the adjournment is not moved it occupies a higher place than if the adjournment is moved. If the adjournment is not moved it goes at the head of Private Bills and Orders, whereas if the adjournment is moved it goes to the foot. therefore I think it would be better not to move the adjournment.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). I am sorry to have been compelled to take up so much time. I have given a great deal of time and pains to the gathering of this material, and hope it will be of some benefit to the people of Canada. The rates of parcel post in a number of European and other countries are as follows:

—	Maximum Weight of Parcels.	Minimum Charge for a Parcel.	Charge for 11 Pounds.
Australia	11	·12	·72
Austria	110	·06	·12
Belgium	132	·10	·16
Chili	11	·10	·17
Cuba	11	·10	·46
France	22	·12	·16
Germany	110	·06	·13
Great Britain	11	·06	·22
Italy	11	·03	·20
Switzerland	110	·06	·08
The Netherlands	11	·06	·10
United States	4	·01	1·32
Canada	.....	.....	.....

The international business has grown to enormous proportions. The figures collected at Berne for 1904, in connection with the postal union, show that the parcels mailed across the frontiers of 36 nations and colonies that year numbered something like 38,000,000. The parcels received by post by the United States during the fiscal year of 1906 from abroad were recorded as 131,064, of an average weight of 2·73 pounds. Sufficient figures have been given to indicate what a great factor parcels post has become in the trade of the world. The value of the merchandise thus transported can only be roughly estimated but it will probably exceed $500,000,000 annually. This business is transacted across frontiers, causing little or no friction with customs officers. Boxes with declared values are subject to legislation of the country of origin or destination, as regards payment of stamp duties on articles exported, and as regards the control of stamp and customs duties on articles imported. The stamp duties and charges for examination by customs officers involved in the importation are collected from the addresses when the articles are delivered.

To illustrate the inconsistency in connection with our present parcels post system, an individual entering any post-office in our country with two parcels weighing five pounds each will be obliged to pay 80 cents, on the one to Montreal, for example, but for the one destined for a foreign country although it usually passes through Montreal, the charge is 60 cents. Should the weight be five pounds six ounces a package addressed to the resident in Montreal will be denied admission to the mails by the postmaster, while the package intended for a resident in a foreign land will be accepted and forwarded, probably via Montreal, at the rate of 12 cents per pound. Parcels for foreign countries will be received in most instances up to eleven pounds.

A rural parcels post would do more to overcome our present way of centralizing our population than any other one thing. It would serve to stimulate trade between the farmer and the country merchant and be a blessing to the consumer. The legislation I would propose for rural parcels post may be summarized as follows:—

The Postmaster General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may authorize postmasters and carriers on such rural lines as he shall select to accept for delivery by carrier on the route, or on any other route starting at the post office, branch post office or station, which is the distributing point for that route, or for delivery through any post office branch, branch post office or station on any of the said routes, at such rates of book rate as he shall determine, packages not exceeding eleven pounds in weight, containing no mail matter of the first class, and no matter that is declared by law.

There is much misconception on the subject of parcels post. In China a parcels post system is carried on with all the European countries. Postal rates on parcels post sent from the United Kingdom to Germany are considerably higher than rates for parcels sent from Germany to the United Kingdom. The Russian Consul in the tenth consular district of Warsaw, reports that British manufacturers are handicapped owing to the difference in parcels post rates between the United Kingdom and Russia and Germany and Russia. Those rates are as follows:

From United Kingdom to Poland		5.0
3 lb. parcel		2.0
7 "		2.6
11 "		3.0
From Germany to Poland		3.D.
3 lb. parcel		1.5
7 "		1.5
11 "		1.5

Germany is able to increase her trade.

The Swiss government now owns the majority of the railway mileage of the country, regulates and controls the traffic rates on all the railways, manufactures all equipment except rails, for all the railways, and owns and operates the telegraph and telephone systems, for which it manufactures all the equipment thereby securing a uniformity of instruments and apparatus. There is a free delivery mail, including rural districts, a parcel post by which anything from a spool of thread to a locomotive may be forwarded; and a post office banking system designated as post check.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce will go on with the Grain Bill. If he does not, I presume we shall go on with the Tariff Commission Bill, if it is ready.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 1, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Railway Statistics of Canada for 1911.—Mr. Cochrane.

TELEPHONES IN RURAL POST OFFICES.

Mr. SPEAKER. Having been called upon yesterday suddenly to consider a motion upon the order paper re telephones in rural post offices, I gave a ruling that, upon more careful and mature consideration, I am quite sure, would not be held to be well founded. I based my ruling of yesterday upon a motion of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) regarding the placing of telephones in rural post offices mainly on the general principle that this resolution appeared to involve a charge upon the revenue and must be considered in Committee of the Whole. A careful examination of cases, both in England and in this House, shows that where the expenditure of public money is not directly involved, and the resolution merely expresses an abstract opinion on a matter which may necessitate a future grant, it may be introduced directly by a private member.

In looking at the authorities I find, in Canadian Commons Journals, 1892, page 133, on a motion moved by Mr. Denison relating to the deepening of canals, which was of a very similar character and was afterwards withdrawn, no ruling was given. In Canadian Commons Journals, 1897, page 59, a motion is presented advocating a bonus on creameries. In that case it was a somewhat similar motion, but would tend more strongly towards a violation of the rule, as it proposed that a cent a pound at least should be given upon all butter manufactured in creameries. After that motion had been considered the debate was adjourned and no objection was taken to it. In Canadian Commons Journals, 1899, page 85, we have a motion with reference to indebtedness for seed grain. Mr. Davin, I believe, proposed the motion which, after being debated, was withdrawn and no point of order was raised. These, with a number of other precedents that I have looked up, justify me in saying that my ruling of yesterday was not exactly sound, but while saying that I would like to quote Bourinot's remarks on the point, because it is a matter that I think the House should take cognizance of in the future. He says:

> A practice has grown up in the House allowing the introduction of resolutions by private members, when they do not directly involve the expenditure of public money, but simply express an abstract opinion on a matter which may necessitate a future grant.

Then he gives the cases I have quoted here and proceeds:

> As this is a question not always understood it may be explained that such resolutions, being framed in general terms, do not bind the House to future legislation on the subject, and are merely intended to point out to the government the importance and necessity of such expenditure.
>
> Referring to this right of members to move such abstract resolutions, all authorities agree that it is one 'which the House exercises, and should always exercise, with very great reserve, and only under peculiar and exceptional circumstances.' Such resolutions are considered virtually 'an evasion of the rules of the House, and are on that account objectionable, and should be discouraged as much as possible.' Nevertheless neither the English nor Canadian House of Commons has ever agreed to the adoption of a rule to fetter their discretion in regard to the entertaining of such propositions.

Therefore, I presume the custom has grown up in that way. It would be in order for the hon. member who had that

motion in charge to move to have it reinstated on the order paper, as otherwise it would be dropped.

Mr. BLAIN. I would move that the resolution be restored to the order paper.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

FISH REDUCTION WORKS, ARICHAT.

* Mr. KYTE:

1. Did the right hon. R. L. Borden, during the late federal election send a telegram to J. A. Gillis, Conservative candidate in the electoral district of Richmond county, N.S., to the effect that if the Conservative party should be returned to power fish reduction works would be established at Arichat?
2. Is it the intention of the government to establish such works?

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). No telegram was sent in the terms set forth in this question. A reduction plant necessary to prevent the destruction of or the serious injury to the fishing industry by depredations of dog-fish would be established.

MR. HENRY COFFIN.

Mr. GUILBAULT:

1. Was Mr. Henry Coffin a messenger of the House of Commons in 1896, and was he dismissed?
2. If so, at whose request, by whom was he replaced, and who recommended the appointment of his successor?
3. What were the reasons alleged to justify Mr. Coffin's dismissal?
4. Was there an inquiry, and was the employee placed in a position to defend himself?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Mr. Henry Coffin was a sessional messenger in the service of the House of Commons up to July, 1896, when he was discharged.
2. There is no record as to who recommended his discharge, or by whom he was replaced.
3. No. reasons were given.
4. There was no inquiry, and consequently no defence.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH BETWEEN SUNNYBRAE AND GUYSBOROUGH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What appropriation was made by parliament at the last session for the construction of a branch of the Intercolonial railway in Nova Scotia between Sunnybrae and Guysborough and Country Harbour?
2. Were tenders asked for by the late government for the construction of the said branch railway?
3. What are the names of the firms or persons who tendered for the construction of the said branch line?
4. What was the amount of each tender and the cash deposit on each?
5. Was any tender accepted? If so, which one?
6. Was notice of acceptance sent to the successful tenderer?
7. Was the successful tenderer instructed not to proceed with the work of construction? If so, why?
8. Did the government purchase a branch railway known as the Sunnybrae branch from the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company? If so, what price was paid for said branch railway?
9. With reference to the following language used by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in his speech in the House on January 18, 1912, in reference to the construction of this branch railway, namely:—'I believe that before committing the country to any expenditure, we should be able to give the people a just reason for our action, and we should see that the taxpayers of Canada get a fair return for the money expended, or at least sufficient to pay the interest on the capital,' does the minister apply the same condition to the expenditure involved in the purposed line between Dartmouth and Deans Settlement in the same province?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $1,000,000.
2. Yes; by newspaper advertisement.
3. Nova Scotia Construction Company, Limited, Sydney, Nova Scotia; M. J. O'Brien, Renfrew, Ontario; James H. Corbett, Moncton, New Brunswick; Kennedy & MacDonald, Antigonish, Nova Scotia; S. Pearson & Son, Incorporated, New York, New York; M. P. & J. T. Davis, Ottawa; MacArthur Brothers, Company, Halifax, Nova Scotia; John W. McManus, Company, Limited, Memramcook, New Brunswick.
4. Nova Scotia Construction Company, $1,057,122.19, cash deposit $100,000; M. J. O'Brien, $1,165,189.17, cash deposit $100,000; James H. Corbett, $1,145,326.10, cash deposit $100,000; Kennedy & McDonald, $1,085,470.86, cash deposit $100,000; S. Pearson & Son, Incorporated, $1,446,020.98, cash deposit $100,000; M. P. & J. T. Davis, $1,066,695.40, cash deposit $100,000; McArthur Bros. Company, $1,272,614.76, cash deposit, $100,000; John W. MacManus, Company, $1,300,947.61, cash deposit $100,000.
5. Yes; the tender of the Nova Scotia Construction Company.
6. Yes.
7. Yes. Surveys of the whole of the railway had not been completed before tenders were called. The first location of the line was from Sunnybrae easterly along the east branch of the St. Mary's river through the county of Pictou, thence southeasterly to Melrose in Guysborough county.

Another location which was urged was one from Sunnybrae southerly following Barren Brook to the west branch of St. Mary's river, thence easterly through Guysborough county to Melrose, a common point to both locations. The last mentioned location was examined only in a preliminary way. The question as to which of these routes should be adopted had not been settled. No reliable estimate of the cost of the work had been made. There not being at hand sufficient information to show that there was justification for the building of the line, and the incurring of the outlay, it was thought well to cancel the contract and abandon the proceedings until complete and reliable data and information could be obtained, and the minister satisfied that, before committing the country to the expenditure, the same is justified.

8. Yes. $100,000.

9. Yes. Practically.

POSTAGE ON NEWSPAPERS.

*Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton):

1. Did the then member for East Lambton on July 21 last ask the then Postmaster General to say whether it was his intention to enforce clause 60 of the departmental regulations, so as to collect special postal charges of one cent per four ounces to each separate address on all newspapers sent to new subscribers during the election contest?

2. Did the then Postmaster General reply in the following words:—'Clause 60 shall be enforced. Any complaints that may be made to the department will be thoroughly inquired into and any infringement will be stopped. There is no reason why this clause should be violated by any of the newspapers. The clause shall remain as it is, and it shall be enforced'?

3. During the last general election contest, did the postmaster at Toronto refer a question of excess postal charges against the Toronto 'Globe' to the department at Ottawa? If so, what reply did the department make?

4. Did the Toronto post office make a similar request for a ruling regarding excess postal charges against the Toronto 'News' or other newspapers? If so, what was the departmental ruling?

5. Is it true, as claimed by the Toronto 'Globe,' in its issue of January 9, 1912, that the 'Globe' had a binding agreement on the part of the Post Office Department to carry these papers at the regular rate of postage, viz., one-quarter of a cent per pound?

6. If so, is it true that as a result of this special mailing privilege certain newspapers were enabled to circulate thousands of copies daily at the ordinary postal rate, and without paying the excess postage rate, while other newspapers were compelled from time to time during the election campaign to meet the department's bills for excess postage?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. The then Postmaster General said that and more.

Mr. COCHRANE.

3. There was no reply sent nor was there one necessary because the rules are well known.

4. The same answer as preceding.

5. No.

6. Answered by No. 5.

CORRESPONDENTS OF 'LABOUR GAZETTE.'

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is A. P. Vanasse appointed as correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' for Sorel, the defeated candidate at the last federal election in the county of Richelieu?

2. Has L. Cousineau, lately appointed correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette,' any other occupation or other appointment from the government?

3. How many 'Labour Gazette' correspondents have been or are appointed for the city of Toronto?

4. What are their names, occupations, and their salaries in each case?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. He is employed by the Public Works Department as watchman of the Ottawa River timber slides at Hull, Que. Although the Department of Labour was not aware of the fact when he was appointed correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette'.

3. Two.

4. Phillips Thompson, newspaper writer, $125; T. W. Banton, newspaper writer, $125.

SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Is there a claim before the Department of Railways and Canals, made by Mr. Denis Martin and others residing in the neighbourhood of the Soulanges canal, for damages incurred? If so, what year was that claim dated?

2. Does the government intend to reply, one way or the other, in the near future to that claim?

3. What has been the cause, up to the present, that delayed the settlement of that affair?

4. The government, having already been said to have answered one of the parties interested that it could do nothing before having a report from the engineers in charge of the hydraulic or topographic plans, is that work done?

5. Since when has it been commenced and when will it be completed?

6. Could not the department get a partial report of the plans regarding the persons who claim damages, in order that quicker action may be taken one way or the other?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. Date of claim July 14, 1905.

2. Yes.

3. Complete surveys of the Soulanges canal property and tributary drainage areas were found necessary as a basis for consideration of these claims.

4. Yes, sufficiently advanced to deal with these claims.
5. Commenced in 1909 and carried on in 1910 and 1911.
6. Yes.

CARILLON CANAL.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Who now holds the lease of the hydraulic power at Carillon and Pointe Fortune?
2. At what date did such lease take effect?
3. Was the lessee obliged to fulfil certain obligations before the end of the first year?
4. Did he fulfil his obligations at the close of the lease? If not, is the lease cancelled by that fact?
5. If the government has not annulled the lease, such facts being established, does it propose to annul it soon?
6. What is the price of the lease?
7. How much has the government received on this account since the leasing to the last person?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The National Hydro-Electric Company, Limited, of the city of Montreal.
2. March 31, 1911.
3. Yes. To commence construction and erection of necessary works and buildings.
4. Yes. No; the lease is still in force.
5. Answered by number four.
6. Annual rental: Land, $100; water, $2 per horse-power.
7. $100 to date.

HULL CITY HALL SQUARE.

*Mr. KIDD:

1. Was the work of grading and sodding, laying granolithic walks, and tree planting, on the City Hall Square, Hull, P.Q., undertaken by the Ottawa Improvement Commission? If so, upon whose request or recommendation?
2. What was the cost respectively of the different classes of work?
3. When was the work commenced and when was it finished?
4. Is the Hull City Hall Square to be maintained permanently by the Ottawa Improvement Commission?
5. Were the electric lamp posts and fixtures in said square erected by the Ottawa Improvement Commission?
6. Is the commission defraying the costs of maintaining the lights? If so, what is the cost per month?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. Yes. The corporation of the city of Hull.
2.

Grading and sodding	$ 156 22
Laying walks	379 57
Tree planting	54 10
Lamps, posts, &c.	719 49
Fence	608 38
Labour on all works	2,070 55
	$3,988 31

3. Commenced July 22, 1911; completed December, 1911.
4. No.
5. Yes.
6. No.

ST. PASCAL MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. Has the contract for the carrying of mails between Kamouraska and the railway station at St. Pascal been cancelled since the 21st September, and for what reasons?
2. Who does the carrying of the said mails at present and on what conditions?
3. Who recommended the change?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2 and 3. The mail service between Kamouraska and railway station was performed under a temporary agreement by Thomas Deschenes terminable at the Postmaster General's pleasure. This temporary arrangement is terminated and a new one made with George Langlais at the rate as paid to Deschenes viz:—$300 per annum.

RIGAUD POSTMASTER.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Has one or more applications been made for the position of postmaster of the town of Rigaud, to replace the present postmaster?
2. If so, what are the names of the applicants, and on the other hand, the names of the persons through whom such applications could have been made?

Mr. PELLETIER:

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

VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM.

Mr. BELLEMARE:

1. What is the number of the workmen and of the employees generally who were engaged, since the 15th April, 1911, on the works at Victoria Memorial Museum, the new museum on Metcalfe Street?
2. Were these men temporary employees?
3. Did the works necessitate the employment of such a large number of men?
4. When and why were they discharged?

Mr. MONK:

1. Workmen employed on grading, sidewalks, roads, &c., the greatest number on any one paylist is 237, the average number for this work is 131.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Owing to the season of the year, the work had to be discontinued.

L'ACHIGAN ICE-BREAKER.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Did the Department of Public Works during the year nineteen hundred and eleven call for tenders for the construction of an ice-breaker for the river l'Achigan, in

the county of L'Assomption? If so, what are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender?

2. Was the contract for the construction of the ice-breaker awarded? If so, to whom and for what reason?

3. If the contract has not yet been awarded, does the department intend to soon proceed with those works and use for that purpose the sums voted in the estimates of 1911-12?

4. If the department does not intend to use the money voted for that icebreaker and have the construction of it done, what are the reasons given for the abandoning of those works, and at whose request were they abandoned?

Mr. MONK:

1. (a) Yes. (b) G. A. Grunninger, $4,150. Jos. Renaud, $4,498. Jas. Bourque, $8,250.

2. No.

3. Not until the question of necessity is investigated.

4. (a) That this icebreaker would be useless; (b) by Mr. Joseph Morin.

DISMISSALS OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BOYER:

Will the hon. Minister, the Postmaster General, equally dismiss from office a Conservative postmaster who has taken part in politics against a Liberal candidate during the last federal election, provided always, that facts supported by indisputable evidence be brought to his knowledge?

Mr. PELLETIER. The Postmaster General decides concrete cases. Each case is decided on its merits.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

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

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, advance and pay to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, hereinafter called the corporation, in addition to the moneys, if any, heretofore authorized to be advanced to the corporation by the Governor in Council by any Act, and which have not at the date of the passing of any Act founded upon these resolutions been so advanced, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of six million dollars, as are required:—

(a) to pay off and retire debentures of the corporation of the par value of six hundred thousand dollars, maturing at the rate of two hundred dollars per annum in each of the years 1913, 1914 and 1915, and,

(b) to enable the corporation to complete the construction of the terminal facilities of the port of Montreal, for which the plans, specifications and estimates have been approved by the Governor in Council, and to construct such additional terminal facilities as are necessary to properly equip the said port, and in respect of which plans, specifications and estimates have, previous to advances being made, been approved by the Governor in Council;

2. That during the period of construction of the terminal facilities mentioned in these resolutions, the interest payable on the debentures receivable by the Minister of Finance in exchange for such advances, shall be deemed to be money required to complete and to be part of the cost of construction thereof, and such interest may be paid out of the said sum of six million dollars.

3. That the corporation shall upon any advances being made deposit with the Minister of Finance debentures of the corporation equal in par value to the advance so made, repayable within twenty-five years from the date of issue, and bearing interest payable half yearly, at the rate of three and one half per centum per annum.

4. That the pricipal and interest of any sums advanced under any Act founded on these resolutions shall be payable, subject to the second of these resolutions, out of the revenue of the corporation mentioned in section 8 of chapter 10 of the statutes of 1896, (first session), and shall be a charge thereon as if the sums so advanced had been borrowed by the corporation under said chapter 10.

Motion agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

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

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the payment out of the consolidated revenue fund of such sums as may be sufficient to discharge the obligations of His Majesty the King, acting in respect of the Dominion of Canada, under the provisions of paragraph 5 of the schedule to chapter 24 of the statutes of 1904, in accordance with the interpretation of these provisions by the judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, on the appeal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company vs. The King, from the Supreme Court of Canada, delivered November second, 1911.

He said: His Royal Highness the Governor General having been made aware of the subject matter of this resolution has assented to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Finance has very properly placed on the table the decision of the Privy Council in this case, and I would ask him to also place before the House, the claim of the Grand Trunk, the correspondence, and the arguments of counsel.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If I can obtain that record I shall be glad to do so. But the matter is very urgent and it is not desirable there should be any delay in submitting it to the House. I have already furnished to hon. members the judgment of the Privy Council and the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada and I shall furnish figures showing the liability of the government to the Grand Trunk Pacific

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The argument of counsel before the Privy Council may not be immediately available and I would forego that, but the minister has in his department all the correspondence from the original claim of the Grand Trunk to the present day.

Mr. BORDEN. It may be possible to procure what is known as 'the case' in the Privy Council, which gives a statement of the contention of each party, and that can be brought down. If the stenographic notes of the argument before the Privy Council have not been extended it will entail some delay to get them, but if they have been extended and are available we will of course submit them to the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will not insist upon the stenographic report of the argument if it is not immediately available, but we should have the claim filed by the Grand Trunk, the answer and the reference to the court.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Very well.

Motion agreed to.

B. C. LUMBER COMBINE.

Mr. KNOWLES (Moosejaw). I rise to a question of privilege Mr. Speaker. I wish to call your attention and the attention of the House to a dodger which was put in every member's post-office box yesterday under somewhat strange circumstances. It is headed: The Canadian government the tool of combines; $20,000 challenge; By A. E. Watts, of Wattsburgh, B.C. I do not wish to encourage this dodger to the extent of reading any part of it, further than to say that so far as it is possible and as effectually as it is possible, to call a member of this House, a liar without using that term, he does so. The writer of this is known to me and to several members of this House. He is known to the British Columbia members; he is known to the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) amongst whose constituents he is to be found and I think the hon. member (Mr. Goodeve) will agree with me, that the writer of this dodger is known as what is generally called half-witted. I say this, not for the purpose of speaking lightly of Mr. A. E. Watts, of Wattsburg, British Columbia, but because it has come to our knowledge officially that during the sittings of the committee, which made an investigation in connection with the lumber combine, the then chairman of that committee, the late Hon. Thos. Greenway had on different occasions to suppress this same Mr. Watts, and on some occasions to do so on my own suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Would the hon. member state his question of privilege and then confine himself as closely as possible to it?

Mr. KNOWLES. I am getting there, Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege is this: This paper which has been put in every member's box, the postoffice of the House of Commons has been prostituted in that way, states that I was guilty of a falsehood when I said that the lumber manufacturers of British Columbia had been guilty of a combine. It also says that I stated what I knew to be an untruth when I said that such a combine, in my belief, existed yet. This has been put in cold print and I therefore am going to do what I am loath to do, pay enough attention to it to prove that my statements were correct in each instance and it will take only a moment to do so. When I spoke on this subject the other day, I read from the official records of the House of Commons Appendix to the Journals, Vol. 42, 1906-07, the report of the committee on this subject, of which I was a member. I shall repeat what I then read:

> The British Columbia Lumber and Shingle Manufacturers' Association, and the Mountain Lumber Manufacturers' Association, which, in the opinion of the committee, amount to a combination——

They were found, in the opinion of the committee which was made the opinion of the House, to be a combine, which justifies the statement I made that a combine had been proved.

With regard to the other statement, that such a combine existed, I went no further than to say that the reports in the public press made statements and representations that such a combine existed as late as October 9 last, and I read from the 'Winnipeg Telegram' a despatch of October 10 last, saying that if that report was correct such a combine did exist. I mention these things to put myself right with regard to the dodger which has been anonymously distributed to the members of the House, and I protest, as emphatically as I am able, against our post office being used for such a purpose. In this instance it does not hurt my feelings to be called what is there written about me, but if it is known as a principle that any member of this House who is enough of a cad to send anonymous communications to every other member with regard to a certain member can do so with impunity, no member will be safe from being embarrassed and harassed by such actions. One can readily understand that if such things are allowed to pass without protest the day will come when a member may say that he has the right to distribute any scurrilous misrepresentation referring to any man's morals or his family relations and I protest against the post office being so used. This letter was not addressed, it was distributed and no such use of our post office should be permitted without the

articles being addressed to the members. I have inquired into the source from which this dodger comes, and I hope the hon. member whom I am about to name will correct me if I am misinformed, I am informed although I could scarcely credit it, that this sheet of misrepresentations this false dodger, this scandalous article was handed in by the secretary of my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) with instructions to place one of these slanderous and malicious articles in the box of every other of the 220 members of this House.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). As the hon. member has referred to me, I would ask the privilege of answering some remarks he has made. With regard to the author of this circular. I need only say he is one of the very prominent lumbermen in British Columbia, a man who has made a very great success of his business and who has large vested interests there.

Mr. KNOWLES. Is he not generally recognized as half crazy at least?

Mr. GOODEVE. Not at all.

Mr. NESBITT. I rise to a point of order. I believe that on a question of privilege no discussion is allowed.

Mr. GOODEVE. I was directly appealed to by the hon. member who has arisen to the question of privilege, who certainly was out of order in referring to a past debate and reading extracts already answered, so I am privileged to reply to a question directly asked.

Mr. KNOWLES. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOODEVE. I have already stated that the article is not anonymous, it is openly signed by the author who issued a certain specific challenge, and he forwarded this to me as the member representing that district, as he had a perfect right to do, and asked that copies be placed in the hands of each member of the House. Under the postal Act that is perfectly legal and legitimate. Any member can receive communications from any outsider without payment of postage under the Act, so that complaint also falls to the ground.

In regard to the names the hon. gentleman has undertaken to call myself I have nothing to say, because from the source from which they come they will have no effect on me. I only make my statement with reference to the gentleman who is one of my constituents and who has openly signed the article which he has written in what he considers to be a fair defence of an unfair attack made on the lumbering interests of the province of British Columbia.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have only to add regarding this publication to which my attention was called, that I made inquiry as to the custom in regard to the use of the post office in such a case. I was informed that such distribution as occurred in this instance is a common practice, that sometimes newspapers or perhaps letters regarding Bills that are coming before the House, or papers of various kinds that are signed, not anonymous, are handed to the postmaster with the request that he place one in each member's box as he would be obliged to do if the communications were addressed to each member, so that the communications may reach the members sooner than they otherwise would. Communications with reference to Bills coming up in committees in a short time are usually distributed in that way and for that purpose. This was done exactly on the same principle and without any knowledge on the part of the postmaster as to the contents of the communication.

I may say as an old member of the House that I know from personal experience that this has been the usual custom and therefore I feel that the postmaster was not blameable in any way for permitting the distribution of this document.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). I desire to call the attention of the government to the apparent necessity which exists in some parts of Saskatchewan at least for the supply of seed grain during the present winter for the crop to be sown next spring. I regret that I am not in a position to give any definite information as to how widespread the necessity may be, but from some parts of my district, I have had representations that it may be necessary to distribute seed grain to some men residing on homesteads or unpatented lands. I have a communication which I received this morning which surprised me, that even on the Soo line, that prosperous country south and east of Moosejaw, which we think is one of the wealthiest parts of Saskatchewan, there is special need for this seed grain. With the permission of the House, I will read a short resolution of the Board of Trade of the town of Wilcox, 40 miles south east of Moosejaw.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is for the purpose of asking a question of the government the hon. member would have the right to read the letter, but if there might be a debate on it, it would be out of order.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I wished to read it as it will place before the government better than I can do the necessity of the case. With the permission of the House I shall read it.

Mr. BORDEN. There is no objection.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Reading:—

We the members of The Wilcox Board of Trade, taking into consideration the wide spread hardship occasioned by the failure of the crop, crave that assistance be given by th government to those deserving parties who are without seed for the season 1912; under the usual grain Act. This Board of Trade will be pleased to forward to the government a list of such deserving parties in the Wilcox district.

A speedy consideration of the matter is urgently requested.

I have no doubt that similar communications have been brought to the attention of the government but I respectfully submit that the distribution of seed grain is a matter that should receive the immediate attention of the present government.

Mr. BORDEN. I may say, in the absence of the Minister of the Interior, that I know this matter has already been brought to his attention, and that he is giving his earnest consideration to it. I think some resolutions passed elsewhere have already been brought to the attention of the government, and I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the conditions to which he alludes are such as to demand not only careful, but immediate attention.

Mr. TURRIFF. In this connection I would like to say one word, that is that the government should take steps to make it thoroughly known that wheat which has been standing out in the stack, or in the stook all winter, and which may have become damp through the inclemency of the weather, and then frozen, will not germinate; although a large proportion of it may look perfectly good.

When I first went to the western country, I put in my first crop in the spring of 1879. Unfortunately I was not able to get a threshing machine, so my stacks stayed out until the April following. My wheat was as fine looking as you could see. I sold most of it for seed, and sowed some of it myself, but unfortunately not over one-third of it germinated. The same thing will take place in many instances this year; a good many of the farmers having no idea that the weather may kill the germinating power of the wheat.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). How did you get on with the farmers when they found it would not germinate?

Mr. TURRIFF. They knew that I was perfectly innocent in the matter, and we suffered together.

I would like to obviate, as far as possible, anything of that kind occurring this spring, and, therefore, I believe it would be advisable for the Minister of Agriculture to take whatever steps he may see fit to spread the information.

Mr. BURRELL. I think we are out of order in entering upon this question now, but I would simply say that the Seed Branch of the Department of Agriculture has been, and is at the present time looking into these matters.

THE GRAIN ACT.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 32) respecting grain.

On section 16,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The committee will remember that when we had this Bill up before we passed section 16, and, then coming to section 29 we found an inconsistency, which might lead to confusion, so section 29 was allowed to stand. I have since looked the matter up, and I think it can best be cured by amending section 16, which now reads: 'Any oath, the taking of which is hereinafter authorized or prescribed by this Act, may be administered by a commissioner, or by the secretary'. According to section 29 an oath may be taken before a commissioner or notary public. I propose to change section 16 to read:

Any oath the taking of which is hereinafter authorized or prescribed by this Act may be administered by one of the commissioners appointed hereunder, by the secretary of the commission, by a notary public, a justice of the peace or any public officer authorized by law to administer oaths.

That will make a general provision, and it may be left out of section 29, because 16, covers the officers who have authority.

Amendment as moved, carried.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved that section 29 be amended as follows:

Every chief inspector, inspector or deputy inspector shall, before acting as such, take and subscribe to an oath of office in the form or to the effect following: 'I, A. B. do solemnly swear that I will faithfully, truly and impartially, to the best of my judgment, skill and understanding, execute and perform the office of chief inspector of grain (or inspector or deputy inspector of grain) and that while I continue to be such chief inspector (or inspector, or deputy inspector) I will not directly of or indirectly by myself or by any other person or persons, deal or trade in any grain on my account, or upon the account of any other persons or persons. So help me God.'

Amendment as moved, carried.

On section 33,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved that section 33 be amended to read as follows:

The chief inspector and the inspectors for the division shall, not later than the seventh day of October in each year select samples of the different grades of grain, which shall be known as official standards.

2. Any such inspector shall upon request therefor, furnish a sample of any such made

of grain, accompanied by a specific statement that it is the official standard for that grade.

3. For all samples so furnished the inspector shall make such charge as is approved by the board.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to put this last subsection in the same list as the one we dealt with in regard to fees. It seems to me that the collection of fees, at this stage in the amendment that would be proper is merely vexatious and will not give sufficient revenue to warrant the vexatiousness of the proceeding.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will take these all up together. And this section will pass

Reconsideration of section 35,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This section provides:

That no inspecting officer shall inspect grain being laden or about to be laden on vessels or cars after dark or in wet weather, except on receipt personally, or through the office of the chief inspector, of an application from the owner or possessor of the grain or his authorized agent, written upon one of the printed forms furnished by the board and signed by such owner or his authorized agent, relieving him, the inspecting officer, from responsibility for damage which may be caused by such wet weather.

The word 'or' should be inserted there, and then it goes on:

——darkness or for loss arising from errors liable to occur in an inspection under such circumstances.

2. In every case of such inspection the inspecting officer shall be personally present when the grain is actually delivered on board.

Inspections to be proper must be made in proper light—I understand that to be necessary. This provides that inspections may be made under, so to speak, improper conditions, at the convenience and at the risk of the owner. But the grade is yet to be established, and the grade should be established under proper conditions. So, I propose to add the following subsection:

3. In such case, no certificate shall be issued until the inspector's sample of such lot is examined under proper conditions.

The inspector watches that grain as it goes out under conditions which are not suitable to proper grading. He takes his samples all along and has his whole sample. And he waits until daylight before he issues his certificate.

Amendments agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 41—oath of office,

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto).

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I move that that section be amended by omitting the words 'before a commissioner or notary public,' the point being already provided for.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 46—fees for examination,

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think it would be more satisfactory to have the amount of fees, within the limits prescribed by the Act, fixed by the board of commissioners, instead of leaving it to the board of examiners in every particular case. There would probably be a good deal of variation. The board would lay down a certain plan. There might possibly be some difference in the fees under different circumstances which might arise, but the board would decide how these fees should be divided.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not think the matter is important. I made inquiry as to the custom that had hitherto been followed under the law, also whether any dissatisfaction had arisen, or any volcanic action had taken place, and I found that up to the present time there has been perfect harmony and no ill effects have been observed. I think in this matter we might give full liberty to the board to do as they please. They might take it into their heads, under certain circumstances, not to charge any fee at all. As we limit the charge in the maximum, probably no great harm would be done if we allowed the board of examiners full liberty to arrange this.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Have these examinations been going on?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Did they ever charge less than $20?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I could not say.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think it is a good principle to leave to the men who are to get the benefit of the fee, the privilege of saying what the fee shall be. If the maximum is fixed at $20, you can depend upon it that the examiners will put the fee at $20, when the matter is left to them, and they have the money to divide amongst themselves. There are many cases where a fee of $20 is not extreme, but there may be cases where it would be regarded as unnecessary.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Could the hon. gentleman suggest a case where $20 would not be exorbitant?

Mr. OLIVER. I would not care to go into that detail. It may be that there are

many cases where $20 would not be too much. I think the principle is wrong, and it might be well to amend the section. I would ask the minister to let the clause stand.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It must be remembered that these examiners get no other remuneration, they are not under salary. However, we will let that stand. It is not regulated according to fixed principle, no doubt. I took it because it has been the custom, and sometimes that makes the best law.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It would not appear to me to be too high a fee if every man, or every applicant who was examined, received a position. But no doubt many men will be examined who will not receive the position, and I believe $20 is excessive.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I do not think a fee of $20 would be excessive in certain cases where only one man came up to be examined. But in cases where there were half a dozen to be examined, that fee would be excessive.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will let that stand.

On Section 48—standards established by Grain Standards Board.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It has been suggested that there ought to be added these words as another sub-clause:

All standards shall be subject to the approval of the board.

The board, under this, appoints gentlemen fit and skilled for the purpose of establishing grades and choosing samples. Then the board knows no more about it, and the idea which has been suggested is that such standard samples, when chosen, should be subject to the approval of the board. I do not really know whether that is necessary or not. If it establishes an additional security without subjecting the thing to any delay that would be injurious it would seem that every safeguard you can throw about a thing of that kind should be thrown about it. The commissioners might not be experienced samplers, but they would always have at hand the chief inspector or some other person who would be thoroughly capable of advising them. I have no objection to that going in if it meets with the approval of the committee.

Mr. OLIVER. It strikes me that perhaps there would be an advantage in it. I would be quite willing to agree to insert it and pass the clause with it in. In case future consideration might lead to its being viewed in another light, I suppose there would be no serious objection to reconsidering the clause?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If we find we have made a mistake we ought to rectify it.

Mr. OLIVER. Has it any reference to sample standards or standard samples?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Would it not be better to use the word 'samples'?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We might make it:

All standard samples shall be subject to the approval of the board.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Would there be any question about this referring to the standards arranged for under section 105?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, that is entirely confined to commercial grades.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). But you are not putting the usual qualifications into that third clause—standards fixed under this section.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Is that necessary?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). It is usually done in such cases.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Well, the words cost us nothing:

All standard samples established under this section shall be subject to the approval of the board.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. There would be no question about it then.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 56,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Under this section the chief inspector may be a member of any Board of Grain Examiners and a member of the Grain Standards Board as well, and it is also provided that he may be a member of the Grain Survey Board within his division; thus, in the latter case he is made a member of a board which adjudicates on his own decisions, and objection has been taken to that. I think the clause should be amended in that respect.

Mr. OLIVER. That is right.

Section amended accordingly.

On section 57,

Mr. NEELY. While a clause similar to this has existed in previous legislation of this parliament, that clause has always been inoperative, and under present conditions will probably remain so. There is no doubt that one of the great sources of loss to the grain grower of the west is the

fact that he has no sample market. As a result of not having such a sample market in the city of Winnipeg, the grain growers of the west probably lose millions of dollars per annum.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is for the lack of a sample market?

Mr. NEELY. Yes. The spreading of price between the grades of wheat, especially the lower grades, amounts to five or six cents per bushel, and often more. The farmer who grows grain that is not quite good enough to grade as No. 1 but is very high class No. 2, is compelled under the present system to accept the same price as the farmer whose wheat is barely able to come into No. 2, and so on down the line with the other grades. Another source of loss from not having a sample market at Winnipeg comes from the fact that according to the rigid requirements of our legislation to bring grain into certain high standards (so far as the colour and appearance and condition of the shell of the grain is concerned) wheat which judged by its intrinsic milling value would be high class is often put into a lower class.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Are the leaders of the grain growers in the west in favour of a sample market? I ask that for information.

Mr. NEELY. My hon. friend ought to be quite as well versed on the views of the grain growers as I am.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I did think so at one time, and I thought they were all in favour of a sample market, but I was surprised to hear within the last few days that the representatives of the grain growers at present in Ottawa are opposed to a sample market.

Mr. NEELY. I will deal with that point in a minute. The lack of a sample market also prevents us employing those chemical tests which are used in the State of Minnesota, and by which grain that from its appearance would under our system be graded low, might justly be placed in a much higher grade over there. Under present conditions we are not likely to have a sample market established in Winnipeg because our buyers are in eastern Canada and in Great Britain, and they quite probably get better value by buying on grade than on sample. Where a sample market is established in order that it be of any value it would be necessary to permit the man who bought the grain on sample to deal as he saw fit with that grain which he purchased.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is to mix it.

Mr. NEELY. Exactly. I have discussed this matter with grain growers but not with representatives of the Grain Growers' Association or any one who could speak authoritatively on the matter, but I know there has been a great deal of discussion among the grain growers on this question of a sample market.

I think the grain growers generally realize the futility of a sample market under present conditions. They would be afraid to have any legislation passed that would permit of mixing at the terminal elevators under present conditions of private ownership and operation; but if those terminals were operated by the government, who would have no object in manipulating the grain to the advantage of anybody, and who would be expected to handle the grain in a proper manner in those terminals, I imagine that the very first thing the grain growers would establish or assist in establishing, would be a sample market in the city of Winnipeg. I would like to know if these conditions which the grain growers desire in connection with the terminals are likely to be brought about by the government in the near future, so that this disadvantage of not having a sample market because of present conditions at the terminals, may be removed.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The section with which we are dealing is section 57, which says:

> Nothing in this Act shall prevent any person from selling or buying grain by sample regardless of its grades.

Does my hon. friend wish to delete this or to put in its place a section which shall forbid any one buying or selling by sample? That is the question which is before us now. My hon. friend said that this clause had been, and was now, inoperative. My information, and I have some good sources of information, is that millions of bushels of grain are sold every year by sample without reference to grade certificates. The farmer comes into the station with his load of grain, and the buyer, and he agree upon the value of the grain as shown by the sample, and there is no question of grading, and no disability, he has a perfect right to sell the grain on sample, and does sell on sample. After the grain has gone through all the processes into the terminal warehouse, the person who owns the grain when he takes that grain out, may tear up his certificate of grade if he pleases, and sell his grain utterly regardless of its grade, and by sample alone. I am told that this is a common practice, and that millions of bushels of grain are sold in that way. I do not suppose my hon. friend would wish to prohibit such a right of sale which every man now enjoys.

My hon. friend wants more information, he wishes to know what the government are going to do about the terminal eleva-

tors. Section 13, was allowed to stand, and I informed the committee that before the Bill was through the government would be prepared to state what they propose to do as to taking over, leasing or otherwise dealing with the terminal elevators.

With reference to the sample market, my information is that at present the representatives of the grain growers who are here are not in favour of a sample market. They think that the time may come when a sample market should be established, but they want certain things changed before that is done.

Mr. NEELY. Will the minister tell us what they are?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Quite frankly, they want the terminal elevators owned and operated by the government, they want that first. They are in conscience, and in principle totally opposed to mixing grains, but they know, of course, that a sample market is of no use to anybody unless there is power to mix, and it is on the mixing part of it that they are not yet quite converted.

There is a good deal in what my hon. friend says with reference to the advantages of a sample market; I do not need much argument to convince me of the feasibility, and also of the desirability of a sample market. It may be that it would be well to keep, with the sample market, the grade market as well, and have a choice of the conveniences that come from both. I want, in the first place, to find out what the desires of the farming community are in this respect.

I find the millers sitting down alongside of the representatives of the grain growers on that matter of a sample market. I do not think they are in favour of a sample market. They have their reasons therefor, and are able to give them. Thus, at present, as far as representations are made to me, neither from the farmers nor from the millers is there a very great pressure for a sample market. On both sides there is pressure for the terminal elevators.

Mr. STAPLES. The question of a sample market has been before this House many times, and while the minister has just stated that the representatives of the farmers who are here at the present time, are not in favour of a sample market under existing conditions, they by no means represent the opinions of all the farmers of the west. They have an organization, the Grain Growers' Association, which has been doing some good work in collecting the opinions of some of the farmers of the west, but by no means all of them. I am here particularly to speak of the opinions of my farmers in the constituency I represent.

I know that one of the representatives here to-day is a constituent of mine, and I give him credit for all the information he has been able to collect, but at the same time I venture to say that if you will take the expression of the farmers of Macdonald you will find they are anxious to have a sample market. How that sample market can best be worked out is, of course, another question. It is set out very clearly and very fully in an article which I read not long ago in the 'Grain Grower's Guide.' If it is possible to adopt a sample market and work it on the same principle and with the same machinery as the sample market of Minneapolis there is no doubt to my mind but that it would mean dollars and cents to the farmers of the west. Of course, I believe in preserving the identity of our wheat, so far as possible, so long as it does not mean a financial loss to the producer. If we can preserve the identity of our wheat until it reaches the British market, unquestionably it would be a great thing for us, but, apparently we have not been able to preserve it, owing to the manipulators. If we cannot overcome the manipulators, and if they are to make the profit, I think we had better start a little earlier in the game, and do the manipulation where the farmers will get the benefit of it. I think that can be done by establishing a sample market. To go into the details of a sample market would be a somewhat lengthy process, but, at the same time I do not think it is impracticable or impossible, even at the present time. When the question was before the House some time ago the serious objection was the lack of railway facilities. We have railway facilities at the present time, and, it will not be long until we have greater railway facilities and greater accommodation as regards rolling stock. It is my opinion that the railway companies of this country ought to be obliged to furnish all the rolling stock necessary to handle the grain, and not cause a congestion, even if you do establish a sample market. The sample market begins from the time the farmer goes to the elevator in his town. He drives up with his load, and, as the minister has told you, his grain is bought on sample; or, at least, on the judgment of the buyer, who takes the grain in his hands, looks it over and says: 'In my opinion that is No. 1 Northern, or No. 2 Northern.'

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he say that that is not a sample market?

Mr. STAPLES. I say grain is bought and sold on sample, and I say the sample begins right there.

After the grain is loaded into the car the sample can be extracted and forwarded to the terminals. The article that I read showed very clearly that all cars were sampled at the divisional points. The government samplers went in, took a sample and forwarded it to the board, and the board then put their graders to work to grade the grain. After this it was put in a pan and laid before the buyers in the Grain Exchange, or at the terminals, or wherever the buyers are, and they bought that grain on sample.

Notwithstanding the fact that the representatives who are here to-day say that the farmers of the west do not desire to have a sample market, I want to say that in my opinion (and I have given the matter some thought, and taken some precaution to get an expression of opinion from the farmers whom I represent) they are anxious to have a sample market, and I believe that a sample market will mean a great deal to the producer. For these reasons I look to the government to work out a sample market and put it in operation.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If that is a sample market, then I have been under a wrong impression, and I think I have been under the same impression as the hon. minister when he said that a million bushels of grain were sold. I do not believe that is what the hon. member from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) had in mind when he spoke of a sample market. My contention is that there is very little wheat sold in the west on a sample market.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I said grain was sold on a sample market.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Sold on sample. I say there is very little wheat sold in the west on sample, and I think I can prove what I say. I bring my wheat to the elevator at Boissevain, and the grain buyer comes along and takes a sample, as you say. What is the result? He has to grade it. He has to take a sample which, when it comes to Winnipeg, will stand the test of a certain grade. Is not that correct? Most decidedly it is. But, that is not selling on a sample at all. It is quite true that when the grain gets to Winnipeg a sample may be taken, but what I understand by a sample market is that when I bring in wheat that will hardly go No. 1 northern, but is a splendid No. 2, that wheat will get just what it is worth as No. 2, and does not have to go to Winnipeg and be graded as No. 3. If I am wrong in my understanding, I wish to be corrected. I do not desire to detain the House on this question, but I claim there is a misapprehension, and I think the remarks of the hon. member from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) might perhaps leave a misunderstanding in the minds of the people when he says that we are now selling wheat by sample, as I understand a sample market.

Mr. STAPLES. It is just a matter as to whether the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has presented his views more clearly than I have presented mine. I say that a man who sells his wheat to a street buyer, if the street buyer does not get his sample graded at all, to that extent the farmer sells on sample.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. But, it must come to grade.

Mr. STAPLES. Not necessarily, if a ticket is issued what does the farmer care about the grain?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. He buys it on grade.

Mr. STAPLES. No, he does not. He buys it on sample. He does not get it graded till it reaches Winnipeg, therefore he buys on sample. As the minister has told you, when the grain is shipped out of the spout into the boat it is sold on sample, and there are millions of bushels sold on sample.

Mr. NEELY. I think the hon. minister understood me perfectly when I spoke on the question of a sample market. I was referring to a sample market in the city of Winnipeg, something which we have not at the present time. There is not a question that this clause has reference to the purchase on sample without inspection. If this clause is to become operative it involves the creation of a sample market at the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). The grain buyer receives his standard samples from Winnipeg. The farmer comes with his grain and the grain buyer buys that grain after comparing it with the sample he has received from Winnipeg. That is how the grade is struck; and that is how the grain buyer reaches his conclusion as to what the grain is worth and how it will grade.

Mr. NEELY. I do not think that has any reference to this clause at all. As a matter of fact, the farmer who brings his load of wheat to the country elevator, though you may say he sells on sample, he does not do anything of the kind.

An hon. MEMBER. On grade.

Mr. NEELY. On grade; on judgment; on an unofficial inspection. On the farmers' ticket is named the grade which that grain reaches in the opinion of the buyer at the country elevator. But I was going to say that I was not in the House when the first few clauses of the Bill were taken up. Referring especially to clause 13, which deals with warehouse receipts, I did not know that the minister had made some

disclosures of the government's intentions before the Bill should be brought to a conclusion. I am quite content to await the minister's pleasure, so long as we are to have the information as to whether or not the government are going to take the steps to make this operative as far as the constitution of the sample market is concerned.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to delay progress, but it may not be out of place on this section to say a word in continuation of what has been said on buying by grade and by sample and on the mixing of grain, as the matter arranges itself in my mind. When I spoke on the second reading of the Bill, I said that the great reason for the complicated provisions of this Bill in regard to grade was in the changes in carriage that the grain had to pass through in going from the producer to the consumer. The farmer sells his grain on the merits of the actual grain itself, or, as you may say, by sample; and the miller in England buys by sample. That is, the farmer gets what the actual grain, there bodily present, is worth, and the miller at the other end of the chain, pays on the basis of what the actual grain is expected actually to produce. The provision that is made for preserving the identity of the grade—as distinct from the preservation of the identity of grain—is for the convenience of trade, in the long chain of exchanges between producer and consumer. Where the sample market is effective as it is in Minneapolis, the grain comes in in a car, is bought on sample and is forwarded to the point of consumption without change; so that the actual, identical grain that the farmer has loaded into the car and that the buyer in Minneapolis has bought by sample is delivered at the point of consumption in the same package so to call it, as that in which it was made up at the station nearest the farm. In that case there is no necessity for the complicated provision of grading; for the seller sells on quality and the consumer buys on quality, the grain being wholly unchanged.

Now, as to mixing: First we have the practical impossibility of preserving the identity of the grain in the many changes of methods of transportation between the wheat fields and the mill beyond Liverpool, which makes it also difficult to preserve even the identity of grade. And it is on this difficulty of preserving the identity of grade that the enterprising and ingenious mixer sees his opportunity. In regard to the mixing of grain, my view is that the man who buys a dozen different kinds of grain has a perfect right to mix that grain, and nobody has any right to find fault with him for doing it——

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If it is his own grain?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, providing the mixing is done before the grain has passed the inspection of the government officer and been given a name and a grade by that officer.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Let me understand. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) says that he has no objection to mixing provided the mixing is done before the grade certificate is given.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, that is what I am trying to say. In the first place, there is no possibility of preventing, and in the next place, there is no reason why it should be prevented, so far as I am aware. But the great profit of the mixer is in the fact that after the grain has been certified as being of a certain standard he degrades the standard by mixing, while getting the benefit of the standard in the transactions through the line of communication.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is practically a fraud.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, actually a fraud as I understand it. There would be no advantage—to use a slang phrase there would be nothing to it—there would be neither a profit nor a loss, in mixing if it were not for the government certificate. It is the government certificate that fixes the commercial value of that grain. If it is number 1, it is worth so much, and if number 2, it is worth so much less. If I buy grain on a certificate showing that that grain is number 2, and then, by a process of manipulation secure a certificate that that grain is number 1, I am absolutely committing a fraud, in my judgment.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). You being the owner of the grain?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. I am improperly trading on the certificate that gives that grain its value as a matter of trade along the line of communication.

Now, in the process whereby grain that is covered by the certificate given by the government is degraded, either by being improperly raised or lowered—and it can be done either way—any means whereby that is done is practically a fraud upon the good faith of the people of Canada who are responsible for that inspection. That is something that every government should try to prevent. But it has nothing whatever to do with the right of the individual owner of a dozen different kinds to mix that grain on his own responsibility, for his own use, or for sale to anybody else. But the wrong comes in when he uses the certificate that has been granted for a certain quality of grain, and changes the quality after the issue of the certificate. That is the whole story.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would ask a further question. Supposing he has

an elevator, and he buys grain of different grades 1, 2 and 3, pays for it, it is his own grain, he puts it into his own elevator and mixes it as he pleases. He has not committed any wrong.

Mr. OLIVER. If he has done it before inspection, he has committed no wrong.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Take the other case. Suppose he has bought, after inspection, grain of 1, 2 or 3 quality, paid for it, taken it into his own elevator, it is his own grain. Then he mixes No. 1 and 2, or 2 and 3, as he pleases, and puts it to his own use.

Mr. OLIVER. If he is the ultimate consumer, he has a perfect right to mix it, undoubtedly.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Then thus far we can agree. Then for instance, he owns a mill alongside, and puts it into the mill; or suppose another case exactly similar to that, and instead of putting it into his own mill, he has mixed the grades, and a friend of his comes along and says, let me see what your grain is like. He looks at it and says, I will give you so much a bushel for that grain, and you sell it to him. Has he done any wrong?

Mr. OLIVER. Not if he is not selling it on the certificate; but if he is selling it on the certificate, he is doing wrong.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). But he is not selling it on the certificate, because the buyer knows that it has been mixed. Now go a step further. Suppose after you have done that mixing you call in the inspector and the inspector grades that grain, we will say, as No. 2. Are you rignt or wrong in selling that grain as certificated No. 2?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is suggesting an entirely suppositious case, and a case that can not possibly occur.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I want to carry it one step further. Supposing that after the grain has been bought, we will take two grades, Nos. 1 and 2, a flush article of No. 1, and a nearly No. 1 in No. 2, just those two grades. You put them into your own elevator, and you mix the two, and you get a mixed grade which, when it is inspected, will grade as No. 1, not a fat No. 1, but a lean No. 1. Are you doing your duty to your country in sending that grain to the foreign market as a certificated grain?

Mr. OLIVER. As the law has always been, and I hope always will be, my hon. friend would not get an inspection for that mixed grain. One certificate is all that is given, and is all that ought to be given. I think the hon. gentleman is mixing up the moral wrong in the individual, and the wrong against the country and grain production generally. I have no hesitation in saying that if what he suggests is permitted to be done, it is a most decided wrong against the grain production of the country.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). In what does that wrong consist? What is the essence of it?

Mr. OLIVER. It is a matter that has been threshed out so often, and is so very technical, that perhaps I am not well fitted to give an explanation. When the grain is bought through the channels or course of trade, it is bought on its reputation. That is, in the course of trade, it is bought on its reputation, but by the ultimate consumer it must be bought on its actual condition. It is the price that is paid by the ultimate consumer that fixes the price in a measure, that is the main factor in fixing the price, that the initial producer receives. Now the whole tendency of good farming is to improve the quality of the product in the interest of the farming industry. It is in the interest of the whole country that every farmer should produce the highest quality of grain that can be produced. That will be admitted. Then if he is going to produce that grain of the highest quality, it is presumed that he will exercise forethought and industry, and go to expense, and it is in the nature of things that he must get a higher price for that higher quality of grain, or he loses rather than gains by the process. When the grain that is of high quality and that has cost the producer more than the grain of a lower quality reaches the ultimate market by the process of mixing it has been degraded, it is naturally worth a lower price than it otherwise would be. The farmer at the producing end of the arrangement does not get the fair value of his better grain. As a matter of fact he suffers a depreciation in the price, and the whole country suffers accordingly, while the man who mixed the grain has certainly made a profit. My position is that the interest of the country at large must be protected against the act of the man who is for the moment handling the grain, and who sees perhaps, no moral wrong in it; and there may be no moral wrong, in degrading the grain that has come into his hands.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Although this is a technical question, it is very interesting, and I want to get from my hon. friend one more idea. Suppose that man buys his grain, not by grade, puts it into his private elevator and mixes it as he pleases, but after that is not given any certificate. Has the country been damaged?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the country has been damaged to some extent, but I do not think that it is a case that can be followed up. I do not think that legisla-

tion can be framed to cover such a case, to prevent it and still to keep within the bounds of the rights of property. I think we cannot prevent it although it is a pity that it occurs.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is one phase of wrong-doing in connection with the selling of wheat that came under my observation last November. I found, when I was in the city of Winnipeg, that a practice had grown up about on the following lines: We will say that a large commission house was getting in a hundred carloads of wheat a day, shipped by individual farmers, to be sold on their account. This commission house keeps an inspector of its own who goes around with the government inspector and takes a sample from each of these hundred cars. I found that two or three of the large milling concerns keep an inspector at Winnipeg who also goes around with the government inspector and the inspector of the commission house and also takes samples. They would find in the hundred cars a number of cars that graded, say, only number 3 Northern, but as everybody knows a certain number of those number 3 Northern cars would average up well to No. 2 Northern and there would be a difference of two or three cents a bushel between their value and that of the ordinary No. 3 Northern. Here is where the wrong-doing came in. I find that although this commission house sent these cars of No. 3 Northern to their order at Fort William or Port Arthur for storage puposes, the large milling concerns, without the knowledge of the farmers who grew the grain, or the knowledge of the commission house that shipped the grain, and with the connivance and by the authority of the railways diverted the wheat that was shipped to Fort William or Port Arthur to their private mills and there unloaded it. They said: We will deliver an equal number of bushels at the same grade. The result was that they would buy an equal number of carloads of the same grade, but a lean No. 3 Northern, a sample that barely squeezed through as No. 3, and they would ship that down to Fort William, without any reference to the farmer who sold the grain or to the commission house which handled it for him. This enabled the milling company to secure a car of grain that was worth from two to five cents a bushel more than the car that was shipped down for storage at Fort William.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). That is grand larceny.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is done in hundreds and hundreds of cases and it is going on to-day. I am just mentioning it to the minister in order that his department may take cognizance of the fact and see about some way of putting a stop to a practice that looks to me, as my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) says, like grand larceny. These are the facts; at all events they were given to me by the commission house that shipped the grain absolutely as I have explained them. I hope that the department will take some means—I do not know how it can be done—of putting a stop to that practice.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the hon. gentleman explain in what way the railway aided that?

Mr. TURRIFF. It could not be done without the help of the railway.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Just explain it.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not know; I was just told that it is done, but I do not know how.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). It is a breach of faith on the railway's part against the man who owned the grain.

Mr. TURRIFF. The commission house said: It really does not affect us at all, nor does it affect the farmer who shipped the wheat to us as we got the price for him at which that grade of wheat was selling on the market. But, the man who loses in the end is the farmer, because that wheat is sent, say, to Fort William or Port Arthur, and the Ontario miller, or the exporter to the old country, buys No. 3 Northern but gets a leaner No. 3 Northern than he would have got if all the wheat that was graded No. 3 Northern had been shipped direct to Fort William and had gone into storage.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). And the country's reputation at large suffers.

Mr. TURRIFF. There would be a higher average grade which would enable the farmer in the end to get more for his wheat.

Mr. AIKINS. Would the substituted wheat be shipped out in the same car?

Mr. TURRIFF. No.

Mr. AIKINS. Then that would be easily detected because the shipping bill would show the number of the car in which the grain had been originally shipped?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. AIKINS. The shipper and the transferee, from the shipping bill, would know that it was not the same car.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is done on the same principle as that which has taken place time and again at Fort William and Port

Arthur. Supposing they had received in the elevators 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 bushels of wheat to be held in storage for farmers waiting for a rise in price; cases have come to our knowledge in which the big elevator men have sold every bushel of such wheat and it has been shipped to the old country while the farmers were still paying storage on it. I only draw this to the attention of the minister in order that he may make some inquiry and ascertain to what extent it is being done. There should be no difficulty in putting an absolute stop to it. When a commission house ships a carload of wheat to Fort William to go into storage that car should go to Fort William and go into storage and no milling company or anybody else should be allowed to divert that wheat to the use of any other persons without the knowledge of the farmer or the commission house and substitute therefor a car of inferior wheat.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Would the public ownership of elevators affect that situation at all?

Mr. TURRIFF. Not that I can see. I think this is one of the easiest matters to remedy now that the attention of the department has been called to it. It was not generally known; at least, I had never heard of such a thing being done. I do not think that the ownership of the elevators at Fort William or Port Arthur would affect that particular phase of the evil.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) to make his case a little more definite. It is like hunting for a needle in a hay stack with the information he has given to me. A commission house did a certain thing and gave certain information. What is the commission house and what is the information? If my hon. friend will put me into communication with the commission house and let me know the exact transaction I will carry it a little farther.

Mr. TURRIFF. I will give my hon. friend the names of the commission house and milling company that were mentioned to me.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would be very glad to have them. Under the best laws you can have, frauds may be committed, but I do not know whether it is I who should look after such a fraud or the courts of law.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). It is a fraud on the part of the railway company; that is quite clear. The railway company has undertaken to deliver certain, identical goods at a certain place and if the railways have this to their discredit also that they cannot be trusted to deliver goods given to them then it is time we knew it and took steps to put an end to that practice.

Mr. COCHRANE. The commission man is at fault there.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). No, they are both at fault. A railway that allows a thing like that is not to be trusted in any case.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That might be done either by neglect or by malpractice on the part of an under official of the railway.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). But they are responsible.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). And the railway management might not know anything about it at all. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) in the conduct of his own business cannot have his eye on every transaction and some of his officials may slip a cog and he is responsible, but he might be in blissful ignorance of it until it was brought to his attention. I remember seeing in the correspondence that a car was sent to a wrong destination presumably for the benefit of the milling company, and on being traced it was found to be due to the neglect or worse of an under official, but the railway company righted the matter the moment it knew of it. I do not think a railway company could exist long if it were guilty of practices of that kind.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). If it does exist it should be stopped at once.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Certainly.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Nothing will tend so much to lower the reputation of Canadian wheat as practices of this kind. There has been too much interlocking of directors between the milling companies and the elevator companies and the railway companies, and that generally results to the detriment of somebody. The railways will have to be put on their honour to stop this practice or else told that they will be up against the law.

Mr. AIKINS. The law on the matter is perfectly clear. When the railway company receives grain for carriage and issues the bill of lading it is responsible for the identical goods until these goods are delivered to the consignee or the consignee's assignee at destination. If, in the interim, any person takes away from the company grain which belongs to the owner of the bill of lading he is liable under the Criminal Code for taking that which does not belong to him. The law is perfectly clear.

It only requires, as I should judge, to be applied to the particular case mentioned by the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. OLIVER. Assuming that everything was as has been stated the commission house lost nothing, the farmer lost nothing, the railway company lost nothing, so that they were not interested in enforcing the law, and the milling company gained and the credit of the country's wheat lost and ultimately the farmers' price would be depressed.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). And wrong-doing was encouraged.

Mr. OLIVER. It is because of the conditions that surround the carriage of grain in bulk, which conditions lend themselves to things of that kind, that this complicated machinery becomes necessary, and that we establish a Board of Commissioners. It is unquestionably probably the most important part of the administration of the Grain Act to see that the credit of the country's wheat is not degraded. The country's interest in the preservation of the standard of the country's wheat is far more important than the question of the private rights of the different parties.

Mr. MEIGHEN. We have indeed spent a most profitable hour in discussing this question of mixing. I had a fair idea of the question before, but after the discussion it is much clearer to me and I compliment the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) for the plain way he has stated the case. I understand his argument to be that the identity of the grain is a public asset, and if the purchaser mixes before the inspection certificate was given and has it sent over without any inspection, he is reaping an advantage at the expense of the country by appropriating to himself profit at the expense of the identity of that wheat. The law puts in a concrete form that public asset and demands that it should have an inspection certificate. Under that inspection certificate the producer of the grain may own the grain absolutely, but he does not own the asset known as the inspection certificate, it being an asset in which all are interested, and particularly the producer. If a fraud is perpetrated upon that, he who perpetrates the fraud is guilty of appropriating to himself what does not belong to him in any sense and he gains an advantage at the country's expense.

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is the kernel of the whole cause of mixing, and if we grasp it we will be able to cure the evil much more quickly.

Mr. AIKINS. After a certificate is issued giving the grade of the grain, how will the mixing thereafter be prevented?

Mr. OLIVER. The whole machinery of this legislation is for the purpose of preventing such mixing.

Mr. AIKINS. But mixing has occurred.

Mr. OLIVER. It is said to have occurred contrary to law, and it is with a view still further to prevent its occurring that we are trying to improve the law.

Mr. AIKINS. Would government ownership of the elevators prevent that practice to any greater extent than if the elevators were owned by a elevator company or the carrying the company?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not so sure on that point. So long as the carrying company keeps its hands off the grain trade it seems to me that would fulfil all requirements.

Mr. TURRIFF. So long as the Canadian Pacific railway owned and operated their terminal elevators at Fort William I never heard of any complaint about mixing in the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators. Their only interest was in carrying the wheat, storing it, and sending it forward. But during the last few years, the difficulty has cropped up in the case of the American grain companies who have leased from the Canadian Northern and others some of these terminal elevators, and also control by subsidiary companies a line of elevators in the interior out on the prairie. That is a very different thing from the elevators being owned and operated by the railway companies, simply as a convenience for the handling of grain and also to make, perhaps, a small profit, but there was no object in the railway companies degrading a grade or trying to turn out No. 2 Northern, where they took in No. 3. It is the ownership of the terminal elevators by the same interests that own and control the interior elevators that has largely brought about the whole trouble that the farmers have had to complain of during the last few years.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. There is more than that.

Mr. TURRIFF. There may be more than that.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have always held that the only way we can remedy that is by the government operation of terminal elevators. I understand that most of the mixing has been done at the terminal elevators. We have had instances. The same thing occurred at Duluth. One hundred thousand bushels of No. 1 Northern, 100,000 bushels of No. 2, and 100,000 bushels of No. 3 went into the elevator at the ter-

minal. But what did they send out? They sent out about 150,000 bushels of No. 1 Northern. They got that by mixing in these terminal elevators and raising a No. 2 Northern to a No. 1. I stated last year and I repeat that we want the men who operate these terminal elevators to absolutely have no commercial interest in the grain. If I talked an hour I could not make that any plainer.

Mr. TURRIFF. That covers the whole thing.

On section 58, weight of bushel.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am not making this as a suggestion, but might there not be an advantage if the weight of our bushel of oats was made the same as the American? At present the American standard bushel is 32 pounds, while ours is 34 pounds.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). What does my hon. friend think about it?

Mr. TURRIFF. I think it would be, but I have not given the question enough consideration to express an opinion that would be worth very much.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am something like my hon. friend in that, and so I took the weights as they were generally agreed upon.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). The present weight is really below the average.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is a good thing, to keep the quality well up.

On section 59, fees.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to enter the same objection to this section as to two others that we have discussed. In my judgment these fees are vexatious without being remunerative and should not be imposed. I would again reserve the right of discussing this on the third reading.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have some very interesting figures on fees, but I shall withhold them until the occasion to which my hon. friend refers when we might have the whole matter up at once.

On section 62, appointment of weighmasters.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I wish to amend this section by adding after the word 'minister' and before the words 'may appoint,' the words 'on the recommendation of the board.' The amendment explains itself.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (Toronto). After the word 'cargo' I propose to add 'but no certificate shall be issued if scales appear to be defective.' As the clause actually reads it would almost mean that every weighmaster, or assistant was in fact bound to give a certificate. I think it is a fair safeguard to put at the end of the clause that no certificate shall be issued if the scales appear to be defective.

Mr. CURRIE. What is the necessity of the words 'upon demand'?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It means that every weighmaster or assistant shall give a certificate when asked to do so.

Mr. CURRIE. I want to point out to the minister that under the law some of the weighmasters appointed at the terminal elevators throughout the country now, do weigh the grain, but, if the owner does not demand a certificate he is not obliged to pay any fees. The present clause states that the weighmaster shall give a certificate upon demand. I think if the weighmasters have complete control, and have to give certificates they ought to be obliged to give certificates whether the owner demands them or not. I also think the fees should be paid whether a certificate is demanded or not.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The fees are always paid, or, if they are not, the weighmaster is not getting his dues.

Mr. CURRIE. The weighmaster attends to the weighing, but when it comes to collect the fees the owner of the grain simply says he did not demand a certificate, and in that way gets out of paying the fees. That is an abuse which is actually existing at some of the terminal elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There have been cases of that kind, I am informed; but they have been followed up and the weighmasters eventually collected the fees.

Mr. CURRIE. I think the idea of this Act is to provide the fees necessary for the carrying out of it. Now, a shipper from the west sends his grain down through these elevators. It comes through the terminal elevator at Port Arthur and is weighed there, but the shipper does not demand any certificate, consequently the weighmaster does not collect any fees. That is something which is actually going on, and, to avoid it in future I think the words 'upon demand' should be cut out altogether, making the clause read:

> Every such weighmaster or assistant shall give to any person having weighing done by him a certificate under his hand showing the amount of each weighing, the amount No. of each car or cargo weighed, the initial of the car, the place where weighed, the date of weighing and the contents of the car or cargo.

Then, the weighmaster could collect his fees.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Subsection 2 of section 62 provides that the weigh-

masters and assistants shall receive such compensation, by fees or otherwise, as is determined by the Governor in Council, upon recommendation of the board. That fixes the principle that they shall be paid. Once the principle has been established that there are to be weighmasters, and that there are to be fees for the weighing, as I understand it, the object of section 66 is to make it impossible for a weighmaster or assistant to refuse a certificate.

Mr. CURRIE. Under the old Act the shippers evaded paying the fees altogether by simply not demanding a certificate.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not see that there would be anything wrong in having it read in this way:

Every such weighmaster or assistant shall give to any person having weighing done by him a certificate, etc.

Mr. AIKINS. Assuming the principle is thus made obligatory do not the words now proposed to be added take away from the obligation, because the weighmaster may say 'these scales appear to be out of order, therefore I will not give you a certificate'.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). These words are simply for the protection of the man buying or selling.

Mr. AIKINS. Instead of giving any one an opportunity for not issuing their certificate, would it not be better to have a certificate obligatory, and, if the scales appear to be out of order have that fact stated on the face of the certificate.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The idea is to get perfect and correct weighing.

Mr. CURRIE. I think the Weights and Measures Act provides that all scales must be tested at certain intervals, and if anyone uses a defective scale he is liable to a heavy fine. That comes under the Inland Revenue Department, which assumes responsibility for the correctness of the scale.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think it might be as well to let the section stand altered as suggested, and I will make a note of it. We can deal with it later on.

Section allowed to stand as amended.

On section 67—record of weight,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved the adoption of section 67, as follows:

All weighmasters and their assistants shall make true weights, and keep a correct record of all weighing done by them at the places for which they are appointed, in which record shall be entered an accurate account of all grain weighed, or the weighing of which was supervised by them or their assistants, giving the amount of each weight, the number of each car weighed, the initial letter of each car or the name of each vessel, the place where weighed, the date of weighing, and the contents of the car or cargo; if the car is leaking or in bad order the record shall state the fact.

2. An extract from the record kept by any weighmaster or assistant in pursuance of this section, certified by the chief inspector or the chief weighmaster of the division, or by any officer in the office of either of them, shall be prima facie evidence of the facts set forth in such extract.

Section 67 carried without discussion.

On section 68—fees,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved the adoption of section 68 as follows:

The fees for the weighing of grain shall be such as are determined by the board which, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may increase or reduce them.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not take the same objection to this section as I have taken to previous sections relating to fees, but I would direct the attention of the hon. minister to subsection 2 of section 62, which provides for the payment of weighmasters in such a way as is determined by the Governor in Council, suggesting the idea that they may be paid by fees.

I would like to say I think it is objectionable that permanent officials holding such responsible positions as those of weighmasters should have to depend upon fees for their remuneration. I do not think they are paid by fees at the present time. I believe they are paid a salary. I think it is not desirable to have a suggestion in the Act that they should be paid otherwise than by fees. If the hon. minister agrees with me, I would like to be strong on that point.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I find that at the present time, so far as the Georgian Bay ports are concerned, they are all paid by fees. Peterborough is paid by salary. I note the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), and I will look into the matter. As a rule payment by fee is not the best way. I wish to make a little change in this section No. 68. I propose to take out 'which,' making it read 'determined by the board, with the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. OLIVER. Is that necessary? Drop out 'which' and let the sentence end at 'council.'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, that would cover it.

Mr. CURRIE. Before we leave section 67, I hope the minister will take a little suggestion from me. There is always a difference between the amount of grain weighed into the vessel at the terminals

at Port Arthur and Fort William, and the amount taken out at the foot of the lakes. A year ago these differences made a total of 180,000 bushels. Some vessels are a thousand or fifteen hundred or even two thousand bushels short. Now, the vessel men say that that grain cannot take wings as it comes from the lakes, and they account for the difference in this way: The grain is weighed by the government weighmaster as it goes into the shipping bin, in which bin there is a spout going into the vessel. They say that the company that owns the elevator shuts off the spout before all the grain is out of the bin, and they come out at the end of the season ten or twenty thousand bushels ahead of the game.

Mr. OLIVER. Impossible!

Mr. CURRIE. Well, as I have said, the vessels coming down the lake had an aggregate shortage of 180,000 bushels. I would like to see a subsection added to section 67 to the effect that in weighing grain into the vessel, the weighmaster shall be responsible for seeing to it that the shipping bin is empty before it is closed off. The minister could have a subsection drafted to meet this very troublesome situation which now gives rise to differences and lawsuits among shippers, ship owners and the elevator men. The minister will remember that there was a great scandal about it a year or more ago. It was said that the elevators were full of grain that nobody owned.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). These difficulties have occurred and do occur. But could not the question be disposed of under section 69 which provides that the board may make rules and regulations for the weighing of grain.

Mr. CURRIE. And the minister will see to it that the board does that?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will see to that.

Mr. CURRIE. All right.

Mr. OLIVER. I think this all bears out my suggestion that the weighmasters, above all others connected with the service should be paid a salary and should have no interest whatever in a fee. They should be men of the highest and of most assured reliability; and in order to secure that class of men permanent salaries must be provided.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I suppose that the present system has arisen out of the variations in the work the weighmasters have to do; some weighmasters have a great deal to do, and in such cases a salary could be paid, but others have very little to do, and it would be difficult to represent by a salary their real earnings.

Mr. CURRIE. The records of the elevators year by year would show what passes through the elevator, and would to a certain extent, be a guide as to what each officer should be paid. I quite agree that these officers should be independent. And I really think the minister ought to provide a corps of Northwest Mounted Police to see that these things are carried out. If that were done, I do not think we should have all these grain growers coming down here asking the government to take over the terminal elevators.

Mr. OLIVER. The shippers want that as well as the grain growers.

Mr. CURRIE. Everybody in the business gets robbed.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Chairman, we have made very good progress. I am sorry that I cannot go on with this Bill to-night, but I hope to take it up to-morrow.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.—PASSES ON THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. MONK moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry the Minister of Railways is not in his seat, as I wished to invite his attention to a matter of considerable importance to eastern Canada. I presume that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will bring the matter to the attention of his colleague, the Minister of Railways. Recently, instructions were sent from the Railway Department at Ottawa to Moncton to the effect that no family passes or trip passes for employees were hereafter to be issued without referring the matter to Ottawa. This was at variance with the long established custom that has obtained on the railway. There were certain rules defined by the department whereby the employees could get, for certain members of their families, at stated intervals, trip passes. A protest was sent to the minister, with the result that the instructions were recalled, and it is now left to the departmental officials at Moncton and along the line to issue these trip passes. Accompanying the instructions relating to passes to employees and their families was an order to the effect that no passes could be issued to newspaper editors or reporters along the line, as had been the custom in

the past, without first referring the matter to the minister at Ottawa. The newspaper men naturally complain, and say that this is practically withdrawing from them the transportation privileges which have been hitherto accorded to them without exception, for many years, all along the line of the Intercolonial. These trip passes are given to reporters at times, on application of the editorial management, to attend gatherings, inquests, and all occasions when newspaper men are expected to be in attendance. They also say that under the new order the occasion when transportation is required has in some instances long passed before they can get any word back from Ottawa. I think their complaint is well-founded. The government railways should be operated on the same principle as a corporation railway, subject to certain well-defined rules, giving the general manager and the officials of his office discretion to administer the rules which have been made by the department at Ottawa. I wished to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to this matter on behalf of the newspapers of the maritime provinces.

Mr. MONK. I regret that the Minister of Railways is absent at this moment. I suppose my hon. friend had not notified him that he would bring this matter up, otherwise I am sure he would have been here. I understand my hon. friend's complaint to be that, under the old usage, the families of employees were entitled to free transportation without interference from the head of the department, and that now the rule is that to secure such transportation there must be a reference to the head of the department.

Mr. EMMERSON. That has been recalled by the minister within the last few days.

Mr. MONK. With some modification, I understand. With regard to newspaper representatives, transportation could be obtained without reference to the head of the department. I understand my hon. friend to say that that rule has been changed, and he would like to see it restored, so that representatives of newspapers may obtain free transportation.

Mr. EMMERSON. In accordance with the general rules which have been clearly defined.

Mr. MONK. I will see that the remarks of the hon. gentleman are communicated to the Minister of Railways.

EXTENSION OF THE PARCEL POST SYSTEM.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I desire to direct the attention of the House to the need of improving the parcel post system we now have in this country. This question has been up a great many times in the House, and I believe the late government had a policy for the expansion of our parcel post system in order to give the people a much better system, and what would be practically an improvement of the express system. We have accepted the principle of parcel post service in Canada already. We have had for years a parcel post which gives fairly good service. The trouble with it has been that it was limited in the weight of the parcels carried, and perhaps the tolls charged were not as moderate as they should be. But for years and years now we have had a parcel post system, and session after session there has been an attempt made in the House to extend that system; it has been discussed also in connection with the excessive rates now charged by the express companies on parcels. My idea in substance is this, that if we expanded our parcel post system at the persent time, the effect would be that the express rates would be cut in two to-morrow, and the public of Canada would have relief to that extent. The people of the Canadian west, who to-day have enormous railway grievances of one kind and another, at a time when they feel the condition of affairs to be onerous, would have a reduced express service. That service would be cut in two, practically, to-morrow, if we expanded our parcel post system on the very lines that I believe had been arranged by the late government, reference to which was made the other night, and reference to which I intend to make later on.

Now, if any one has any doubt of the efficacy of the parcel post to-day, I would like to hear the argument presented. I think the parcel post has been absolutely successful wherever it has been tried. Every nation that has adopted it, with the exception of Canada, has expanded it and extended it by increasing the weight of the parcels to be carried, and they have done it with great and lasting service to the public. Great Britain has been one of the most successful countries in administrating a parcel post system, she has led the world in the matter of postal progress. At one time, I believe, a letter cost a shilling in Great Britain, but now, owing to her almost free postal system, the price of letter postage was reduced from time to time, until it has attained its present very low figure. We have had the same experience, so has the United States, namely, that in proportion as you improve the postal system, and as you reduce the cost of postage you increase the service rendered to the public, and in that way, you help along the progress of the country. Now, I wish to find out either from the present Postmaster General or the late Postmaster General what was the proposal that was before the

late government for two or three years, and which, according to a statement made here the other night, was blocked in the last session, and could not therefore be put into effect. As I understand the matter, it requires no further legislation to extend the parcel post system, all it requires is an order in council. There is a provision in the law now to do so, it is all a matter of policy, and to my mind it is largely a matter of the opinion of this House whether we shall have a parcel post system to-morrow, greatly extended, or not. Seven or eight years ago I brought into this House a motion to regulate the charges of express companies in connection with the Railway Act. Session after sesion I brought motions forward in that direction. But after several defeats, and after a good deal of hard fighting, those of us who favoured the proposal at last induced the government to put the express companies under the regulations of the Railway Act; so that we have already made some progress. But they are not very extensive. The fruit growers have complained time after time about the exorbitant express rates, and, do what we like and argue what we like, there is very little hope of relief from the express companies or the railway corporations until this country goes into active competition with the express companies through the medium of the parcel post. Public competition is the one thing which will bring the express companies to a sense of their duty to the people and compel them to reduce their charges.

I want to refer for a moment to this principle of public competition. I spoke of it in the House the other day and I return to it to-night. It is the only available weapon in the hands of parliament, the legislatures and the municipalities, to bring private corporations exercising public franchises to a sense of their duty and to a realization of the service which they ought to give and especially the rates which they ought to charge. We have in the province of Ontario embarked in what are called municipal enterprises and we have begun in many of our towns and cities to run our own street railway systems and to generate and distribute our own electric power. We have gone a step further and now we have formed a great combination of municipalities to buy electric power at Niagara Falls and distribute it throughout the province of Ontario. The greatest and the most successful experiment in regard to public ownership, the public control and distribution of a great utility, is in the province of Ontario in connection with the Hydro-Electric Commission, the men who administer it and the associated municipalities. The result of public competition in Ontario in connection with electrical energy has been that prices have been cut in two and further reductions are promised. If there is one thing that the people of Ontario believe in—and the people of Ontario are as progressive as those of any other section of the country—it is in the efficiency of public competition in connection with a public service, to improve the service and to cut the rates in two, or even to reduce them more than half. Every municipality in Ontario that has tried public competition in this respect, either in connection with the Hydro-Electric Commission or of its own motion, has succeeded not only in cheapening the price but in doubling and trebling the use of the utility by the people. When you reduce the cost you increase the use of the utility in a greater proportion. So, the people of Ontario know the efficacy of public competition. They know what public competition can do to increase a service and to reduce its cost.

My argument here to-night is that if we were to put our parcel post system in operation on an extended scale, if we were to increase the weight of parcels and improve the service, and if we made the delivery of parcels a part of the service, it would have the effect of improving the service and reducing the rates of the parcel post, and not only reducing the rates of the parcel post, but compelling express companies to follow in the same way, that is improve their service and reduce their rates. It does not require any more legislation. The legislation is on the statute-book. All it requires is an order in council. If we establish this principle in connection with parcel post, and if we compel the railway companies to reduce their express charges it follows, as night follows day or day follows night, that all we have to do is to intimate to the telegraph companies that unless they cut their rates in two or reduce them greatly the government will be compelled to go into the telegraph business. We have legislation now on the statute-books which will allow us to go into the telegraph business. If we once make the railway companies understand that government competition will come against them if they do not treat the public fairly, reduce their rates and give a better service, they will be very quick to give a better service and to cut their rates. If we wish to help the people of the northwest with regard to the conditions which prevail there, and railway grievances form the great bulk of their troubles, the time is now and the method to adopt at the outset is an extension of the parcel post system.

The people of the United States are to-day agitated over a parcel post system. They have never had it. As I have said in this House time after time, the reason they have not had a parcel post system in the United States up to date is that the railway lobby has been so strong that they have been enabled to defeat every proposal for a parcel post system that came up in Congress. But the day of the supremacy of the railways is at an end. A committee in the recent session collected a great deal of information on the matter, a Bill has been introduced, or is now about to be introduced into Congress, and both parties are committed to put it through. In a very few days you will see the Americans with a first-class parcel system. They see now what can be done in this connection. Only a year ago or less they introduced for the first time, the postal savings bank system against the opposition of the National banks, and all the other banking institutions of the United States. But the savings bank in connection with the post office now has got more business than it can do, and yet the proposition was at the outset that the Postmaster General should try only a limited number of offices. But, day by day, he has extended that system of post office savings banks, and to-day one of the things that the American people are most interested in in the way of recent legislation is the measure which inaugurated the post office savings bank, and the result is that they are determined to have a parcel post system. The American post office to-day is carrying parcels for the British parcel post, and delivering them through the United States. It has to do it because of the International Postal Treaty. It is carrying those parcels for people in Great Britain who wish to send them to the United States, and it is delivering them all through the United States for one-quarter what the express companies charge. The people are finding out that they could send a parcel to England, mail it there and have it delivered, but for the duty, at a cheaper rate than the express companies would charge at any point in the United States.

There is a great argument against the expansion of the parcel post system in this country. I have tried to find out what it was, and I have heard it stated in this House at times. When I came to follow it up, the argument, outside of that of the railway companies who wish to maintain the monopoly that they at present have, is that it would be hard on the country storekeepers. I have heard men say in this House, it has been written in the press, and I have heard on the platform, that if the parcel post system were extended it would hurt the country storekeeper, and would be for the advantage of the large departmental stores in the cities, and those stores which carry on what is known as a mail order business. That may be, but there never was an improvement introduced that did not hurt somebody. The steam railways put the stage coaches, horses, country inns and blacksmiths along the roads, out of business, and in that way there was a grievance against the railways. But look at the advantage which came to the general public from the improvement in the speed and comfort of travel.

The world will progress and the old order must give place to the new, and even if it be a disadvantage to the country storekeeper, it is the good which it will do to the general community that must prevail. Think of what an immense advantage it would be to the settler away out on the prairie to be in touch not only with the country store, but also with the base of supplies. I know any number of instances where when a part of an agricultural implement was needed in a hurry and it had to be sent by express, the express charge was greater than the original cost of the article. That should not be. We have one railway in Ontario under public ownership, but I am sorry to say that the express charges on that railway are about as high as they are on the corporation roads. It is not right that the settler in that portion of Ontario should be handicapped by these unnecessarily high rates on the government road. If the people in other countries have the advantage of this enlarged parcel post system why cannot the people of Canada have it? So far as I can find out the block has been caused by the express companies who use the country storekeeper as a buffer between them and an extended parcel post; the voice may be the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hand of Esau. When John Wanamaker was Postmaster General of the United States he announced in public that he would like to give the people the advantage of an enlarged parcel post, but there were four great reasons blocking the way and these were the four express companies which were allied with the railway interests. And these reasons exist in Canada to-day, and they will block the proposal as long as the people allow them to do so. We have fourteen thousand postmasters in Canada every one of whom could become a parcel post agent with a trifling addition to his salary, while to-day the railway and express companies have only their agents at the different railway stations. See what an advantage it would be if every postmaster could handle parcels. And then, consider what a centre of life it would be if we had in every village a post office where parcels could be handled, a telephone office and perhaps telegraph office which with the growing

business could give the community a day and night service throughout the year. That is the present position in many European countries and it has proved to be a great blessing to the people who live at a distance from the centres of population. The Winnipeg 'Free Press' is making a strong campaign now to improve railway conditions particularly in the west, and it has been able to prove that the people of the west are paying more in freight charges than are the people of the United States, and far more than the people of eastern Canada. The 'Free Press' shows that if we had an improved parcel post system we would immediately get reduced freight charges all over the Northwest. I give the Winnipeg 'Free Press' credit for its campaign in that direction. It has made out a case against the railways and express companies and a good way to bring those corporations to time is to extend the parcel post system in this country. The Postmaster General and the ex-Postmaster General are here to-night and I hope they will give us some information on the subject, and I hope that the result of this debate will be that the government will accept the principle I advocated and declare themselves in favour of an extended parcel post. To show what the feeling of the west is I read the following from a speech made in this House by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) a few days ago:

> Some time ago the hon, member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), then Postmaster General, proposed that the parcel post system should be greatly extended. At that time I felt that it was going to be of more use to the departmental stores in our country than to the public in general and I was one of those who told him I would not support that proposition. I must say that I have changed my mind. I think I made a mistake, and those of us, and there were enough of us to stop his good efforts, who voted in that way, did in my opinion make a mistake. I hope the Postmaster General will, unless we get better treatment from the express companies, extend the parcel post system. If the Postmaster General introduces an extended parcel post system I will support him now because we have not had fair treatment from the express companies, and if the express companies want to head off an extended parcel post they will substantially and quickly reduce their rates.

There is no use waiting, or threatening an investigation before the Railway Commission, let us declare for an extended parcel post system now, and relief will come at once.

As I have said, I wish to see adopted in this country that new and great principle in connection with private owned public franchises, public competition wherever it can be put in force. Of course I would prefer to see a public monopoly in this matter and not the competition that I propose in this case. But perhaps we are not ready to come to that. I am ready for public ownership of all these monopolies now and completely. I would put the express companies completely out of business, I would take over the whole monopoly. I would put the telegraph companies out of business and make that a government monopoly. But if we cannot have that let us have public competition so as bring down the rates and improve the service.

What is the essential advantage of public ownership over private ownership in the matter of great public utilities? It is this: Public ownership seeks to improve the service and cheapen the price, while private ownership tries to reduce the service and increase the profits of the owners. The difference is as wide as that between daylight and dark, the difference between a corporation, an organization of men trying to improve and widen the service and cheapen the cost, and an organization of men trying to make the most money possible out of it. Wherever there has been public ownership of these great utilities the result has been to extend the service to a great many people. There is always a line in public ownership where the service does not pay, but year after year such a service is extended to the smaller and outlying communities, thereby increasing its usefulness. But the first thing a private company controlling a public monopoly says is: Is there a big profit in it for us, if not we shall not extend it until you can show us that there is money in it. The whole tendency of the world to-day is to extend the parcel post system. They are coming to it in the United States, they have every faith in it in Great Britain and Europe; they have worked it out in Australia and New Zealand until it is a great success and why should Canada further delay? Why should somebody be able to come into this House, the railway and express companies, I imagine, and under the guise of protecting the country storekeepers, prevent the people of this country having so useful and necessary a thing as cheap parcel post? The railways should not have that influence and I hope they will not have it any longer. I hope that the members here to-night, irrespective of party, will declare in favour of the extension of a parcel post system and let the word go to the people of the Canadian west to-morrow, in their trials and difficulties and the trouble that has come to them by reason of the late crops, the bad weather and the inability of the railways to give them care, and of the elevators to store their grain.

Mr. TURRIFF. And the lack of markets.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). And the lack of markets, if the hon. gentleman wishes to say so, and bring the political

idea into it. If we can do something for them, let us do it now, let us do something for the people of the west to-day. We are giving them a Grain Act, an important advantage, let us give them something else, let us give them a cheaper parcel post and cheaper express to-morrow. If we give them cheaper express by parcels post to-morrow, then next week they will have cheaper telegraphs, the railways will see that if they do not reduce their telegraph rates there will be public competition there as well. If we could give them reduced passenger rates, that would be a great relief to them. Our railways are earning enormous profits, and the people in the west should have a cheaper passenger rate. I tried the other night to get an equalization of freight charges in this country. That is something to which they are entitled.

I hope the House will unite in support of this motion, and that we will be able to give to the people of the Canadian west an immediate relief in the way of express charges not only in their country, but throughout the whole of Canada.

I therefore beg to move, seconded by Mr. McCraney:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

This House is of the opinion that the expansion and extension of the parcels post system would be in the public interest.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville). Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the principle of this motion, and after having heard the last remarks of the hon. member for South York, I am even more strongly in favour of it because the hon. gentleman by his remarks has gone a little further than the words of his motion. He is not only in favour of an extension of the parcel post system, but also in favor of larger markets for the Canadian farmer.

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

Mr. LEMIEUX. And when I hear such a doughty supporter of protection as he was during the last general election advocating larger markets for the Canadian farmer, surely I cannot be false to the motion which he has so ably presented to the House.

My hon. friend has appealed to me as a former Postmaster General, and has been kind enough to quote some remarks which I made last year on the subject when I had the honour of being Postmaster General. It is true that last year, speaking on this very question, I expressed the opinion very frankly and speaking for myself alone, that the day was not far distant when the Post Office Department of Canada should take upon itself the duty of establishing a parcel post system. At the present the parcel post service is chiefly carried on by the railway companies, or by the express companies, the Canadian Express Company, and the Dominion Express Company, which are part and parcel of the two great railway systems, the Canadian Pacific railway, and the Grand Trunk railway. In every European country the express business is carried on by the Post Office Department.

Allow me to express here the opinion which I expressed the other day before the Canadian Club of Montreal, and which was re-echoed by the press, that the day has practically come in Canada when the Postmaster General should be not only the letter carrier of His Majesty the King, but should also be (as he is in foreign countries) the minister of communication. In England, in France, in Germany, in Japan, and very soon to be in the United States the Postmaster General is the superintendent not only of the post office, but also of the telegraph and telephone rates and parcel post system.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that we have in our post office regulations a parcel post system in the embryonic stage. It is hidden in the Canadian Official Postal Guide. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, in whose ability and alertness and business-like methods I have the utmost confidence, will see himself that we are only at the embryonic stage—that for many reasons, which he knows as well as I do, the express companies were allowed to hold in their hands the parcel post system of this country. However, notwithstanding the regulations of his department, the time has come when a bold policy should be adopted and when the Post Office Department should establish a popular and cheap parcel post such as they have in other countries of the old world, even in Japan.

I might remind my hon. friend that some years ago when I took office there was a movement on foot, especially in the province of Ontario, and in some of the provinces of the west, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, strongly in favour of the establishment of a cheap parcel post system in Canada. I received many petitions praying for the establishment of such a system, but, concurrently or concomitantly I was deluged with petitions signed by farmers who were deluded into signing them by the railway companies. It was easy to see that these petitions were engineered by the railway companies, or rather by the express companies. My hon. friend the Postmaster General may see these petitions in the Post Office Department. They are in the archives of the department, if they have not been eaten by the rats. He will see that whether these petitions were signed in the province of Ontario or in the constituencies of the west they were all worded in about

the same language. The fear expressed in these petitions was that if the Post Office Department of Canada were to establish a cheap parcel post system the effect would be that the departmental stores of Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Winnipeg and the other large cities would take all the benefit of the system, and the result would be the destruction of the utility of the country stores. I think the case was well put before the House yesterday by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) who said that there is a possibility of a limited parcel post system which cannot injure the country merchant or the country store.

My hon. friend has referred to the telegraph and telephone rates. I am not prepared this evening to express an opinion on that very important subject. For the present I am free to say that in my judgment we have given enough powers to the Railway Commission to deal with this question for the time being. Mind you, I am not saying that we cannot go one step further. I am somewhat of a radical, like my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), and, perhaps by going a little more deeply into the matter I might adopt some of his views. However, I am not discussing that subject this evening, and I do not say I share altogether the views expressed by the hon. member for South York.

We have our Railway Commission presided over by a man of whom this country must be proud, because he has rendered the country most valuable service since he has presided over the board. Some years ago we gave that commission wide powers. It has the right to look after the rates charged by the telegraph and telephone companies. I introduced legislation some years ago to give that commission additional powers as regards the cable rates, and, in my judgment the rates which were announced the other day by the home government, whilst very gratifying after the agitation which has taken place during the last few years, are only the first instalment of what should come for Canada.

I believe in a state-owned cable between Canada and the mother country, thus linking the premier colony of the empire with the nerve centre of the empire in London. We have already the Pacific cable which is doing a great deal towards making better relations between Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Still, there remains the last link to be established, and that link is between Canada and the mother country. I think I shall be in a position, at another sitting of the House, to show my hon. friend the Postmaster General that if he wishes to make a name for himself, he should favour a state-owned cable between Canada and the mother country, thus encircling the globe with cheap telegraphic communication between the various British colonies.

The question this evening is that of cheap parcel post and I was referring a moment ago to the hidden clauses which are contained in this 'Postal Guide.' My hon. friend will see on page 20, section 100, and following, under the heading of 'fourth class matter,' that he has the power to establish a parcel post system. As a matter of fact, it is already established, but it goes under another name. Section 100 of the 'Postal Guide,' reads as follows:

This class includes merchandise of all descriptions such as confectionery, drygoods, groceries, hardware, stationery (including blankbooks, &c.) not included in the first, second and third classes, and not excluded from the mails by the general prohibitory regulations with respect to objectionable matter. The rate of postage for articles in this class is one cent for each ounce or fraction thereof.

Section 101 reads:

The postage on fourth class matter must be prepaid by postage stamps, and no packet will be forwarded that is not prepaid at least one cent.

Section 102 states:

An insufficiently prepaid article of fourth class matter may be forwarded by post subject to payment of double the deficiency on delivery, provided at least one cent is prepaid. After the additional postage required on any short-paid packet of fourth class matter has been collected from the address 'postage due', stamps for the amount are to be affixed to the article, and cancelled by the postmaster.

Section 103 states:

The limit of weight for a package of fourth class matter is five pounds, and the limit of size is thirty inches in length by one foot in width or depth, but the combined length and girth of any packet must in no case exceed six feet.

A little further on in the same volume my hon. friend will find a series of parcel post conventions between Canada and nearly all the countries within the postal union, together with the rates agreed upon. I will not worry or weary the House with these rates and figures; but they show, for instance, that a parcel larger than is provided for under our domestic rates may be sent from Ottawa to Great Britain at a lower rate practically than that at which our smaller parcels can be sent from Ottawa to Halifax. I understand that when Canada was sparsely settled, when the revenue of the post office department was low, and when we had to exhaust all our resources to meet the demands for public works, it was not easy to give this country the benefit of a cheap parcel post such as they have it in other lands. But with the settlement of the country, with Canada's prodigious development during the last

fifteen or twenty years, there is no reason why we should not adopt a bold policy in this connection. Let me remind my hon. friend—and I am sure he will not object to my going into history; he is new in the service and I am sure he means well—that when Rowland Hill, in Great Britain, advocated penny postage within the United Kingdom, he was laughed out of court. For years he was a voice crying in the wilderness of public inattention. In those days when one went to post a letter, three questions were asked: What is the weight of the letter? For what distance is it to be carried? What are the enclosures? And even in so progressive a country as the Great Britain of fifty or sixty years ago, in every post office was a strong candle light, before which the letter was held—there were no envelopes in those days—in order to see what enclosures it contained. If the letter exceeded half an ounce, it paid double rates; if it had to be carried more than sixty or seventy miles, it paid double rates; if there was more than one enclosure it paid three or four rates. It was to replace such a system that Rowland Hill advocated penny postage for all letters less than an ounce in weight over all parts of the United Kingdom. As I said, he was laughed at. Even so distinguished a statesman as Palmerston would not even listen to Rowland Hill when he propounded his system before a committee of the House of Commons. Rowland Hill had published a book in support of his idea, as believers in one idea are so apt to do. And one member of the House, having read the book, said: 'I have tried to find a hitch in the logic of this system and '—your pardon, Mr. Speaker—'I'll be damned if there is a hitch in it at all.' And, as we all know, the system, being adopted, proved a great success, not only in Great Britain but in every country of the civilized world. Cheap rates for letter carriage, cheap rates on railways, cheap rates for telephones, cheap rates for cables, and cheap rates above all in the parcel post, means increased revenue in every case. My hon. friend knows very well that some years ago it cost 16 cents to send a letter from Ottawa to Aylmer; from Ottawa to Brockville, 27 cents; from Ottawa to Montreal, 30 cents; from Ottawa to Quebec, nearly $1. That is within the recollection of some of the older members of this House.

Mr. PELLETIER. Not ours.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, but my hon. friend remembers when we had to pay 3 cents on a letter.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Five cents.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Until 1898 our cheapest rate was 3 cents. The penny system was then adopted as between Canada and the rest of the empire. There were people who predicted a huge deficit in the Post Office Department. On the contrary, I make bold to say, the surplus of the post office is due directly to the reduction of the postal rates. Some years ago, I myself as Postmaster General, introduced a reduction in the rates on what are called 'drop letters,' letters to addresses in the city within which they are posted. This was a reduction from two cents to one cent on a letter and applied to all the large cities of the country. I was told by the officers of the department that we might perhaps suffer a check for some years in the revenue of the department. On the contrary, within a few months after the rate of 1 cent for drop letters had been adopted, we had a surplus, a surplus which must be attributed to the fact that we reduced the rates. And the same result will follow if my hon. friend will adopt cheap parcel post for this country. In postal matters the United States has been a follower of Canada, having followed us in the adoption of many improvements which we ourselves had borrowed from Great Britain. For instance, there was the postal savings bank system, which, copied from Canada by the United States, has been a great success. But as regards the parcel post, the United States has stolen a march on Canada. I have here a report, the latest issue that they have in the library. That report shows that Postmaster General Hitchcock has proposed to establish a cheap parcel post, using in that connection, the agency of the rural mail system.

I read from page 10 of the Post Office Department Annual Reports of the United States:

> The recommendation made in the last annual report of the department for the introduction of a limited parcel post service on rural routes is earnestly renewed. It is believed that as soon as the postal savings system is thoroughly organized the Post Office Department should be prepared to establish throughout the country a general parcel post. As the preliminary step in the development of such a service it is hoped that Congress will authorize the delivery on rural routes of parcels weighing as much as 11 pounds——

Our limit is 5 pounds.

> —which is the weight limit for the international parcel post. This form of service can be conducted with little, if any, additional expense to the government. It will not require the appointment of more carriers, for those already employed have the necessary equipment in the way of horses and wagons to distribute the parcels as well as the ordinary mail, which is rarely of sufficient volume to take up more than a small portion of the mail space in the carrier's wagon. A rural parcel post of the kind proposed, if successfully conducted, would probably lead to a more general system. Before the parcel ser-

vice is extended to the whole country, however, definite information should be obtained as to the nature and volume of the business to be handled. It is accordingly urged that in conjunction with the experiment on rural routes a further inquiry be authorized by Congress in order that the department may be in a better position to develop the system on conservative lines and that a special appropriation for the inquiry be promptly granted.

This was in 1910, and since then the United States Post Office Department have put in force a limited parcel post system in connection with the rural mail system. Now I would not be so radical as to say that throughout the whole length and breadth of Canada there should be a general parcel post system, at very low rates. The machinery for such a system would be very costly to begin with, and I do not know whether it would work very well. You can require the rural mail carrier to carry a parcel, because he has the machinery for it; but the ordinary mail carrier, where there is no rural mail delivery, is not in the same position. Of course, the hon. gentleman would have to invite new tenders, and to revise many of his contracts. I am aware that he is revising some of them without establishing a parcel post. However, that is only en passant. The hon. gentleman will see at once that by extending his rural mail system, although limited in its extent, which he has at present, he can start in with a cheap parcel post. I know that my hon. friend will be opposed at the start, but opposed by whom? Not by the people of this country, not by the honest merchants, but he will be opposed by the express companies. But the express companies have taken out of our hands the business which we ought to carry ourselves. The parcel post is one of the public utilities which by its nature pertain to the Postmaster General.

Mr. LALOR. Did the hon. gentleman find any opposition to the parcel post system by the country merchants?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I explained a moment ago that when I took office there was for a time a strong agitation in the press of the country generally in favour of a cheap parcel post. When petitions began to pour in to the department, I was surprised to find that all those petitions were worded in the same way, the same reasons were invoked against the system, in fact the same printed forms were used all over Canada. From what I gathered from the officers in the department, I concluded in my own mind that the agitation originated from the express companies; in fact I have no doubt of it whatever. That is easy to understand. The moment the Postmaster General of Canada starts a cheap parcel post system, having already under his hand a complete machinery to carry it out, it is easy to understand that his rivals will be the express companies. But I say again, the express companies ought not to be allowed to take away from the Postmaster General a business which by its nature pertains to his department. At all events, the establishment of a cheap parcel post system would bring the express companies to reason and to terms. Let me read from a pamphlet published by Mr. Kindel, 'Relation of a Parcel Post to Businessmen and Farmers'; this was read before the Trans-Mississippi Congress in November, 1911. Here is a paragraph which applies exactly to our own conditions in Canada; in fact, you might change the names of the cities of New York and Boston to Montreal and Toronto, and you will find that it exactly describes our conditions:

How the United States government discriminates against its own citizens in favour of those of foreign countries.

Well, my hon. friend and myself, unwillingly, when I was in office, did discriminate against our own citizens in favour of those of foreign countries.

To illustrate the inconsistency in connection with the parcel post service attention is drawn to the following conditions: An individual entering any post office in the United States with two parcels weighing four pounds each will be obliged to pay 64 cents on the one to New York, for example, while for the one destined to a foreign country, although it usually passes through New York city, the charge is 48 cents. Should the weight be 4 pounds 6 ounces, a package addressed to the resident of New York will be denied admission to the mail by the postmaster, while the package intended for a resident of a foreign land will be accepted and forwarded, probably via New York, at the rate of 12 cents per pound. The parcels for the foreign country will be received in most instances up to 11 pounds. In other words, our own people must pay 4 cents per pound more for the privilege of dispatching packages to each other than when destined to residents of foreign countries.

I have already said that when I was Postmaster General—I make no bones about it, my hon. friend and myself are equally guilty in that respect—we have been too kind to the express companies, and we have not been bold enough in regard to a parcel post in former years. We should have been as bold in this direction as we have been in the reduction of postal rates on letters and drop letters. Let me read to the House a paragraph from 'La Follette's Weekly':

At present, the transportation of parcels, except for very small ones, is in the grip of the express monopoly. Every person who sends a Christmas package must pay tribute to the few individuals who control the express

business—must help to create those enormous 24 million dollar 'lemons.' Service that is rightly part of the people's Post Office Department is now performed not as a public function but as a means of building up collossal private fortunes.

If the Christmas package were our only small parcels transportation problem, it would not be serious. But, as a nation, the shipment of parcels enters in an important degree into the economy of our daily life. Now to send small shipments quickly, cheaply, and securely is a thing which America has apparently been unable to learn from the enlightened countries of Europe, Australia, Asia, Africa and South America. It is not that the people of the country do not understand the condition, nor that they do not understand the remedy. It is only that congress is deaf to the public demands for a national parcels post.

Here is a good occasion for my hon. friend to make a name for himself. I will give him all the credit he will deserve if he starts, in the not too far distant future, a cheap parcel post system.

Representative agencies of public thought, neswspapers and public speakers have for years voiced this demand. Labour organizations in their national conventions and through their accredited representatives, have emphasised it. The farmers of the country plead for it.

But for some mysterious reason the demand, not only of the farmers but of labouring men and public spirited citizens generally, when they have touched the subject of parcels post have been persistently ignored by congress.

A parcel post is no mysterious thing. It means simply that congress shall authorize and that the Post Office Department shall put into operation rules and machinery for the transportation of packages in the domestic mails of the United States reasonable rates, subject only to reasonable, not arbitrary limitation as to size and weight.

As I stated a moment ago, you can substitute the words 'parliament of Canada,' for 'Congress,' and the name 'Ottawa' for 'New York,' and you have exactly a picture of our parcel post system as it at present exists in Canada. If my hon.friend wishes seriously and conscientiously to deal with this subject, I warn him at once that he will meet with some obstacles in his path. I mentioned a moment ago the express companies. He may also meet with some red tape in the department. I do not wish to blame the officials of the department, but I only wish to say that after a system has been in existence for years and after certain rates have been established, strange to say, when a demand is made for a reduction or a change immediately objections are made, not by the public, not by legislators, but by the officials of the department. In the Post Office Department I can say that my hon. friend has most intelligent officers who are quite in accord with the public on his question. I would remind him of one thing. If it is not shelved, he will find a report in the department on this very question prepared by my good friend, Mr. Geo. Ross, of Toronto, chief Postoffice Superintendent of Canada, one of the ablest men in the world as regards postal matters generally. I would not be afraid to put Mr. Geo. Ross of Toronto on a par with the postoffice officials of any country in the world. He has been trained in the postoffice system for forty years. He is a very able man, full of ideas and always ready to accept a reform when a reform suggests itself to the public. My hon. friend will find in the department a very lengthy report prepared by Mr. Ross about three months ago. I was under the charm of that report when I left office, unfortunately. That report simply confirms what my hon. friend has stated this evening and very largely what the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) stated yesterday. If my hon. friend will read the remarks made by my hon. friend for East Lambton yesterday—I am sorry I cannot refer to a past debate—he will find concrete facts which are corroborated by Mr. Ross in his lengthy and able report which conclusively proves the necessity of starting afresh on this question of the parcel post in Canada. Now, I have said all I have to say on this question.

Mr. PELLETIER. I desire to profit by the experience which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), has had while occupying the high position of Postmaster General for several years, and perhaps he will be prepared to give some suggestions as to how this parcels post system might be put into effect as far as rates and weights are concerned.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend will find all that in Mr. Ross' report.

Mr. PELLETIER. I want to know if my hon. friend agrees with those figures, because I have seen the report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend has seen the report I am very glad because he is more conversant with the subject than I thought he was. I agree completely with Mr. Ross' conclusions, and I say that the hon. member for East Lambton yesterday propounded a scheme which could be arranged. By your leave, Mr. Speaker, I might be allowed to quote a few of the remarks of the hon. member for East Lambton.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is part of the subject introduced by the hon. member for East Lambton, and discussed yesterday. While great latitude is allowed in moving an amendment to go into Committee of Supply, there is a limitation to it which I think it is well to keep in mind.

Mr. PELLETIER. There is no objection whatever on this side of the House to the hon. gentleman going into this subject fully. It is a matter of very great public interest.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) illustrated yesterday the way in which the system, as propounded by Mr. Ross, could be worked out in Canada, and how it would be possible to do away with the objection raised with respect to departmental stores. It is a scheme which would establish the parcels post system within the limits of rural mail routes, and would not deprive the country merchants of their clientèle. My hon. friend will, I am sure, read over the report of Mr. Ross. I fully agree with that report. I have nothing more to add on this subject. I am in accord with the motion made by the hon. member for South York. In this matter, as in all matters, it requires a little boldness and some courage. We have been experimenting in the Post Office Department for the last ten or fifteen years with this result, as the logical conclusion of these experiments, that whenever we have established cheap rates we have had larger revenues. The same thing is true with respect to cables. Some years ago when there was but one cable between America and Europe the rate for one word was £1, and the cable service was, therefore, inaccessible to the people.

The moment a second company was started there was a reduction in the rates, in 1887 and 1888 the cable rates, because of competition went down so low as twelve cents a word. So long as the express companies are not interfered with there will be a monopoly and high express rates, but if the Postmaster General follows the suggestions made by Mr. Ross in his very able report, he will render a great service not only to the residents of the cities, but to the farmers of the country as well. In Germany and France the farmers make tremendous use of the parcel post system by sending their staples such as eggs, butter and cheese to the market, and the parcel post is one of the paying agencies of the postal service in European countries. Great Britain is in the van of progress amongst all civilized nations in her postal service. From Great Britain we got the penny post, and let us copy her in the parcel post system. Later on we can have a cheap telegraphic communication by establishing a state-owned cable between Canada and the mother country. If the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) does all that he will make a great name for himself.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) will be able to show us, as he has said, that the introduction of this parcel post system will not unduly advantage the departmental stores of the cities, and unduly disadvantage the country merchants.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I trust the Postmaster General will place before the House the report of Mr. Ross which shows that a local parcel post system such as they have in the United States can be established without injuring the country merchant, but rather that it will be an advantage to him. I know that a great objection comes from the country merchant, but the country merchant is stirred up insidiously by the express companies, and the objection is in reality only fictitious. We all know the methods of the monopolies for years and years in this country. On this important question which is now so widely discussed, my hon. friend will find that the report of Mr. Ross demonstrates that a local parcel post system will work to the advantage of the country merchant.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). I rise to a point of order. I have a motion on the order paper in connection with this very question which we were discussing last night at six o'clock when the House adjourned, and which will come up on Monday next when I shall be glad to have the support of the hon. gentlemen for it; but I wish to know if it is in order in this way to anticipate a motion which is already on the order paper.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). This is a new proposal which has been presented. There is a great grievance in Canada in connection with the parcel post system and express charges, and the constitutional rule is to move for the redress of grievances before going into Supply. I have said that the parcel post system is one way of getting at the express companies——

Mr. SPEAKER. In speaking to a point of order it is not permissible to wander off into a general debate.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I respect your ruling, Sir, but I wish to point out that if by putting a notice on the order paper you could block an amendment to Supply on the subject dealt with in that motion then there would be no possibility of bringing up grievances in this manner.

Mr. PELLETIER. I cannot be here next Monday, and this debate has gone on for a long time, and if it should be stopped now I do not want the people of the country to think that I have any objection to its proceeding. I would rather have the question ventilated and the debate continued if it be within the rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is great latitude given on the discussion of amendments to the motion that Mr. Speaker do leave the

Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply. Bourinot says:

The ancient constitutional doctrine that the redress of grievances is to be considered before the granting of supplies, is now represented by the practice of permitting every description of amendment to be moved on the question for the Speaker leaving the chair before going into the Committee of Supply or Ways and Means.

Bourinot continues to point out certain limitations to this rule one of which is that you cannot discuss a matter which is already dealt with in a notice on the order paper, but the notice of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) asks for a committee to gather information with respect to the nationalization of telegraphs and telephones, and the extension of parcel post, &c., while the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) is simply that the parcel post system be extended. In my judgment the amendment does not deal exactly with the same matter as the notice on the order paper, and it is therefore quite in order.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon). I wish to second the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) and to give a few reasons why I wish to see the extension of the parcel post service. Those who have followed the discussion in the public press know that there is discrimination against the west in the matter of express rates. A rate which in the eastern provinces would be say $1, would be about $1.66 in the west. An extension of the parcel post system which would to a great extent do the business of the express companies would do away with that discrimination against the west.

Another grievance which our people in the west have is the paying of double express rates. The recipient of a parcel by express from Ontario who resides on the line of the Canadian Northern railway must pay an express rate to each of the two companies—The Dominion Express Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Express Company—during the winter season. There is no more reason for charging two express rates on an express parcel than for charging double postage on a letter going into any part of the west. An extension of the parcel post system would remove that double charge. Another reason for supporting this motion is that the express rates are too high and that the business if taken over by the government could be administered more economically than it is by the express companies and the exorbitant charges would be wiped out.

I was pleased to hear the remarks of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to the country storekeeper. I have not yet got away from the idea that the country storekeeper is the mainstay of the settler. In the west many of our people who are poor, have no money and have no means of getting out their wheat and so must get credit. They do not get credit from T. Eaton & Company or from Robert Simpson & Company. It is the country storekeeper who must keep these people alive until they are able to get cash. If some arrangement can be worked out which will produce a system of parcel post which will not be to the disadvantage of the country storekeeper, then we will have a very perfect system indeed and when my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) with all his experience, assures us that that can be done, I am very glad indeed to support the proposal which is before the House.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am heartily in favour of the motion before the House. My principal reason is that the express companies are so exorbitant in their charges on goods going to the west. For instance I have in my office a bill for a four pound box of candy that was sent from Ottawa to Edmonton a year ago last Christmas. The box cost $2.40, and the Canadian Pacific railway express company charged $2.50 to take it from here to Edmonton. That has been the whole trouble, and I do not know of any better way to bring the express companies to time than to extend the parcel post. I would not like to interfere with the country merchants but I believe, as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), has said that a system can be devised that will be fair to the country merchants and to the settlers as well. We must always bear in mind that for one country merchant there are 50 farmers or more, so that their interests, I think, have to be kept well to the fore. The express charges are simply ruinous and this is the best way to deal with them.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the charge to which my hon. friend refers the regular, ordinary charge?

Mr. TURRIFF. It was the regular charge and the party who sent the four pound box objected strongly and held off paying for a week or so but they insisted that that was the ordinary charge and compelled him to pay the $2.50 from here to Edmonton.

Mr. BLAIN. Was it carried by one express company or two?

Mr. TURRIFF. By one express company only, because the Canadian Pacific railway have a continuous line between here and Edmonton.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was very much interested in the speech of the ex-Postmaster General, more especially with reference to the effect produced by the reduction of rates

of postage, particularly on drop letters. It may be in the recollection of the ex-Postmaster General that on several occasions in past years I drew his attention to the fact that whilst he had reduced the rate of postage on drop letters in the cities, he had not given to the people in the country any corresponding reduction.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am for that now.

Mr. HENDERSON. His argument then was that he could not make up his mind to give the people in the small towns and villages and in the townships a reduction to one-half cent on drop letters in rural districts until he had discovered what would be the result of the drop from two cents to one cent in the cities. My argument was that if that was good in one instance it ought to be good in the other and the ex-Postmaster General put me off from time to time until he should discover what the result would be in the cities.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear, the time has come now.

Mr. HENDERSON. The time has come and the ex-minister has become a convert to my contention.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You are justified.

Mr. HENDERSON. I purpose to-night making use of the arguments of the ex-Postmaster General to impress on the present Postmaster General that in consideration of the cities having received a reduced rate of postage from two cents to one cent on drop letters, the present Postmaster General should now render to the people in the rural districts which I represent more particularly that justice which my hon. friend the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) could not see his way clear to granting in the past. I trust the Postmaster General will find in what I have said and in what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) justification for making the reduction which I then asked and which I am very glad to ask for now.

To this extent, at least, I am in sympathy with the motion of the hon. member for South York. I think that whatever extension is made to the postal system should be to the material benefit of the country merchant, who has occasion to use the post office a great deal for the purpose of advertising his wares. Whether the object of the hon. gentleman from South York (Mr. Maclean), is carried out or not, I am sure my hon. friend the Postmaster General, particularly having heard the admission of his predecessor in office, will make an amendment to the postal law that will give the effect to the proposition for which I contended on several occasions.

Mr. EMMERSON. If the proposed motion resulted in the lessening of the express rates I think it would be a very desirable course to take. We often hear complaints about the east and the west, but there are never any murmurings as regards the east. Nevertheless, the express rates in eastern Canada are abnormally high, and unconscionably excessive. A charge, for instance, from New Brunswick to the city of Ottawa of $1.80 per hundred pounds for articles like vegetables, which cost less than $1 per hundred pounds, would seem to be by comparison outrageously excessive. Yet, particularly during the present season, these commodities can only be brought to Ottawa by express. You cannot trust to way freights, so the express companies are used. That is only one illustration. Many others could be cited to indicate that there is something wrong with the express charges in eastern Canada as well as in the west. I have not looked into the subject of parcel post, and how far it would discriminate against the retail merchants throughout the country, but I rather suspect that those who have been complaining in this regard have not been the retail merchants, but the transportation companies who are interested. I can say this however, that of all the revenue of the Intercolonial railway the largest precentage, without a corresponding expense charge is that derived from the Canadian Express Company and the Dominion Express Company. That business is done on a percentage basis, and if you will turn to the records of the Intercolonial railway you will see the very large sum which goes into the treasury of the railway as its proportion of the express charges. You would be amazed at it when you realize that special trains are not run, and that there are not even express cars on every train. Now, that amount is only a small proportion of the total express charge. The balance goes to the express companies. If you consult these figures you can form some idea of the burden which is placed on those who have to pay these charges. I speak of this because I think it is a matter with which the Railway Commission should deal at once, and if the action suggested by my hon. friend the Postmaster General would result in an awakening of the consciences of the express companies (if they can be said to have such a thing) it would be doing a very great service to the people of Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). Without entering into any discussion I merely wish to place the two resolutions on 'Hansard.'

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is permissible to discuss a ruling of the Chair. It may be appealed against to the House, but that is the only way it can be touched.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). I do not intend to discuss the ruling of the Chair,

Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to place the two resolutions on 'Hansard.'

Mr. SPEAKER. I take it that is the purpose of bringing up the two resolutions again.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). There seems to be a general opinion expressed on both sides of the House that the express rates in this country are excessive. This is a question which has been before the House a good many times. We have discussed it session after session, and we believed a few sessions ago that when we left the regulation of the express rates to the Railway Commission the people of the country would have some remedy, and that their grievances would receive redress. I think this question was brought up again at the last session of the House, and apparently the Railway Commission moved in the matter, making some slight reduction in the express rates.

We hear the Railway Commission praised; and I think they deserve great credit for what they have done in connection with railway traffic and arrangements. But I believe that in express rates, they have not done their duty. The reductions they have made were so small as to amount to little or nothing. I believe they should be urged to move in this matter of express rates and bring to an end such exorbitant charges as were referred to by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). There is no reason why we should not have lower rates, especially when we consider the capitalization of the express companies and the great profits they are making. While I am not opposed, and I am not going to express opposition, to the proposed extension of the parcel post system, at the same time I would remind the Postmaster General that 90 per cent—I think I am safe in saying 90 per cent—of the merchants throughout the Dominion are opposed to this change. Large stores in the principal centres, such concerns as the T. Eaton company and the Simpson company of Toronto, are supplying people all over this country with merchandise which should be bought from their local country merchants, and the proposed reduction of the parcel post rates will increase to an enormous extent this form of business. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has told us that a system could be worked out which would give us an extension of parcel post service, yet not hurt the country merchant. The explanation did not satisfy me. I do not see how it could be done. Surely, if the rates are lowered the country merchant must be hurt. Some hon. members on the other side spoke as if they would oppose the extension of the system, if it were likely to hurt the country merchant. Though they hope under the advice of the hon. member for Rouville, that a system can be worked out that will allow an extension of the system without causing injury to the country dealers. As to the petitions that were sent in, the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) has suggested that they were initiated by the express companies. Unless the hon. member can give us some authority for that statement, I can only say that I think he is mistaken. I believe the petitions were initiated by the Retail Merchants Association. They were certainly circulated by country merchants, and many of those petitions, including some that I received from my constituency, were signed by farmers who were opposed to the big departmental stores supplying the farmers to the injury of the trade of the country merchant. While, as I have said, I am not expressing opposition to the extension of this service, I hope the Postmaster General will consider it from all points of view before he decides. For I believe it is going to be a great injury to the country merchants. As has been said here to-night, the farmers depend pretty largely upon the country merchants, and I think we should keep that fact in view.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, this is a very important question. Without expressing an opinion now upon any of the explanations which have been made, let me say at the outset that, with the general way in which the motion has been drafted, there is no objection to accepting it as it stands. I think the House will be very much indebted to hon. members who have studied this question and have given us the benefit of their suggestions and advice. Without referring—as I am not allowed to refer under the rules—to the debate of yesterday, I may be permitted to say that we had from the hon. member from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) not only an elaborate, but a statesmanlike presentation of this and the other questions with which he dealt. He has evidently looked into these questions very carefully, and I not only thank him on my own behalf, but I am sure that I express the sentiment of all the members of this House on both sides when I say that we are indebted to the hon. member for having put on 'Hansard' the result of what must have been a pretty long study of the subject. I was sorry that, because of the House adjourning at six o'clock, my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) had not an opportunity to say everything he wished to say. I hope I may be here when the debate is resumed. If it is gone on with on Monday, I regret to say, I cannot be present; but I hope to be able to arrange with my hon. friend to fix some other day when I can be here. For, having heard what was so ably said yesterday, I must say he has given me

such a mass of information on subjects within my department that he has done for me a good deal of work which I should have otherwise have had to do for myself. For that, I tender him my sincere thanks.

I now come to this question of parcel post which was included in a certain way in the motion of my hon. friend from East Lambton, and which has been dealt with to-night on the motion of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. MacLean). I have listened very attentively to the remarks of all the gentlemen who have spoken, and I was struck with several of the addresses, and amongst others, that of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who, in the course of his very able speech has had the candour to tell this House—for it practicalsy amounts to that—that his government might have done a great thing but failed to do it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We were just on the verge of doing it.

Mr. PELLETIER. It took them fifteen years to get to the verge. There were many things, apparently, that they were on the verge of doing, but the many bad things that they did must have kept them so busy they had not time to do the good things. The time had indeed come for a change of government, if these gentlemen, being imbued with such great and patriotic ideas, were not able to put them into effect. But now that they are in opposition, they say to us: You are in power; do these things now; we thought of it for fifteen years, yet we, this great government—they do not say 'great,' but everything points to that—did nothing; but you are in power; now do these things that we failed to do.

However, Mr. Speaker, I must say that in the position I occupy at present, I have something else to do than to present only one side of this question. Whilst I am in accord with the principle of the resolution before the House, I am bound to say that there are serious objections to putting it into effect, at least to any great extent. As we know, there are two sides to every question, and so there are to this one. There are objections and the objections exist not only from the point of view of the express companies. If this government, if the Post Office Department, comes to the conclusion that it is in the interest of the people at large to adopt a parcel post system, no express companies will prevent us from doing it. The question has many bearings, it is one of great importance. In view of the position taken in the past by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) and the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), I have taken some pains to study this matter. I am bound to say that although the expansion of the parcel post system would undoubtedly be a great boon to the public, there are obstacles in the way, obstacles which my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has brushed aside with a wave of the hand, but which exist nevertheless. I think it necessary to lay before the House both aspects of this question. We are told that the mother country, England, is the pioneer in that direction. So she is, Mr. Speaker, as she has been the pioneer in many other respects. In regard to postal organization, I entirely agree with the hon. member for Rouville that we have to go to England to learn. Let me call the atttention of the House to a very important fact, that while we find in England a highly developed parcel post system, in another country to the south of us, the United States, the parcel post system is practically ignored. What is the reason for the difference between these two countries in that respect? In the British Isles they have a territory of 121,000 square miles, with a population of 45,000,000. Ontario alone has an area twice that of the British Isles; and if we take the Dominion at large, instead of an area of 120,000 square miles, which is that of the British Isles, we have an area of 1,832,854 square miles. What does that mean in relation to the parcel post system? It means that we have a very large area to supply, and a very sparse population to support the system. Hon. gentlemen will easily understand how these facts affect the question. A large population in a small territory will go very far to make a parcel post system successful; whereas if you have to cover an area of a million square miles with a small population to support the system, you will very likely make it a failure. The House will easily understand the bearings of these facts. Now, why have the United States not gone further in the development of a parcel post system? For the very reason I have pointed out, namely, that while the area of the United States is about the same as ours, they have a population of 90,000,000 people. The United States even has not proceeded as far as the hon. member for Rouville would wish us to proceed. My hon. friend has read from a report of the Postmaster General of the United States, and I was already acquainted with some of his remarks. But it is only during the session of Congress of this year that the Postmaster General of the United States has drawn attention to this question in a pointed way. Any one who reads the New York papers will see that one of the reasons for the United States being slow in this matter is the fact of the immense area of its territory. You must have a dense population in order to make the system a success. We must look these difficulties in the face. It is not sufficient

to say to the people: You must have this, and you must have that. We must treat the people frankly, and put all the facts before them, before promising to inaugurate this or that system. I think our parcel post system can be expanded, that it can be made much better than it is to-day. But I would not like the people to expect that with our seven or eight million inhabitants we are going to inaugurate a parcel post system such as they have in the British Isles with their forty-five millions. I admit there is room for amelioration, there is no doubt about that. Look at the position we occupy to-day—and I do not say this in order to criticise our hon. friends opposite. Under the operation of the parcel post system which we have now in force we actually play into the hands of the express companies; we give them all the profitable business, and we keep for ourselves the unprofitable business. That statement is as true as any statement that can be made in this House. The express companies take all the business on the short hauls because it pays them, and they leave us all the business on the long hauls. They do not undertake that, because it doesn't pay them. It is the Post Office Department that provides for the long hauls. Now we take a parcel from Vancouver and carry it to Halifax for a cent an ounce.

It is the same principle as that which we should apply to ordinary mail matter. If we do not say that in a certain province, or in a certain zone, there shall be a certain rate according to the distance between these zones, we shall certainly put ourselves in the position that we will carry all over this continent what the express companies carry now and, if the cheap rates which are suggested and asked for to-night are adopted, we will put the Post Office Department out of commission. In England, where they do these things so well, they have a minimum rate. They will take a parcel and carry it for threepence per pound. But, if it weighs one pound one ounce it will cost sixpence instead of three. We charge one cent per ounce and we go up a cent for every ounce until we have reached the sixteen ounces in a pound and when we charge 16 cents. From there up to 25 cents it goes by ounces. The minimum rate of the express companies is 25 cents. They are very careful to leave all those little things which are so tiny and small that they might be lost to us. At the rate which exists now one of those little parcels, weighing two or three ounces, may be sent by the mail and it will only cost two or three cents. The express companies leave all that business to us. I do not think that is a state of things which should continue or which should be encouraged. I think that we should go into the question fully and try to find a remedy for the existing state of things. There are various aspects of this question and I am only going over them in a very general way because I think the time has not come to go very fully into them. The public demands on the Post Office Department are immense. We are asked from all sides to extend and expand our system of rural mail delivery. I am not prepared to say, because comparisons are always odious, which is the better, speaking for the government, because the government has not yet considered this question, but in so far as I am concerned I am inclined to believe that if we are to go into any very extensive new policy in the Post Office Department, my preference for the moment would be in favour of the rural mail delivery first. If we intend, as was suggested a moment ago, to come to the help of the farmers, I think they would prefer rural mail delivery to the fact that they might receive from the big shops like Eaton's in Toronto a parcel once a year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no doubt that the extension of rural mail delivery will help in getting cheap parcel post.

Mr. PELLETIER. I think that is true to a certain extent, but that point is not as clear as some people would think. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) submitted a plan yesterday in which I think there is a great deal.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The plan of Mr. Ross.

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes I was going to say that. It is what is called the limited parcel post plan, and it is the plan which Mr. Ross, who knows a great deal about this matter, has brought before the department. I do not want to criticise men who know more about this matter than I do.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is a technical question.

Mr. PELLETIER. It is more than a technical question. We are told by Mr. Ross and by the hon. member for East Lambton that we should limit the parcel post delivery to the point where the rural mail delivery man begins his work. How would we carry mail from the distributing point to this local point? We must provide for the distribution from, say, Toronto to Niagara, Brantford and those other places. We must provide for transportation to the point where the rural delivery man will take the mail. I do not see that any provision has been made for that and it must be looked into because it is a serious question. We are told that the United States have done something. Whereas, we have a five-pound limit for our parcel post, the United States have only a four-pound limit. In that great country, knowing as much as they do,

they have not yet gone beyond the four-pound limit. In England they have reached the eleven-pound limit, and I do not suppose that anybody will ever think of going beyond that for the parcel post delivery. I am sure that the hon. member for Rouville will side with me when I say that if you are going into this trade, because it is now a trade carried on by the express companies, you must provide for more than my hon. friend thinks. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has said something with regard to a point of very great importance and one to which it is necessary to give mature consideration. We have in this country the mail car. We also have the express car. I have seen it stated in books and articles that there was not much in the objection which has been urged in this regard because it was said the mail and express cars were half empty. As a matter of fact the cars are crowded now as much as they can be and to-day it has become a great problem with the railway companies on account of the very heavy increase in the quantity of newspapers which are carried all over because the people read more than they used to——

Mr. LEMIEUX. And at a cheaper rate than in any other country.

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes, my hon. friend is right. We have to face this question. As my hon. friend knows, the railway companies have been hammering at him

Mr. LEMIEUX. And at my predecessors.

Mr. PELLETIER. And at his predecessors because they think they are not getting enough for the transportation of mails. It got to such an acute point that my hon. friend, not knowing how to deal with this question and being obliged to refuse these railway companies, thought of referring the whole question for decision to the Railway Board.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I thought it was the proper plan.

Mr. PELLETIER. It was at all events a very good plan of taking it out of the way for the time being.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They were satisfied. What has my hon. friend done?

Mr. PELLETIER. Well, I am sorry to say that I have had to differ on this question from my hon. friend as I have had to on some other points, though we are personally good friends. We have had an order in council passed taking away from the Railway Board the decision of this question. I am not going to tell you anything to-night that might induce the railway companies to ask for too much money, but the railway companies, I must admit, have a case. They carry much more than they used to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I agree with my hon. friend in that.

Mr. PELLETIER. We have in our hands a strong card; we have the law in our favour, and the law says at what rates the mails shall be carried by the railway companies. Having that power in our own hands, why should we give it away to the Railway Board. If there is justice in the contention of the railway companies, let us render justice to them after we have ourselves considered the matter, and let us say to the railway companies: you will get what you are entitled to and no more. That is why I have taken this question from the Railway Board. The submission to the Railway Board would tie the hands of the government because I presume no government would dare to refuse to accept the suggestion of that board. And, that decision of the board might not only wipe out our post-office surplus of $1,250,000, but leave us a deficit instead. I was new in the department, but I went very carefully into the matter and when I saw that we might possibly be condemned to pay such a big amount in a lump sum, I thought I would recommend to my colleagues that since the law gave us the power to decide the question we should decide it for ourselves. We will then be sure that we will not pay more than we should.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Postmaster General agrees with me that the railways have made a prima facie case, and if he now proposes lower rates and larger weights for the parcel post, he will be in a better position to make arrangements with the railway companies for the future.

Mr. PELLETIER. When we are making a deal with the railway companies for the carriage of the mails it will be a good business transaction in the interests of the people of Canada for us to try and get a reduction and a considerable one at that—in the express rates. It will be a matter of give and take. To deny that the railway companies have made out a prima facie case would be to deny a clearly evident fact.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The railway companies it is agreed, have a prima facie case against the department, and the question had been hanging in the department for the last fifteen or twenty years as to what should be done in view of the heavy increase in the mail service. The companies were pressing me very hard and I thought the best way was to refer the whole question to the Railway Commission which had been asked to decide cognate questions. I do not say I would have been bound by the

decision of the Railway Commissioners, and I always had a view that we might consider the question in our negotiations with the railway companies towards the end of extending the parcel post system at lower rates.

Mr. PELLETIER. If the railway companies had a decision of the Railway Board in their favour they would have a big stick in their hands over the government, but having the law in my favour I will keep that big stick in my own hands. I do not mean that I shall dictate anything unjust to the railway companies, but the railway companies will not dictate to me. If they had a judgment of the Railway Board which would amount to an award by arbitrators, they would have the better end of it, but I shall always try to keep the better end for the public so long as I am at the head of the department. Coming back to the parcel post question, I say there are other things to be taken into account. The whole system at present for handling the mails, the size of the bags, among other things, would not be sufficient for the larger parcels, rural delivery boxes would be too small and I believe we have already one hundred thousand. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) has admitted that we will practically have to change all the mail carrying contracts if the new system is adopted. A minister in charge of a department has to consider all these things before he announces to the people that this reform will be inaugurated and put into effect by a wave of the hand. If under this new system we are to become common carriers of the parcels of this country, we shall probably have to have another mail car on the trains, and generous as the railway companies may be, it is not to be assumed that they will give two cars for the price of one. I believe that the business is done to-day on a profitable basis for the railway companies and the express companies. We all know that the express companies are subsidiary companies of the railway companies and that the directors go from one room to another, and the resolutions they carry in one room they can have adopted in the other because they are nearly always the same men.

With all that the express company is making a very good profit. Although I must confess they are not giving out the secrets of their business to everybody I understand that they now have an arrangement in virtue of which the railway companies carry the parcels the express company receiving 45 per cent of the revenue and the railway companies retaining 55 per cent. It is no wonder the express companies are making a great deal of money and are able to pay large dividends.

If the government should enter this field and should charge the same rates as are now charged by these express companies, it would be no advantage to the people of Canada. So it results necessarily that we must think and work out another system altogether from the present one. I do not want the country merchant to think that we are going to do anything that will be harmful to him. The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) has said to-night that in the different parishes, townships and hamlets of this country the country merchant is badly needed and this government should take care that this man is not injured in his business. Big firms like Eaton's in Toronto will never be stopped from sending their goods throughout the country and to a certain extent injuring the country merchants. They are sending their goods at the existing rates and they are even sending special trains with goods in certain parts of this country. They are paying for these trains which shows what splendid organizations and what immense outputs these big firms must have. But where they do not run special trains, they will send goods anyway. There is not a country place in Canada, however small, where Eaton's are not sending goods. You cannot expect to stop them, and the country merchant knows that this has to be done. Great care will have to be taken, however, not to injure the business of the country merchants. They are worthy people, they earn their living and the living of their families in this way and their rights should be respected. Probably some of my friends will say that whilst I am accepting this motion I have said everything that may be said against it. I do not want my friends to so interpret my remarks. The advantages of the system have been so well put before the House by the gentlemen who have spoken before me that I felt I did not need to repeat them. I had some pencil notes from which I intended to speak, but no one hopes to speak as eloquently as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has spoken in favour of this system. So it is perhaps better to allow him to set forth the advantages of the system and I have been obliged to take the other side in order that the case may be fully presented. I at once agree that something must be done. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) is in a position to assure the people that this parcel post system will be a good thing, but with the responsibilities of office I have to look on the other side of the question.

On the other question which has been incidentally discussed, the state-owned cable, I shall say one word. I entirely agree with the opinion that the reduction we have obtained in the rates for the transmission of news from the mother country

to Canada, and vice versa, are absolutely inadequate, and that we should not be content with them and sit quiet and wait.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER. The cable companies must understand and I have weighed my words—that this country intends trading with the mother country. Canada has said so, in a solemn manner, lately. One means of facilitating trade between the two countries is to have an inexpensive means of transmitting not only postal matter, but cable matter, and this is most important to the business man of this country. We are a self-governing colony, but we are part and parcel of the British Empire, and it is essential that this premier colony, Canada, should have cheap means of cable communication. The cable companies are a monopoly——

Mr. LEMIEUX. And American companies.

Mr. PELLETIER—and American companies. I think it is the bounden duty of this government to do something in this respect. I have been asked, as the head of the Post Office Department, to give my views on this matter to a certain number of important newspapers in London, England. I have put it over my signature that we are not satisfied with the present system, and rates although they have been reduced to a great extent, and that we expect better for this country in future, and that we must and are bound to get a cheaper means of cable communication. My words may appear strong, but they are not any stronger than I think they ought to be.

On all these important questions I am happy to see that both sides of the House agree in believing that the government will endeavour to, and will succeed in doing its full duty.

Amendment, Mr. Maclean (South York), agreed to.

Mr. MONK moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

SUPPLY.

Harbours and rivers New Brunswick, $286,925.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that an item which was in the main estimates of the past year for Bathurst harbour improvements has been omitted. I would say to the hon. gentleman that Bathurst harbour is one of very great importance, and I would like to ask whether it has been struck out advisedly.

Mr. MONK. It was not taken out with the idea of discontinuing the work, but there were a great many demands for improvements, and I believe I suggested its taking out myself. It may be taken into consideration for the supplementary estimates. There is no idea of abandoning it completely.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Bathurst harbour is the centre of a very large lumber manufacturing district. I think there are five rivers emptying into it, and each one of these rivers is a source of lumber supply, there being large forest areas on each of them. There are quite a number of mills at Bathurst, in fact, I believe one of the most modern mills in the eastern provinces, if not in the whole of Canada, has been built there recently. At the present time there is very great expense attendant upon the shipment of lumber. The sawn lumber has to be lightered out of the harbour to some distance outside on the roadstead. I believe the cost is something like 75 cents per thousand, which could be saved if the harbour were dredged out so that vessels could come in close to the mills and the lumber be conveniently placed on board.

There is also another very important consideration and that is that within about 18 miles of Bathurst there is a very valuable iron deposit which is being operated by a company formed by the Drummonds. They are shipping their ore at the present time from Newcastle, some 40 or 50 miles away. It has been represented by the company that if Bathurst harour were improved a very considerable portion of the ore would be shipped from there, as it could be done with considerable less expense. I do not think the idea is to abandon the shipments from Newcastle altogether, but rather to ship ore from both places. For two years we have been doing dredging in Bathurst. During the past season a government dredge was continuously employed, a special vote being put in for Bathurst harbour. I am glad to hear my hon. friend state that it is not the intention to discontinue the work, but that it will be considered with the supplementary estimates.

Mr. MONK. It is not intended to abandon the work, because the harbour is an important one, but we have large demands for harbour improvements in New Brunswick, particularly at St. John, consequently we have been obliged to cut off some of them for the present.

Mr. TURGEON. Might I ask the liberty of adding a few words to what the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has said in regard to Bathurst? If the hon. Minister of Public Works will allow me I would make a most urgent request upon him to continue the dredging works which have been commenced. No doubt other places are also pressing their claims,

but I wish to call the especial attention of the hon. minster to the fact that dredging was commenced in Bathurst harbour two years ago and was continued last season. Under the circumstances it would certainly not be a businesslike policy to discontinue the work now, more particularly when we know that the business of Bathurst is suffering pending the completion of the work. The hon. member for the city of St. John has mentioned the large lumber interests centred around Bathurst. As a matter of fact two of the largest and most modern mills in the province have been recently erected there, one on each side of the harbour. The hon. Minister of Public Works was through Bathurst on one or two occasions, and saw some of the mills there, but since his visit these two mills have been erected with all modern improvements and of immense capacity, and have added a great deal to the importance of the harbour.

The interests of the iron mine referred to by the hon. member for St. John are also urging upon the hon. minister the necessity of continuing the work. Large shipments will be made, and the people greatly benefited. The people of the municipality have taxed themselves to assist the company to build as fast as possible. They have exempted the company from taxation for a number of years, and have taxed themselves to the extent of $25,000 in the shape of a bonus in order to induce these capitalists to come and develop that immense iron ore deposit—the largest on this hemisphere—which will be able to supply iron ore for centuries to come. Now, these industries are considerably handicapped until the harbour works are completed.

It means a loss to all these lumbermen, and their loss will affect business generally in that section. I hope that the minister will be able to guarantee me to-night that he will have a vote in the supplementary estimates so that that work may not be stopped. A special dredge has been purchased by the department which is now undergoing repairs to continue the work, so it will not require a very large additional amount. I trust the minister will consider this matter very seriously.

Mr. EMMERSON. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) to an item in the estimates of last year for a new wharf at Beaumont. I do not know whether tenders for this work have been called for or not. I had some assurance from the department that, as soon as the plans could be completed they proposed to ask for tenders. Beaumont is in Westmorland county, and the proposed wharf is to be constructed on a site on the Peticodiac river near a very important building-stone industry, that was in operation at one time, but is not in operation now. In addition to the desirability of having a wharf there for that industry when it should be revived, there are many other reasons why the people of that locality feel the need of a wharf. The money was voted last year, and I do not recall that it is dropped out of the estimates now before us. The hon. minister knows that timber can be provided for construction more economically in winter than in summer, and therefore it is desirable that tenders should be called for soon.

Mr. MONK. I can only repeat the fact that an item that appeared in the estimates last year is not in the estimates this year, does not necessarily mean that the government has abandoned the work. We hope, in most cases, even if we do not provide for these works in the supplementary estimates, to take them up as soon as possible. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) knows that it is impossible for successive governments to coincide exactly with regard to the urgency of a given list of works. In the case of New Brunswick especially, we have had very large demands, and we are obliged to make considerable provision for the main port, that of St. John. The remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) will not be forgotten, and the work will be taken up as soon as possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The practice has been in the past to put in the main estimates items for all works provided for previously and not yet proceeded with, and in the supplementary estimates, items for new works. In the estimates now before us there is not a single new item for New Brunswick in the harbours and rivers vote chargeable to consolidated revenue. On the contrary, whereas during the current year the total vote was $868,390, the total vote for harbours and rivers for New Brunswick chargeable to consolidated revenue for the coming year is $286,925. So, my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), by diligent and, perhaps I could say ingenious, use of the pen, has reduced the vote for New Brunswick in respect to this vote by nearly three-quarters. It is regrettable that these items should be omitted because they had already been provided for, and it would have been so easy for my hon. friend to have proceeded with these works. For instance, there was a vote for a breakwater at Castalia. This is a very important place in Charlotte county, a thickly settled section which carries on a large fishing business. A breakwater is needed there for the protection of the fishermen, and I am surprised my hon. friend should have struck out this item. It must have been done without his having his attention called to it; for, if he had

considered the matter, he would have concluded that among the smaller works of the province, none is more important than a breakwater at this place. Then $100,000 had been voted for a wharf at Chatham. This is a very important work. Of course, my hon. friend may intend to have that work done by the Department of Railways and Canals, as the work is in connection with the extension of the Intercolonial railway to the waterfront. But the amount was provided for in the estimates of the Public Works Department. Whichever department builds the wharf, the work is absolutely essential in order to reap the full benefits from the contemplated extension of the railway. The Miramichi river is a splendid river and a very large business in done in Chatham, which business no doubt, with proper accommodation, will greatly increase. Another important work is Gooseberry Cove breakwater. The amount for the dredging of the St. Croix river is struck out. That dredging is very important. It was intended to dredge from the Calais side of the river in the state of Maine across to St. Stephen, New Brunswick, to provide a channel for the steamers that frequent that river, and then to make the channel down the river, affording the necessary depth of water. The matter was taken up between the Department of Public Works and the representatives of the government of the United States.

As the larger vessels, and I think the larger portion of the tonnage, belongs to the Americans, we came to an agreement under which they would contribute a much larger sum towards the dredging than this government. We put a small amount, I think $7,500, in the estimates last year, which my hon. friend has re-voted in the present year, but is omitted from the present estimates for next year. That work surely is not to be dropped. A binding agreement has been come to between the two governments, under which the United States is prepared to go ahead with the work, and we have agreed to contribute our share. I would ask why the amount has been dropped in the estimates. Then there was an amount of $50,000 for the purchase and improvement of a property at St. John for buoys and for the accommodation of government vessels. That has also been dropped. That accommodation is very much required, both by the Marine Department and by the Public Works department. There is no suitable wharf accommodation there belonging to the government where the buoys of the Marine department may be repaired, where government vessels may lie and be repaired, and where dredges and scows belonging to the Public Works department may be repaired. St. John is wholly unequipped in that particular, and that is why I had an amount placed in the estimates. On the whole, my hon. friend will see that he has reduced considerably the amounts for New Brnswick. There is another item of some importance which has been omitted. For a number of years past there has been an arrangement between the two governments under which certain wharfs were constructed by the provincial government, and this government has been paying half the cost of construction. There has been some criticism of that arrangement. I would like to know if my hon. friend has decided to put an end to it, and to make no further payments to the provincial government of New Brunswick with respect to the wharfs that are being constructed upon the tidal waters of the St. John river, and other rivers.

Mr. MONK. There has been no breaking away from the arrangement made between the local government and our own as to the wharfs just alluded to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why has the item been dropped?

Mr. MONK. I do not think we were tied down as to the manner in which we would make that contribution. If the obligation has to be satisfied during the year, there will be provision made in the supplementary estimates. But I do not think there is anything of a rigid character in that arrangement which would oblige us to put a vote in the main estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Under the ruling of the Auditor General there will have to be a special vote for that purpose. The works are constructed by the provincial government, and some two years ago he refused to allow payment to the provincial government under an item for improvements, holding that there must be a special vote.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend naturally goes back to works which he, in his wisdom, thought at that time, to be urgent. I am better prepared to defend the works for which I ask estimates myself. But he is mistaken when he says that we have not generously provided for public works in that province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that, I said he had dropped important works that were provided for.

Mr. MONK. That has been done so often during the last 15 years that I have sat in this House, that there should be no surprise if it is done now. I have seen items appear in the estimates four or five years in succession, and then dropped altogether; I have seen items changed year after year under different ministers. It is not surprising, under these circumstances, that in the estimates of which

we have only taken a part this session, these items should not appear. When this government is called upon to bring down its own estimates and to initiate all these works, it is not surprising that we should fail to see eye to eye with the preceding government. That happens whenever there is a change of government. The committee will note the large contribution we have had to make this year for St. John; we have provided a sum for St. John far greater than was ever provided before, and that has been due to the urgent necessities which have arisen at that port. I do not think it is fair, because an item has been left out of this year's estimates, to conclude that the work is dropped or that it will not be resumed, or that at another time the government will not make provision for carrying on that work. I may say that in no case where the work was under contract, and where an interruption would have been absolutely prejudicial, has that interruption taken place. We have taken the estimates under review in all the provinces, according to our best judgment, and have done the best we could for urgent works with the means at our disposal.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) has referred to the fact that $50,000 in the estimates last year for the purpose of building a wharf for government steamers at St. John is not in the estimates this year. I would point out that there is no necessity for that vote being in the estimates this year. That wharf is no doubt required for the Marine and Fisheries Department, upon which the buoys and material belonging to the government might be stored, and at which vessels might lay up from time to time, vessels that are under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department to supply lighthouses and to look after the buoys. Incidentally also it might serve as a wharf to which steamers under the control of the Public Works Department might resort. I may say to my hon. friend that it is not at haphazard that this vote is left out of the estimates. I am advised by the officials of my department that at any time we wish to acquire property in St. John for that purpose, we have the funds to do so; and I may say that negotiations are going on now, and I have instructed the engineer of my department to consider different places that have been suggested as available. If the minister should decide to buy a property of that sort we have ample funds at our disposal with which to do it, and which we are authorized by law to expend for that purpose. Under the vote that was made last session, a vote for general purposes in connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department, I am advised by my deputy minister, and also by the engineer of the department, that we can use the money for this purpose. So that if we determine to buy that property, there are plenty of funds at our disposal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am surprised to hear that statement, that under a general vote for fisheries, property could be bought for the purpose of constructing a wharf upon which to store buoys, and at which vessels might lie. I think that is a new departure. I think this parliament ought to have placed before it the estimates to purchase a property of that character, and also a special amount for improvements. I know that was the view taken both by the Marine and Fisheries Department, and by the Public Works Department when this matter first came up. There was a vote placed in the estimates by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, then, as it was thought that the property could be utilized by both departments, the vote was transferred to the Department of Public Works. Now my hon. friend says that without asking parliament for the money the department can acquire the property, which will cost a good deal of money, and build thereon a wharf for the purpose of repairing buoys, and at which vessels may lie. I doubt very much if the Auditor General, in the discharge of his duty, would pass an expenditure of that kind under a general vote.

Mr. HAZEN. From inquiry I have made I am afraid that $50,000 would not go very far in acquiring such a property as is needed for this purpose. It would take a much larger sum.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would think, from information that I have, that $50,000 would be sufficient. Of course, it would depend on where the property was obtained. If some of the rumours I have heard are correct, that parties are getting options on properties which they thought might be suitable, it might be that the minister would have to pay more than it might otherwise cost. But, I have in my mind a property in St. John which, I think, could be obtained for about $50,000.

Mr. HAZEN. I hope the hon. gentleman will let me know where they are.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon friend will find in the Public Works Department a report from the Superintendent of Dredging Captain Howden and Mr Scommell, the engineer of the department, on a property which is admirably suited for the purpose, comprising 45 or 50 acres.

Mr. MONK. Does not my hon. friend think that with the works we have pro-

vided for this year we will have ample room for any vessel of the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend says that these estimates contain more liberal appropriations for St. John harbour than we made. He is not correct in that. The amount for St. John harbour in the estimates this year is identical with the estimates last year. A million dollars is the amount I put in the estimates last year for the improvement of St. John harbour and my hon. friend has very handsomely come down with a million dollars for the coming year.

Mr. HAZEN. How much was spent last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I kept $500,000 intact for improvements at Courtenay Bay.

Mr. MONK. I think the votes last year amounted to $950,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, that is pretty close. I will give my hon. friend the benefit of the extra $50,000, but I am bound to say that if my hon. friend goes on with improvements at Courtenay bay it may be desirable to have a further sum in the Supplementary estimates. I do not complain at all of my hon. friend's action in regard to St. John. I do not say that he is not treating us well. He is proposing to do a work which is of great national importance, but, at the same time, it is not new because parliament had appropriated last year an amount equal to the sum which my hon. friend is proposing to place in the estimates for this year. But, I do think it is a pity that these very important works should be neglected. These works at Castalia, Chatham, and other places are, as I have said, of very great importance. I must congratulate my hon. friend upon this, however, that notwithstanding all the attention he has been giving to public works in New Brunswick, he has not found it necessary to put in a single new item. I find that all the items which he is asking parliament to vote are just those which we had in the estimates last year.

Mr. HAZEN. You should have proceeded with the works last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well we were proceeding as rapidly as we could.

Mr. MONK. As we are doing now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were all important and the minister has shown his wisdom in providing for them. But, it is unfortunate that he has left out a few works which, I think, are just as necessary as those which he is providing for.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry that in the process of elimination my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has found it necessary to eliminate the wharf at Beaumont. Members representing constituencies outside of St. John have always experienced difficulty in convincing St. John particularly that it was not the whole province. Apparently my hon. friend from St. John city (Mr. Pugsley), and my hon. friend from St. John city and county (Mr. Hazen) have imbued the Minister of Public Works with the idea that St. John was the only place in New Brunswick that required particular attention, and that if there was any elimination to be entered upon the other constituencies would have to suffer. I do not wish my hon friend to be too much impressed with the importance of having St. John alone looked after. I do not wish that Westmorland should be overlooked even though the minister may be impressed with the importance of St. John. The wharf at Beaumont is only a small matter after all, but it affects a very large number of people. It is not a political wharf in any sense. The government will find that its friends are quite as much interested in this wharf as those who supported the former government. This wharf was brought to the notice of the department by myself because of a united people presenting strong and indisputable reasons why there should be a wharf at this point. I simply ask my hon. friend to look into it, and if he does he will see that there are special reasons why these people should be considered. In so far as the political standpoint is concerned I make no plea at all, because that is not of serious import, but it is a matter in the interests of the people who have suffered for many years for want of this convenience. They had a wharf in former years. That wharf was continued down to within a very recent period, but change and decay went on and in the course of time it became impossible for business purposes, and now it is required in the interest of the business of that section of the country.

Mr. MONK. We will consider it, Mr. Chairman. Of course, it is a pity that when there was a possibility during the whole year of beginning a work of this kind it was not begun.

Mr. EMMERSON. That shows that it had nothing to do with the elections.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will realize that these things cannot all be done at once. Engineers have to prepare plans and specifications.

Goose Creek harbour—breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What about Gooseberry cove breakwater? That has been left out. Is it finished?

Mr. MONK. I have no information about Gooseberry cove.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend said that it was being done by day work.

Mr. MONK. Probably it has been finished.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the late estimate there was a vote for $3,000 for a wharf at Shediac Island, and that vote is not repeated in the present estimates. The people living on that island are thrifty French Acadians, engaged in fishing and agriculture, and while in the winter they can cross on the ice, in the summer their supplies have all to be obtained from the mainland and there is neither wharf nor landing place, which, of course, imposes great inconvenience on the inhabitants.

Mr. MONK. Why was not the wharf built last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because the vote was not obtained in time. The work could not be commenced without the money having been voted.

Mr. EMMERSON. If the late government were selfish in the matter, from a political standpoint, it would be desirable to do the work and the fact that the work was not undertaken proves that it was not a political venture at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was no such thing under the late government.

Mr. EMMERSON. If there is any lingering doubt in the mind of the present Minister of Public Works on this point I wanted to remove it. The inhabitants of Shediac Island are sorely in need of this wharf.

Mr. MONK. I will take the matter into consideration. I may remind my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) that I lived on an island myself for many years, and I tried to get the late government to build a wharf but I met with failure.

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope this government is not so hardhearted.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—NAPIERVILLE POST OFFICE SITE.

Mr. MONK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. LANCTOT (Lapraire-Napierville). (Translation):

Mr. CHAIRMAN, before the adjournment I beg leave to put a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works, concerning the Napierville post office site.

DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Mr. Blondin). I will remind the hon. member that he is not allowed to enter into a discussion of anything else than the item now under discussion.

Mr. LANCTOT. It is only a question that I want to ask the hon. member. On the 16th January last, on the item for a public building at Napier, I asked the hon. member if it was the intention of his department to erect the building on the site purchased by the late government. His answer was that effectually there was a vote of $15,000 for a public building in the city of Napier, on St. Luke street, that $1,000 had been paid for the site and that the work was to be proceeded with without delay.

That was on the 16th of January last. On the 22nd January I received a letter from Mr. Pierre Bourgeois in which letter I am asked to interest myself in this question and see that he is paid by the Department of Public Works. Therefore he had not been paid on the 22nd, in spite of what was said by the minister on the 16th. I wrote immediately to Mr. Bourgeois informing him that he must have received a cheque in settlement of his claim, since the minister had declared on the 16th that he had paid for the site in question. On the 28th January I received another letter from Mr. Bourgeois stating that he had not yet been paid.

I would like to know from the minister, how is it that the cheque has been sent to Napier more than three months ago and that Mr. Bourgeois has not yet been paid.

I do not know if my information is correct, but I am told that the Department of Public Works has written to the Department of Justice advising them to do nothing until further advice. The Department of Justice, in turn, has written to Mr. Barrette, notary, not to make the payment until he receives further instructions.

Mr. MONK. The information I gave to my hon. friend was furnished to me by the officials of my department. I think the matter was brought to the Interior Department. I will inquire about it and then give the information asked for by the hon. member.

Mr. LANCTOT. The hon. minister must certainly know that a parcel of land has been bought last summer in order to satisfy his own department. Mr. Bourgeois was obliged to pay two hundred dollars for that piece of land. That occurred six months ago, it is only fair to refund that amount to that gentleman.

Mr. MONK. Those delays occur in the Interior Department.

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

Mr. MONK. Some of the government bills on the order paper, and then Supply.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to give notice that on a convenient occasion, on going into Supply, I propose to move a resolution in regard to the grain blockade in the west.

Mr. MONK. I suppose my hon. friend will let us see the wording of that resolution?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 2, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. SEXSMITH moved:

That the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER. As this report involves an expenditure of money, it seems to me very doubtful whether it is regular. The report is:

Your committee recommend that one hundred and fifty thousand (150,000) copies of the evidence of Dr. James W. Robertson, Chairman, Committee on Lands, Commission of Conservation, given before the committee on Thursday, January 25, 1912, be printed forthwith in pamphlet form, in the usual numerical proportions of English and French, as advance sheets of the committee's final report, for distribution as follows:—140,000 copies to members of parliament, 6,000 copies to Department of Agriculture, 2,500 copies to witness, 1,500 copies for use of committee.

I am not aware that there is any authority for incurring the expenditure necessary for this purpose, and I draw the attention of the House to the matter, so that it may be looked into

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). My attention was not directed to the character of the report, but I am under the impression that similar reports have been received in the past. I would suggest that the matter stand for a day until your honour has an opportunity of looking into it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I know that this has been done in the past, but I have always believed that it was wrong. We have a rule that provides that all proposals for printing should go before the Printing Committee. In this case the proposal would not go before the Printing Committee at all.

Mr. STEVENS. This very point was before the Printing Committee this morning, and a resolution was incorporated in the report of that committee asking that all proposals for printing be passed through that committee. It was pointed out that frequently a great deal of matter that is printed is left about the building, and the committee wished to have some oversight of the printing in order to see that everything printed was utilized and nothing wasted.

Mr. SEXSMITH. The object of this report of the Committee on Agriculture is to prevent what the hon. member has just referred to. If this matter has to go before the Committee on Printing, the evidence will not be printed in time to go into the hands of the members this session. Then the great bulk of it will be sent to their homes, and will not reach the people for whom it is intended.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the matter is allowed to stand, it can be brought up again in regular form.

Motion allowed to stand.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That on and after Monday next, the 5th of February, to the close of the session, government Orders will have precedence on Monday immediately after notices of motions for the production of papers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Postmaster General is anxious to be present when the debate with reference to the resolution I have on the order paper is continued. I understand that the Postmaster General will be unable to be here next Monday and he gave me to understand last night that he would arrange with the Prime Minister with reference to that debate.

Mr. BORDEN. The Postmaster General has not spoken to me on the subject; I presume the matter has escaped his attention. What was the exact nature of the arrangement?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Last evening the Postmaster General told the House that he was compelled to be away on Monday next. I interviewed him and he told me that he was anxious to have as extended a debate as possible on my resolution and that he would arrange with me for some other day when it could be taken up and disposed of.

Mr. LENNOX. The Postmaster General expressed a very strong desire to be present when the debate was resumed, and said that he would like to have it not on Monday next but at some other time.

Mr. BORDEN. That would not really affect this motion because this is designed

to take Monday next as a government day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection to the motion being adopted, but I would point out that if the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) is not taken up next Monday it cannot be taken up this session, unless by a special leave of the government.

Mr. BORDEN. That is quite correct.

Mr. MACDONALD. There are quite a number of motions not yet disposed of, some of which would not involve much discussion. On Wednesday, the last day available, hon members were not aware that Monday would be taken by the government so soon. I think the usual course of giving one day before these motions are cut off altogether would be the fair thing.

Mr. BORDEN. I have no desire to deny a reasonable opportunity of disposing of these motions and so I would move to amend my motion with the permission of the House to read as follows:

That on and after Monday the 12th of February, to the close of the session, government orders will have precedence on Mondays immediately after notices of motion for the production of papers.

Motion agreed to.

THE WRIT FOR SOUTH RENFREW.

On the orders of the day being called.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Has the writ yet been issued for South Renfrew?

Mr. BORDEN. It was issued yesterday. The nomination day is the 15th of February and the polling day therefore will be the 22nd of February.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) kindly see that returns which I moved for a considerable time ago, and to which I have referred once or twice already are brought down? One relates to the Harvey and Salisbury railway, which should take very little time to prepare and the other relates to the appointment of commissioners under the Boundary Waters treaty.

Mr. BORDEN. I was under the impression that the last mentioned return had been brought down. It may be that it is in my office and that through my own inadvertence it has not been presented to the House.

The other relates to the Department of Railways and Canals, and I shall bring it to the attention of the minister of that department.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. WHITE moved that the House go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the payment out of the consolidated Revenue Fund of such sums as may be sufficient to discharge the obligations of His Majesty the King, acting in respect of the Dominion of Canada, under the provisions of paragraph 5 of the schedule to chapter 24 of the statutes of 1904, in accordance with the interpretation of these provisions by the judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, on the appeal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company v. The King, from the Supreme Court of Canada, delivered November 2nd 1911.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this resolution I have furnished to each member of the House a copy of the judgment of the Supreme Court and of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I have also furnished to the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the papers for which he asked yesterday. In view of this it is probable that the House is acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, but, on account of the very large sum involved by way of obligation under the judgment, a brief explanation may not be out of order.

Under a contract dated the 29th day of July, 1903, between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, provision was made for the construction of the National Transcontinental line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean. That railway was to consist of two divisions, the eastern division and the western division. The eastern division was to extend from Moncton to the city of Winnipeg, and the western division from the city of Winnipeg to the Pacific coast. The government of Canada was to construct the eastern division and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was to construct the western division. The eastern division was to be owned by the government and to be leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company under the terms and provisions of the agreement. The western division was to be owned by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and the entire line was to be maintained, equipped and operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The 28th and 30th paragraphs of the contract of July 29, 1903, to which I have referred, were as follows:

28. For the purpose of aiding the company in the construction of the western division, the government shall guarantee payment of the principal and interest of an issue of bonds to be made by the company

for a principal amount equal to seventy-five per centum of the cost of construction of the said division, as defined and ascertained in accordance with the provisions of paragraph eighteen hereof, but such principal amount shall not in any case exceed thirteen thousand dollars per mile of the mileage of the prairie section, nor thirty thousand dollars per mile of the mileage of the mountain section, although seventy-five per centum of such construction may have exceeded the said respective sums per mile.

30. The said bonds shall bear interest at the rate of three per centum per annum, payable half yearly, and shall have attached thereto coupons representing the instalments of interest thereon, and shall be in such form as the government shall determine.

The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada were to guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for an amount sufficient to raise the balance of the money required for the construction of the line.

At the time this agreement was entered into, the 3 per cent stock of the Dominion of Canada stood at about par. Shortly afterwards there was a fall in that stock in common with other high class low interest-bearing securities, and as a result it was seen that the 3 per cent Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's bonds guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada would not nearly realize par. In order to meet that situation a supplementary agreement was entered into in the following year. Among other things it removed the limit as to the $30,000 a mile upon the mountain section, but allowed the $13,000 per mile as a maximum of bonds to be issued by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company on the prairie section to stand. And then comes the important section to which I direct your attention upon which litigation subsequently arose and these judgments were rendered.

5. Nothwithstanding anything the said contract contained the government may and shall, preserving always the proportions in the said contract provided as between the 'Prairie' and 'Mountain' sections of the western division implement for the purposes and subject otherwise to the provisions of the said contract its guarantee of the bonds of the said company to be issued for the cost of construction of the said western division in such manner as may be agreed upon so as to make the proceeds of the said bonds so to be guaranteed a sum equal to seventy-five per centum of the cost of construction of the western division ascertained as provided in the said contract, but not exceeding in respect of the Prairie section thirteen thousand dollars per mile.

In 1905 a trust mortgage was executed over the entire western division, securing the bond issue of £14,000,000 to be guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada. Differences of opinion arose between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as to the construction of the clause I have just read. On the part of the government it was contended that implementing the guarantee meant that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should issue its bonds guaranteed by the government to an amount which would realize by sale a total amount equal to $13,000 per mile on the prairie section and par for the amount of bonds required on the mountain section.

The Grand Trunk Railway Company, on the other hand, contended that the true meaning of implementing the guarantee was that the government of Canada should pay the difference between the net selling price of the three per cent bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, issued from time to time, and par; in other words that the government should be directly liable to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, for an amount sufficient to implement or make up the difference between the net selling price and par, and that there was no obligation on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to issue its bonds further than to the amount of $13,000 a mile, no matter what they realized. The government, as I have said, contended that their liability on this was secondary or as guarantor.

So there was a clear issue between the government, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, the difference being that the government contended that it would have merely to guarantee bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company sufficient to make up the difference between the net selling price of the bonds and par, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company on the other hand contended, that the government must be directly liable and responsible to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for an amount sufficient to make up the difference in cash.

A case was submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, and that Court held in favour of the contention of the government, namely that its liability was to guarantee bonds issued by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to an amount sufficient for the purpose of implementing. An appeal was taken to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and the Judicial Committee reversed the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada so that in the result the contention of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company prevailed, and the Dominion of Canada, under the terms of that judgment, have become responsible to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for a very large sum. I shall read the last portion of the head note of the judgment of the Privy Council.

Held, that the liability of the government under this agreement was not a secondary

liability as guarantors only, the primary liability falling on the company, but that the government were liable to make the bonds of the first issue up to their nominal value without recourse over against the company.

That is substantially the history of the transaction, and the effect of the judgment. As to the amount involved, which, as I have said, is very large, I have had a memorandum prepared, showing the position to date, and the estimated total liability under the terms of this judgment. The memorandum is as follows:

Memorandum respecting Privy Council decision, Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company v. The King.

Sales of Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's three per cents guaranteed by the government which have already taken place—

In 1905 £3,200,000 were sold at 92½ and produced.. .. ..$14,559,674 08

In 1909 £2,000,000 were sold at 80 and produced.. .. .. 7,773,495 15

In 1910 £2,000,000 were sold at about £80 13s. 9d., and produced. 7 856,119 67

The amounts here stated as being produced from the respective sales include interim interest accretions in London before the transfer of the funds to this country, and to that extent the net proceeds as above stated are too great.

The sum to be paid the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company by the government under the Privy Council judgment, in respect of these sales, will therefore be approximately $4,900,000.

On the basis of the estimated cost of construction of the mountain section made by the government chief engineer, there will yet have to be sold of these three per cent bonds approximately £5,515,220.

Assuming that when a sale of these bonds has to be made they bring the same price as the last lot sold, viz.: £80 13s. 9d. for each hundred pounds, there will be required to be paid in cash by the government in respect of such sale, to make the proceeds of the sale equal to par, the sum of $5,183,617.40.

On these estimates this will make a total cash contribution by the government of approximately $10,080,000, in order to make the proceeds of the government guaranteed bonds equal to par.

That is substantially the position as I understand it, and I, therefore, beg to move that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name.

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

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 95) respecting the National Transcontinental railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE GRAIN ACT.

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

On section 80—re-inspection,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Representations have been made for an amendment to subsection 2. It reads now:

Should any person interested in such grain have reason to believe that it has gone out of condition, or has deteriorated in quality since it was originally inspected, any inspector may, at his request, re-inspect such grain.

The representation is made that it sometime occurs that the grain is manifestly not of the grade which the certificate carries, and that there ought to be provision for review in a case of that kind, just as strong a reason in a case of that kind as there would be in its going out of condition, or in its being deteriorated in quality. It is proposed to insert after 'originally inspected,' the words:

Or is manifestly not of the grade called for by the certificate.

Then it would read:

Has gone out of condition, or has become deteriorated in quality, or is manifestly not of the grade called for by the certificate, he shall endorse across the face of the original certificate a statement of the facts, with the date and place where the re-inspection was made and shall attach his signature thereto; but under no circumstances shall such grain be mixed or re-graded.

Instances have been adduced where the grade of the grain, as it would be carried by the certificate, was found to be manifestly and afterwards proved to be altogether a different grade; and the contention is, and I think it is a fair one, that there ought to be a chance for re-inspection, and a statement of the facts; but no regrading.

Mr. OLIVER. What would be the consequences to the owner in such a case?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Just the same as in either of the other two cases. Then I suppose the inspector would inspect it and write across the certificate the condition as he found it. What he would write in a case of that kind would be that this was not up to the grade carried in the certificate, that fact would be written across it Then I suppose that what would take place would probably be an appeal to the Grain Survey Board. Any way, there would be a chance of presenting the facts, and of subsequent restitution or re-arrangement, just the same as in the other two cases.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a very important amendment, perhaps more important than it seems on the face of it, because it rather

opens the door to the re-inspection of grain, and therefore a recognition of grain which has been mixed. I am willing to concede that when there has been an actual exchange of grade there should be a notice of that fact, but it will be necessary to word very carefully a provision intended to meet that case. First of all, I would like to have it distinctly stated upon whose say-so the grain was manifestly of a different grade; somebody would have to take that definite responsibility.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). In the first place, it would follow exactly the conditions of the section as it now stands in which two cases are made exceptions. Should any person interested in such grain, we will suppose it is the person to whom the grain has been consigned, or the person who owns, or thinks he owns it, if he finds that it is out of condition he has a recourse under these circumstances, if he finds it has deteriorated in quality since the original inspection, he has a recourse. Now if, in these cases, it was found to be of another grade than that represented in the certificate, there ought to be some space left in some way for a presentation of the facts in the case. If my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) would like to keep this over, we will let it stand for the time being.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to see the wording of the amendment, because it is of the greatest importance that the provision should not go further than is necessary to meet the special case that is mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend will find the wording of the amendment in 'Hansard' to-morrow.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Would it not be somewhat of a check against mixing?

Mr. OLIVER. It depends a good deal on how it is worded.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It would be a check on any under grading or wrong grading.

On section 82: grain of same grade to be kept together; certificate for mixed cargo.

Mr. CARRICK. As a representative of the district in which the terminal elevators are situated, I would like to say a few words in connection with clause 82. The question of mixing grades has been a live issue both in the United States and Canada for the past twenty years. The United States have solved this question by allowing mixing in the terminal elevators. In Canada there seems to be an opinion that mixing is a crime. It is a misdemeanour, and a civil offence according to our law, but I want you to look at this, Mr. Chairman, as a simple business proposition, and it is from that standpoint that I purpose saying a few words with regard to it. The process of mixing, as I understand it, is simply raising up to a certain grade a class of wheat which, through climatic conditions, has suffered deterioration, by mixing with it another grade of wheat which has a superabundance over and above what the law requires of those qualities in which the first sample is deficient. I will give an illustration. We will take a car of wheat which is No. 1 Northern in every way, except with respect to Red Fife wheat. The law requires that there shall be sixty per cent of Red Fife wheat. If that car had only 55 per cent of red fife wheat it is graded as No. 2. We will take another car which has all the qualifications of No. 2 Northern, but has only forty per cent instead of forty-five per cent of Red Fife wheat, which, therefore, is graded No. 3. I will take these two cars and mix them. I fulfil the requirements of No. 2 grade; that is I raise up a No. 3 car to No. 2. The average spread in the price between the two grades is 5 cents per bushel. On 1,000 bushels I would make $50. At the present time there is a difference of about 7 cents between No. 2 and No. 3 Northern, so that in that case I would make a little more. But, take another instance. Take a car that is all Red Fife wheat, but has been frosted. It will not be graded as No. 1, but as No. 2. Then I can take seven other cars that are No. 2 in every respect, but have only got 40 per cent of Red Fife instead of 45. I will take these eight cars, mix them, and I will have what will pass inspection as No. 2 grade. Thus, by using one car I can raise the whole seven cars to No. 2 grade. Otherwise, the whole seven cars would, under our law, be graded as No. 3. There is a profit of 5 cents a bushel on 7,000 bushels, or $350.

We had an instance at Port Arthur the other day where a car of flax was shipped to Mr. Irwin of the Consolidated Elevator. That flax was one pound short in weight per bushel. It was shipped as No. 1. The owner thought that he would get No. 1 grade, but when it was inspected it was graded as rejected. There is a difference of 25 cents a bushel between No. 1 and rejected and he applied to the survey board in Winnipeg, but they maintained the inspection. He wired down to Mr. Irwin at the Consolidated Elevator to ship the flax to Duluth, because he could get practically the full difference in price between the two grades there or about 25 cents a bushel more, for the car. But the car had been unloaded. I maintain that there is a great economic loss to the farmers of Canada, because mixing is not allowed. I believe that there is between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000 a year lost to the

farmers of this country under the system which has hitherto prevailed, and will be lost under the proposal contained in the present Bill.

Mr. NEELY. Would my hon. friend not rather say that this is lost to the dealers and not to the farmers?

Mr. CARRICK. No, the farmer is the man who will get it. I am glad that question was asked, because it brings up another point in connection with mixing which I shall take up in a moment. Now, I would like to ask why was mixing prohibited? You will remember that under the old system the elevator man bought on his own account, and also stored the grain for the public. He took the fat grades of the public, mixed them with his own wheat and made for himself this extra profit. The farmers objected to it, and legislation was brought in, first, to prohibit the terminal elevator man from dealing in grain and, second, to prevent mixing. I wish to ask this question: Has this law been enforced or can it be enforced? I say that the law has not been enforced, and that it cannot be enforced. As the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), said yesterday in the House, under the system of interlocking directorates, the terminal elevator owners at the present time are directors of country elevators, and they are buying grain. I will just quote from page 18 of the report of the Select Committee on Bill Q before the Senate, Mr. Searle's testimony. With regard to the elevator at Port Arthur the question was asked:

How many Canadian companies do the Peavey people control?—A. Do you mean line railways?

Q. Yes.—A. They control the Port Arthur Elevator Company, the British American Elevator Company, the National Elevator Company.

According to a statement with regard to licensed elevators and warehouses, as made out by this government, the British American Elevator Company control 93 elevators —Manitoba 17; Saskatchewan 69; and Alberta 7. These same directors can, and do, buy grain at the present time. Therefore, I maintain that the law has not been enforced. Then the examination proceeds with regard to mixing. We have proof that mixing is going on and I will again read to the committee from page 126 of the Select Committee report on Bill Q. This is evidence in connection with a couple of cases that came up in Port Arthur and Fort William last year in regard to mixing. I shall quote from the testimony of Mr. C. B. Watts, secretary of the Dominion Millers' Association:

At the close of navigation in 1910 we find that Inspector Gibbs at Port Arthur reports to the warehouseman that he finds certain elevators there have shipped out large quantities of No. 1 Northern, and they are short quantities of No. 2 Northern. Now, I do not want to take up the time of the committee, but I must refer you to a short extract from Mr. Castle's report of this trial, which these gentlemen say was only a mistake, and it was immaterial, on the enormous quantity of grain handled. The fines imposed by the magistrates show it was not very trivial, as they were $2,500 in one case, and $3,000 in another. Mr. Castle, in his report, says: 'In the Port Arthur elevator the shipments exceeded the receipts of No. 2 Northern by 169,066 bushels. Of the Empire elevator he says the shipments of No. 1 Northern exceeded the receipts by 437,884 bushels.

It may be said that this is an isolated case in connection with mixing, but I would point out that the government inspectors were on the spot and that they gave an inspection certificate when the grain went in and when it came out. These cases we know of, but I am quite sure there were a great many more where mixing was done and where fines were not imposed. What is the use of putting a law on the statue-books if we cannot enforce it. The purport of this Bill should be to remove the incentive for wrongdoing and then the wrong will not be done. Under the present law the government allows mixing by compelling the elevator man to mix the fat and the lean shipments of any one grade. For instance, in No. 1 Northern you can mix anything that has got sixty per cent Red Fife wheat and up to seventy-five per cent Rred Fife and in No. 2 you can mix the different lean and fat grades of from forty-five to sixty per cent Red Fife. We therefore, allow mixing to-day with certain restrictions and I maintain it would be much better for the country if these restrictions were taken off. I do not wish to see the integrity of our grain destroyed. I do not wish to see our grades lowered and I do not believe they will be lowered by mixing because any shipment of grain that goes out will have to stand the government inspection. The men who get the benefit of the grades to-day are the millers and the European buyers. The miller does not want a sample market. He wants to buy on grades because he is getting a litlle more than he pays for and it is the same with the European buyer. Our samples of grades are sent over to the old country and the European buyer buys just on that sample, hoping no doubt that he is going to get a little more than he pays for. The purchaser in the European market buys on the minimum grade and on that point I cite the evidence given by Mr. E. R. Wyland, a large exporter, and which appears on page 160 of the report of the select committee:

The old country man does not buy your wheat on a 64 or 63 pounds to the bushel. He

buys it as 60 pounds to the bushel. That is No. 1 Northern. He buys it on the standard that Mr. Horn and Mr. Gibbs send to the old country market to represent No. 1 Northern. If they get wheat higher than that standard, we get no benefit from that. That is an absolute fact, and any gentleman who has been in the export business knows that the old country buyer will not pay any more for No 1 Northern wheat.

At page 168 of the same report we find this:

By hon. Mr. Lougheed:
Q. You have stated that the Liverpool price of wheat, or the Liverpool quotation is based on the minimum grade?—A. Yes.
Q. Not on the maximum?—A. Not on the maximum grade.

Let me ask why should the question of sentiment enter into the price. I do not know of any other business that is conducted on an economic basis where it is thought that sentiment must be taken into consideration in fixing the price of an article. The European buyer buys on the minimum of the grade and why should our farmers sell on the maximum of that grade? I believe in maintaining the integrity of the high stadards of our grain, but I find in the 'Weekly Report' issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce for January 29 last year, that the shipment of Canadian wheat alone through United States channels amounted to 33,806,535 bushels last year. That wheat goes through with our government certificate, but when it goes into the American elevator we lose absolute control of it. A few weeks ago a shipment of No. 2 Northern was rejected in the old country because there was a great deal of corn mixed with it, and everyone knows we do not grow any corn in Manitoba. We have no control over that grain when it goes through the United States elevators and yet a most important thing for the farmer of the west is to maintain the identity and integrity of Canadian grain. I want to see that our grain shall always maintain its present high standing, but we certainly cannot keep control of it when it passes through United States channels. I think I have shown that the terminal elevator interests are violating the law and do buy grain.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does the certificate have any existence when the wheat goes into a foreign country?

Mr. CARRICK. If it is shipped through in bond the Canadian certificate will remain with that wheat and it is sold in the old country on that certificate.

Mr. KNOWLES. No.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The hon. member (Mr. Carrick) is right.

Mr. CARRICK.

Mr. CARRICK. The minister says my statement is right in that regard. I think I have shown that mixing prevails to a greater or less extent and that mixing is allowed under the law in the different grades. Let me point out the farmer's attitude in regard to mixing. They had a convention at Brandon last week and the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of January 27 states that the following resolution was passed at that convention:

That this convention considers a sample market absolutely necessary to obtain for us the true value of the grain and that our executive be instructed to take the necessary steps to obtain such a market.

Mr. Kennedy, the vice-president of the Grain Growers' Association, said:

A sample market is a necessity and it is the only way we are going to get the real value of our grain. The grading system does not give the value of the grain at all. If the sample market is a success and works out the same that it has in Minneapolis we will get more for the grain. If you can get a better price for our products what further answer do you require?

This goes to show that the farmer is not entirely satisfied with the present situation. The farmers ask for a sample market, but I think I will be able to show that a sample market is useless unless we can have mixing. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said yesterday, if I understood him correctly, that the farmer now has a sample market.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto): I did not say that. We were talking of selling on a sample and selling on a sample market. What I said was that millions of bushels were sold on sample and not on certificate; that when certificates were granted they could be thrown away and the farmer could sell on the sample. But we have no sample market, of course.

Mr. CARRICK. I stand corrected, but I understood the attitude of some hon. gentlemen opposite to be that the farmer sold his grain on sample and not on grade I believe the farmer does not sell anything on sample. The track buyer, who is an expert, has his samples of all grades before him when he buys. A car of grain may be No. 1 in everything except perhaps colour, hardness, size or Red Fife, and may fall down a little in one of these qualifications. It is graded No. 2 by the buyer and the farmer is paid only for No. 2. He does not get any benefit whatever from the spreads, and we all know that there is a great difference in the value of the different grades. I have here a few quotations from the 'Grain Growers' Guide' of November 8, 1911, which show that No. 1 Northern wheat on a sample market sold on one day as low as $1.02 and as high as $1.06⅝, other

cars selling at $1.04, $1.05½ and $1.05¾. On the same day No. 2 sold at as low as 99 cents and as high as $1.04. I have also the quotations of the Minneapolis sample market of November 4, as printed in the 'Grain Growers' Guide' of November 8 showing that barley No. 4, sold as follows; one car, at $1.03, three at $1.13, one at $1.11 and one at $1.14. There was a difference of 11 cents for the same grade on the same day. I maintain that the only man who loses the value of these spreads is the farmer. Now who gets the benefit of the spreads? The millers and the European buyers. We allow the millers to blend wheat; why do we not allow the farmers and the elevator men to mix it? The miller can blend the different grades and sell the different brands of flour in the open market; but there is a restriction placed upon all other owners in regard to the mixing of grain I contnd to the detriment of the farmer. Now, the farmers have asked for a sample market, but a sample market is not workable unless mixing prevails. On this point I would like to quote from the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' of January 3, page 16. I understand that this is the great farmers' paper in the western country. This is an article by F. W. Eva, who is the chief grain inspector for the state of Minnesota, in which he says:

Should the Winnipeg market decide to make a sample market they certainly will have to permit the mixing of grain in elevators; the two go together. The intermingling or mixing of grain of different grades, resulting in improving of low grades to a higher grade, is considered by all grain men and handlers as legitimate a business as the improving or mixing of any article in any other line of business. The mixing of wheat does not injure the producer, but as a matter of fact, is a benefit, as is well known by all conversant with the grain business. It increases the number of buyers, creates competition and results in a premium above the price of the regular grade for the choice lots of cars in each grade. No prominent market in the United States is without these facilities.

If a sample market is to be established, there is only one place for it, that is, at the head of Canadian navigation. The modus operandi of the sample market at Minneapolis is this: About one hundred miles from that city samples are taken from the car and are sent by express to Minneapolis, and by the time the car arrives the grain is sold on these samples. We can do the same thing in the handling of our western grain. We can establish a sample market either at Port Arthur or Fort William.

Mr. NEELY. Which would the hon. member prefer?

Mr. CARRICK. I would rather not answer that question, as I represent both cities. Samples could be forwarded to the sample market by express, and the grain would arrive three or four days later. There would thus be an opportunity of disposing of the grain before its arrival, so that there would be no delay in its transportation. The solution I offer, then, for the situation is: first, that we should have a sample market at the head of navigation; second, that mixing be allowed; third, that we should have two systems of terminal elevators—public elevators operated by railways, with mixing prohibited, and private elevators to handle only their own grain, but to be allowed to mix. If the farmer wants to send his grain to the old country, he can store it in the public elevator, where there is no mixing, so that the grain keeps its integrity; while if he believes he will get a little more for it if it is mixed, he can send it or sell it to the private elevator.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Would you allow the grain which goes to the mixing elevator to be inspected and graded out?

Mr. CARRICK. Yes, that is my whole argument. The government have their inspectors there, and after the grain is mixed it must come up to the high standard demanded by this government. It is claimed now that the Manitoba grain brings more money than the American, and why should it not? What qualifications are required on the other side for No. 1 Northern? Take the requirements for the American No. 1 Northern. That grade requires only 50 per cent of hard wheat and a weight of 57 pounds to the bushel. What is our No. 1 Northern? Sixty per cent of Red Fife White and that it shall weigh 60 pounds to the bushel. We are entitled to receive a greater price because we have a higher grade of wheat.

Mr. KNOWLES. How about the grain we wish to send west via Vancouver and the Panama canal to Europe or via Vancouver to the Orient? Where will it be inspected?

Mr. CARRICK. I presume that by the time our grain is shipped west there will be a system of large elevators at the coast and I would advocate the same system at the coast as at Fort William and Port Arthur.

In regard to storage facilities, we all know that the elevator capacity of the Dominion of Canada to-day is inadequate, that we have congestion in all that western country. I have just received a letter from home stating that all of our Port Arthur elevators are filled, that the boats in the harbours are all filled except the 'Plummer' and the 'Pellatt,' and these hold about 50,000 each. My informant also advises me that 3,500 cars are already shipped and billed to Port Arthur for the ele-

vators there. Fort William is in practically the same condition. I maintain that if we have a sample market and you allow mixing, this great difficulty will be obviated and that in the course of the next year or two $10,000,000 will be invested in Port Arthur and Fort William in elevator capacity and storage. During the last year I have been in negotiation with some elevator men to have them increase their capacity at the head of the lake but they have been nervous in connection with the regulations and laws that were before the government. Now we require that storage. I maintain that the farmer is going to get the benefit in the advance in price because the question of competition enters into the calculation. While the farmer will get the greater part of the advantage to be derived from the sample market and mixing the elevator man also gets a part of it. A man must get a return on his money in order to make an investment. The great question before the House and before the country to-day is to relieve and alleviate the present situation in the west and I believe that if such a provision is inserted in this Bill it will do more to alleviate the present congested situation than anything else we can do. If I understand the question properly, and I have lived at Port Arthur for a number of years and have been around the elevators a great deal, I do not believe there is any grain shipping port in the world at all to be compared with Port Arthur and Fort William where there is not a sample market and where mixing is not allowed. The Americans have adopted legislation giving a sample market and allowing mixing.

I predict that it will be only a few years until this question is solved along the lines I have suggested. There is no other solution. It is a vital question to all western Canada, and the farmer is just awakening to the realization of it now. A short time ago they were strongly opposed to mixing and Mr. Kennedy, the vice president of the Grain Growers' Association in the 'Grain Growers' Guide' of December 27, says:

> If we ever get a sample market, it will only come through accommodation given to purchasers of grain on a sample market. That will induce men to come to our sample market where all get a square deal and special privilege to none. In order to make a sample market a success, the purchasers must have special binning privileges, and mixing privileges under proper supervision. Without such, a sample market is practically impossible.

This question has been given some consideration at the head of Canadian navigation, where the people are largely interested in the grain trade. I have no brief for any of our people up there, the only question in which I am interested is to keep the transportation of our grain in Canadian channels. Our people have not now the storage for grain they require, and there was a movement on foot before I left home, whereby they expect that five or ten million bushels of our grain might be shipped to Duluth. The great interest I have in this Bill is to keep the shipments of our grain in Canada, and I am sorry to say that the figures brought down by the Trade and Commerce department show that this year 33,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain went to the old country through American channels.

Mr. NEELY. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Carrick), says he is not endeavouring to present a brief but he is undoubtedly presenting a brief that appears to be not so much in the interest of those whom he quoted so frequently, the farmers of the west, as of the dealer in grain, who operates elevators throughout the different parts of the west and at the head of the lakes, at Fort William and Port Arthur. I think my hon. friend's arguments were rather contradictory if they are analysed closely. I recognize that mixing would have to be permitted if a sample market were to be successfully established, but under present conditions I do not see where the farmers would get any benefit from the establishment of a sample market, if the mixing is to be done in elevators that are owned and operated by men who control the interior elevator systems throughout the west.

Mr hon. friend quoted from the report of the Select Committee of the Senate on Bill Q from the evidence of Mr. Whalen, a member of the Fort William Board of Trade and a grain exporter, that so far as the present conditions in the European markets are concerned the producer of grain in the west, no matter what the quality of his grain may be, is paid only according to the minimum of the grade. My hon. friend himself gave the reason for this. He told us that the practice of mixing has been carried on notwithstanding the law that exists on our statute books against it. Consequently the European buyer, because of what has been done at Fort William and Port Arthur, finds it necessary to pay a price which does not depend on the quality of the samples that our inspector sends yearly to the European market, but on the quality of grain which the European buyer has been in the habit of getting from the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William.

So, if they do not pay anything above what the minimum of the grade calls for, it must be because of the practices which my hon. friend says have been going on all these years at the terminals. The buyer cannot depend on getting the same quality of grain as the inspector sends him from year to year, and consequently, he has to pay the price of the minimum of the

grade. That being so, I do not see where the farmer comes in. I do not see what would be the benefit under present conditions, of permitting wholesale mixing to gentlemen in the terminal. My hon. friend said that the farmer would get the benefit. I do not think he would. To-day the farmer in selling his grain, sells it to the Canadian dealer on the minimum of the grade. If he sold on a sample market under present conditions, with the monopoly which exists in the grain trade by the combine amongst the dealers, he would still sell his grain as it would be judged by his standard in case it were inspected. The dealer would benefit, and does benefit, by this mixing operation. If we had an ideal condition, if we had a sample market and mixing were done under proper supervision, and grain so mixed had to be sold, not under inspection, but on sample, I could conceive where the farmer would get some benefit. But my hon. friend contends that, after these gentlemen have been permitted the privilege of mixing in their mixing elevators at the terminals, then they should have the privilege of having that outgoing grain inspected by a government officer, and that low grade grain—'lean' grade, as my hon. friend called it—would be sold in the old country. Such a practice would still prevent the farmer from getting in the European market anything but the price paid for the minimum of the grade. But, if the sample market is established and mixing is permitted, my view is that that grain so mixed should not be inspected; it should be sold on the European market purely on sample, as it was bought. My hon. friend undertook to show that some of the farmers of the west, leaders of the grain growers, are in favour of a sample market. I touched upon that point yesterday in the discussion on another section. I have no doubt, many of our farmers are in favour of it. But, as to the gentleman my hon. friend named, and who has been quoted two or three times, Mr. Kennedy, if my information is correct, he is not vice-president of the Grain Growers' Association, of Manitoba, which is purely a farmers' organization, but holds the same office in the Grain Growers' company which is altogether a different proposition.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Do they not grow grain?

Mr. NEELY. They are very largely interested in the buying and selling of grain and are dealers the same as any other dealers. Their views on this question, I think, would hardly carry very much weight with the great body of the men who simply grow the grain and sell it at home.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do you mean to say that they resort to the same devices as other dealers?

Mr. NEELY. I am afraid business,—well——

Mr. OLIVER. Is business.

Mr. NEELY. Yes, I'm afraid that business is business with the Grain Growers' Grain Company as well as with any other business concern. My hon. friend (Mr. Carrick) tells us that the one reason he is anxious to have this privilege permitted of mixing under present conditions is to prevent our grain from going by any other than the Canadian route. Well, if we are going to allow this damage to be done to the standard of our grain, as is done at Fort William and Port Arthur, I do not think it would make very much difference to the farmer whether it goes by the American or the Canadian route. I do not take back a word of what I said yesterday of the necessity and the advisability of a sample market and mixing under proper conditions; but my hon. friend must understand what these conditions are. If evil practices have been carried on in years gone by at the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, the hon. gentleman ought to know—as, apparently, he reads the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' so carefully and assiduously—that the farmers have suggested a condition of things, which, if brought about, would make the sample market and the mixing of grain a possibility. That is if the mixing were done under government supervision in elevators operated by officials of the government, then the farmers feel that that would be a safeguard for them——

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mixed and afterwards graded?

Mr. NEELY. No, the grain passes inspection at the initial point of inspection. If it is mixed in the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, it has no right to inspection after that.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am not quite clear why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) wants the mixing done under government supervision if it is not to be graded afterwards.

Mr. NEELY. My hon. friend (Mr. Carrick) has pointed out that we can still have the same system of inspection even supposing mixing is allowed in certain elevators at the terminals, and that the grain so inspected would be kept by itself, shipped as a separate entity and would go with our grade certificate to the markets of the world.

Mr. CARRICK. What certificate?

Mr. NEELY. The certificate furnished by the government's inspector. Now, if

you have a sample market and if you permit mixing to be done at Fort William and Port Arthur, and then grade the grain out of the terminals, you are still going to have a vast amount of our grain going to the eastern and European markets at a low grade. The condition which my hon. friend says exists on the European markets to-day would continue to exist, notwithstanding that many of our farmers might still adhere to the old system and send to these markets a class of grain much higher than would come out of these mixing elevators. The grain that would come out of the mixing elevators, being sold on inspection certificate in the European markets, would degrade the reputation of every bushel of grain coming out of the railroad elevators to which my hon. friend refers, when that was sold on inspection certificate.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The question I asked was this: There is your mixing elevator alongside the government elevator, or the terminal which is under government supervision. If you are going to let them mix, and take the results of it without giving any grading, why do you need government supervision over them while they are mixing?

Mr. NEELY. As far as that is concerned, if the mixing were permitted by that method as long as the grain was not inspected out, I do not see that there would be any necessity for government supervision of those elevators. Now the hon. gentleman who preceded me has quoted the interest of the farmers. If he takes the position that the farmers of the west take, as to the method of proof, I can see no objection to his argument. But I say that under present conditions it is not the farmer who would get any benefit from throwing open the door to the mixer, it is purely and solely the man who deals in grain.

Mr. CARRICK. My hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely), seems to think that if there is mixing we are going to deteriorate the standard of our grain. I understand that the grade is set by our government inspectors, and they mix up to that grade, or else the grade does not grade in that class. The standard is established by our government inspector and they mix up to that standard. Our standard now is much higher than it is on the American side. The hon. gentleman says he does not see how the farmer is going to get any benefit from the sample market. Why, the whole advantage in this matter, as in any other business, is competition.

Mr. NEELY. Does my hon. friend mean to say that if no mixing had been carried on in the past, or were permitted, and if our grain going to the European market had always been above the minimum, that we would not get a premium on that grain?

Mr. CARRICK. I have answered the hon. gentleman by the evidence taken before the Select Committee by a man who has made a life study of the situation, and he claims that the grain bought on the European market is all bought on the minimum grade. Yet my hon. friend claims there has been some mixing in the Port Arthur elevators.

Mr. NEELY. I take the hon. gentleman's authority.

Mr. CARRICK. The authority I took was Mr. E. R. Weyland, the exporter, and I gave previously the page of the Select Committe's report. I maintain that if there is mixing the farmer gets the benefit of the competitive price. Look at the different prices in the same grade on the Minneapolis market, and on the same day, where there is a difference of 4 or 5 cents, and as high as 11 cents a bushel. We would have the same competition on our own side of the line. Then referring to the damage which it is claimed has been caused to wheat shipped to the old country, I have said that there were about 437,000 bushels of one grade that was raised, and about 200,000 bushels of another grade. Now, last year we shipped out of Port Arthur and out of Fort William 100,000,000 bushels of grain altogether; and even if those few hundred thousand bushels were mixed, it would not affect the price in the European market to more than an infinitessimal degree. I repeat that the great solution of this question will be the sample market, and inspection afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am glad to hear the lucid remarks of my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Carrick), I have not the least doubt that the question of a sample market will again come up in the course of the discussion over this Bill. Meanwhile, would it not be well to get on with the Bill?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am a little mixed on this question myself. I do not quite understand this selling wheat by a sample market that was not afterwards graded. It is one thing to sell wheat by grade, and another thing to sell it on the sample market. I understand that what the farmers want is a sample market in Winnipeg or elsewhere, so that they can get out of their wheat all there is in it for milling purposes, and not take the minimum grade; that is, if it is a poor Northern, to get a No. 3. I want to repeat what I said yesterday; on that point the Minister of Trade and Commerce and I do not agree. I claim that there is very little wheat sold from the west by sample, and I challenge anybody to deny it. 95 per cent, of it is sold by grade, at least. The only way they

sell grain by sample, is when the miller comes up there and buys the grade of wheat by sample, and that wheat goes through to his mill. That is the only wheat sold in the northwest on the sample market.

On section 89: inspectors to establish standards not later than first day of October in each year,

Mr. NEELY. Has the minister taken note of the objection I raised to section 33 with regard to the dates?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, in clause 33 it reads the 7th of October and in this clause it reads the 1st of October. This is for the western inspection division and the other is not. I do not think it makes a pin's difference whether it is the first or the seventh, but it might be just as well to make this the same as the other —the 7th of October—so that there would be no apparent inconsistency.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think it should be the first in every case.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is not later than the 7th of October, so that it could not be done after that in any year.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Section 33 does not apply to any special district.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Section 33 is a general section, it will cover everything provided for by section 89 and this is only a duplicate. I fail to see that subsection 3 means anything, because if they are bound to provide samples they will provide samples of cargoes as well as anything else. It looks to me as if it were a duplication by some error. Otherwise it is something that has crept in and has no right to be there at all, because section 33 is certainly general enough to cover everything.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I propose to strike out the words in section 89 'establish standards for' and substitute the words 'select samples of.' As to the first day of October, I do not know that it makes any particular difference whether it is the 1st or the 7th.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) raises the question as to the necessity for this section at all.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There are some parts which are necessary and it will not do any harm.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Would it not be exactly the same as the other, and if so, why have the two?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). You will find certain things in the western division the same as in the eastern.

Mr. OLIVER. I would suggest that the time be made October 1 in section 33.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Very well, I move the reconsideration of section 33.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I move that the word 'seven' be deleted and the word 'first' be put in its place.

Section 33 as amended, agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to subsection 3 of section 89, I would ask the minister if he sees any particular purpose in it?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not see any purpose in it or otherwise. It is exactly the same as the old Act:

Inspectors shall also supply cargo samples when required.

There must have been some reason why it was put there. I would not like to strike it out unless I knew. It will not hurt anything, but I will make a note of it, and if afterwards we want to make an Act which is clear of all surplusage and it is not necessary, we will strike it out.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Subsection 4 of section 89 reads:

For all samples so furnished the inspector shall make such charge as is approved by the board.

What does that mean?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They will have to pay for their samples.

Mr. OLIVER. I will take the opportunity of making the same objection to this subsection as to some of the others, that the fees are insignificant and burdensome without being valuable.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will take it as a general notice that my hon. friend objects to all those with fees in?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I make an exception in the case of weighing fees; but fees that are collected simply for the issue of a certificate or some other clerical transaction, are vexatious without being valuable.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is a fair objection.

Section 89 as amended, agreed to.

On sections 90 and 91,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There have been some far reaching amendments suggested to sections 90 and 91 about which

I wish to consult my officers before making up my mind. I would ask that the sections stand.

On section 96,

Mr. NEELY. What action is the board to take when at these annual weighouts it is found there is an overage or a shortage. The practice is, that the inspecting officer gives direction that the grain shall be cleaned, say three per cent for dirt, but if the cleaners take out two and a half per cent then at the annual weighout there will be an overage. Under present conditions, the elevator man might sell the fifty or sixty thousand bushels that are over. There is no provision for that, but we will assume it is possible to do it. There is a provision in the Bill which gives the Governor in Council, when the necessary money has been voted by parliament, power to take over these elevators and operate them, and there being clauses in the Act which prevent the board, from buying or selling or handling grain, how in such a case would the overage be disposed of?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Provision is made that the stock shall be taken in August each year. Heretofore I suppose the benefit of the overage has gone to the elevators. The stock taking provision makes it possible for the government to know what grain is over and it therefore lays the foundation for whatever action may be taken. What action will be taken requires more consideration than we have been able to give it so far. If the government owns all the terminal elevators and operates them, if there are overages the government would be that much in.

Mr. NEELY. Then you would have to change the terms of the Bill because there is no provision in it by which the government or the board could buy or sell grain.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Before we get through this Bill finally I expect to find that the government is going to operate these terminal elevators. If they are not I would like to know what penalty there is attached to clause 3 which says that no grain shall be transferred from one bin to another in a terminal elevator without the supervision of the inspecting officer, and we know that that practice has been going on. The only thing that will prevent that and make that clause operative will be for the government to operate these terminal elevators. A man interested in the grain should have no advantage in changing it from one bin to another.

Mr. CASH. Is it a fact that in stock-taking the grain is not weighed, but is merely estimated?

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, it is not a matter of estimating. The grain is weighed.

Mr. OLIVER. The matter of overages is one that calls for some solution. The fact that there are large overages has been demonstrated, and a Bill will be very lame in an important principle if it fails to deal with that question.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The Bill, I suppose, is strong enough in two ways—definiteness of the clauses which forbid certain things being done or order certain things to be done; also possibly in the penalties. But there is broad ground and long ground between the Act and the penalty where evidence is necessary to prove a case before action can be taken. Some people say that the Angel Gabriel himself would not be able to detect mixing in an elevator. I do not know how true that is, but the department has found difficulty in proving the actual commission of these offences. But some solution must be found for that, and before the Bill is put into the shape of an Act we shall have some solution to offer.

Mr. OLIVER. What the hon. member for Humboldt referred to was not overages in grades but actual overages in quantities, which is a simpler matter.

On section 97—certificate to accompany grain,

Mr. NEELY. This clause, I think, should be given some consideration. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Carrick) to-day gave us some statistics of the quantities of our western grain carried via American routes, and I think he is correct in saying that once that grain crosses the American border we have absolutely no supervision over it and no means for maintaining the identity of the grain. Evidence was given before the Select Committee of the Senate on Bill (Q) by a gentleman connected with one of the leading elevator interests operating the terminals at Fort William, to the effect that all that the American government do is to bond the wheat by quantity and not by grade. They give no guarantee to preserve the indentity of the grain. I would like to know what remedy the minister proposes in this Bill for that. I do not think there is any doubt that the reputation of our grain standards has been lowered very greatly in days gone by in the European markets owing to the grain that has reached those markets by the American routes. Samples of our grain have been on exhibition in the Liverpool markets containing corn and other things that we do not grow. There is absolutely no method under present conditions by which we can prevent this. I understand that the

practice has been to sell this wheat on the Canadian certificate, and it has no doubt tended to damage the reputation of our western wheat in the European markets.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Under the old Act a certificate is to accompany the grain to its destination; but when the grain gets outside of Canada, there may be an arrangement by which the certificate follows the grain or goes to the ultimate buyer, possibly in the old country. But we have no power over the handling of the grain, except by mere courtesy, from the time it leaves our country and while it passes through a foreign country on its way to the ultimate port of shipment. The suggestion has been made that the Canadian certificate should be confined to Canadian jurisdiction, and not carry any force outside of that so that the shipper of Canadian grain through foreign territory would get no benefit from the certificate, because it would be void when it left our territory so far as carrying the guarantee of the Canadian government control and supervision was concerned. The foreign buyer would then know that if his grain came with government inspection through Canadian channels he would be getting the actual grain of the grade shown by the certificate, and he would also know that if the grain went through a foreign country, he would have to take the risk himself from the time it left Canadian territory, and the Canadian certificate would suffer no damage.

Mr. CASH. This is a serious question, and one that we should decide now. I applied to the office of the minister in regard to this very matter and received a reply that we have no jurisdiction. The letter says in part:

> As soon as the grain reaches Buffalo, or any other port in the United States, we have no supervision over it whatever. The customs simply require that the shipper export the same number of bushels that he put in.
>
> The customs are expected to keep it under seal while passing through the elevators and through the cars in New York, and again there until it reaches the vessel.
>
> However, you now have some idea of what elevator men can do, and if they are working in conjunction with a crooked shipper, there is no doubt mixing could be done either at Buffalo or New York.

I wrote to the Collector of Customs at Duluth and received this reply:

> In answer to your letter of the 27th instant relative to the handling of Canadian grain in bond for exportation to Great Britain, you are informed that the grain arrives at this port under Canadian and United States customs seals. The grain is transferred under the supervision of Canadian and United States officers to bonded bins, which are sealed by the Canadian and United States officers, and by these transferred to vessels or cars for export.
>
> In other words, the identical grain received is exported as Canadian grain.
>
> There is no Canadian grain ground into flour at this port.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> N. A. LINDENBERG,
>
> Special deputy collector.

This is a very serious matter. The minister and his officers tell me that we have no jurisdiction over the matter, this official at Duluth tells me that these bins are taken care of by both American and Canadian officials. I understand that a great deal of wheat bonded in the United States is milled in Minneapolis and passed through to England as Canadian flour ground in the United States. I think it is necessary that Canadians should be informed as to whether our grain is exported, made into flour, and so exported in bond. If we cannot have an officer to look after the grain passing from this country through the United States in bond we are doing a very wrong thing to allow it to go in bond at all. If we are going to sell wheat to the United States let us sell it, but if it is not taken care of in passing through that country in bond let us not ship in bond.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I suppose the shipping matter is entirely in the hands of the shipper. If he wants to ship in bond you cannot prevent him.

Mr. CASH. It should not go through as Canadian grain; if our grain is to be mixed there in bond or mixed in milling it should not have a Canadian certificate with it. On the question of the certificate, when the Canadian government places its seal on any thing, its fiat, whether on a piece of paper or of gold and says this is so and so, it is very jealous that that certificate should be preserved in its entirety, and in its integrity. When it puts its seal on a bushel of wheat and says this is No. 1, it should be just as careful about that seal. The government's word is behind it and the government should protect it whether it goes through the United States or anywhere else. If you are going to send it through the United States, then take up your certificate. If it can be handled at certain ports, where we have Canadian officers to assist the American officers, that is very different.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We have an officer at Duluth and I imagine that under the arrangement of the Customs the identical wheat which goes out of Fort William or the Canadian west to Duluth, is shipped out from Duluth, but after it leaves Duluth, it may go to Portland, Boston or New York and we do not follow it there. It may be possible to make an arrangement with the United States Cus-

toms officials by which our officers at the different transfer ports, should, in connection with the Customs officers of the United States at these same ports, effect the carriage of the identical lot as far as the place of shipment on the Atlantic vessel. If we can do that at Duluth, it might be carried out still farther.

Mr. NEELY. It would appear to be very difficult to do anything with respect to the grain that goes by the American route, except to cancel the certificate when the grain crosses the border. This clause applies to grain going by any route. Canadian as well as American. Would the minister tell us what method and what supervision is employed to enforce this provision with respect to grain going by the Canadian route? As an illustration: Supposing a shipper is sending out from Fort William we will say 10,000 bushels or ten cars of No. 1 and 10 cars of No. 2. He gets his certificate for 10,000 bushels of No. 1, and 10,000 bushels of No. 2. The certificate may be for 1,000 bushels each. What is to prevent that shipper from shipping we will say 8,000 bushels of his No. 1 down to Quebec or west St. John, or any Canadian port, and a couple of thousand bushels of No. 2, so that the wheat, if mixed, will still grade up to No. 1, putting that into the hold of a vessel, mixing it at west St. John, or wherever he loads it and sending along his 10,000 bushels No. 1 certificates? Then he can take the balance of his No. 2, the 8,000 bushels, send it along as No. 2, and the remaining 2,000 bushels of No. 1 he can sell on a sample market. This is an important point. It appears to me, that while there may be something in the statements that in the past mixing has been done to some extent in the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, ever since I have given any consideration to this question I have been of the opinion that a great deal of the mixing has been done after the grain has left the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur. I would take a case in point, and this is a condition of affairs that our law ought to provide for under the system of inspection and supervision. I met on the train a wholesale baker who buys flour in large quantities and who does business in Ontario as well as in Winnipeg. He told me that a certain miller in this province, under contract to supply him with so many thousand pounds of flour to be made from No. 2 Northern wheat, supplied a flour away below what flour from a No. 2 wheat should be. So he undertook to make an investigation. He went to the miller who was still working on his order, and when he looked at the sample of wheat being used to fill his order, he said it was not better than a No. 4. He said: What do you mean by grinding that wheat to fill my order?

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

The miller went to a drawer and produced a No. 2 certificate saying: There is the certificate for that wheat and this is the wheat I got out of terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, as a No. 2 wheat. Those terminals were blamed for that situation. I am satisfied that the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur were not to blame in that instance or in many others. That miller had probably some time previously had a shipment of No. 2 Northern, he had retained the certificate and he simply used that certificate to mislead this purchaser of his flour.

What is there in this legislation to meet a situation of that kind? I do not see that we have any protection. If we have any protection, I would like to know what it is, because I think that in many cases it is not applied.

Mr. CARRICK. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) is not familiar with the working of the elevators at the head of the lakes, or he would not have spoken of small shipments of eight or ten thousand bushels going out.

Mr. NEELY. I was using that for illustration.

Mr. CARRICK. The grain when it comes into the elevator is put into large tanks, each grade by itself. It is sent out in large shipments. And this Bill specifically provides that if there is a cargo shipped out containing different grades, that fact shall be specified in that cargo.

Mr. NEELY. But you ship a lot by rail, in car lots, and that is what I am speaking about.

Mr. CARRICK. The government inspector is there, and he gives a certificate, not only when it comes in but when it goes out, so that there can be no chance of doing what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. NEELY. The hon. gentleman confirms what I say—that the grain is inspected out and the shipper is given a certificate——

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The hon. gentleman is speaking of car shipments.

Mr. NEELY. Yes. It is shipped by rail to St. John or any other Atlantic port. And I do not know of anything in our present legislation or in the proposed Bill to prevent these certificates being used for an illegitimate purpose in the manner I have suggested.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). What time elapses between the date of the sale of the grain and the date of the issue of the certificate? One could not use a certificate two years old.

Mr. NEELY. No, but he could use one a couple of months old, and, in the case

of a shipment to the European market, the shipment would be of recent date. If the shipper were shipping so much No. 1 and so much No. 2, the date of the certificate would not have any effect upon the case; all would be of recent date. So far as I know we have not been following our Canadian shipments and we have not seen to it hitherto that the certificate and the wheat that go together to the old country market belong to each other.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I should like to continue the discussion, but I am going to ask the committee to let it go over to another day. I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Neely) will find his fears are a little ahead of the facts of the case, and that there is much more efficient supervision and check than he has led us to suppose. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again for the purpose of introducing an amendment to the present Grain Act of which I have already spoken, with the hope that the House will allow me without objection to put the amendment through without delay.

Progress reported.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I mentioned the other day the case to which I wish to refer, and ask members on both sides to keep it in mind. The present Grain Act, section 99b. says:

> The commissioner shall have power in his discretion to order cars to be supplied, contrary to the provisions of the Act, to elevators that are in danger of collapse, or in cases where the operator of any country elevator reports in writing under oath that some portion of the grain in his elevator or warehouse is heated, and that in order to preserve the same it is necessary to ship such heated grain to the terminal elevator for treatment: provided, however, that no relief shall be granted in such last mentioned cases as long as the warehouseman has plenty of room in his building for the rehandling of such grain.

The condition of things at the present time, as I stated is very onerous and may be productive of great loss unless the conditions be met as rapidly and effectively as possible. I am going to ask the House, if no one objects, to allow me to introduce an amendment to that section of the Act and to put it through its different stages, to this effect: That after the word 'collapse' in the third line, there be inserted 'all places where grain is damp and liable to become damp, or for the purpose of distributing seed grain to any point in the western division.' In these cases the warehouseman shall have the same option and discretion as is given him in the other two cases. All the representatives of the different interests, including the railways, are favourable to this being done. And I might say that the Board of Railway Commissioners have also recommended it. I move that the rules relating to this matter be suspended and that leave be given to introduce this Bill.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 96) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second times, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. OLIVER. As I heard the provision read, it seems to be quite satisfactory. But it is a very important deviation from the main principle of the Bill, and unless there is special urgency for seeing it through today, I would ask the minister to give us until Monday to consider it.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Monday is private members day. But we might report the Bill, it will be printed, and hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity to discuss it at a later stage.

Bill reported.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

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

> 1. Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, advance and pay to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, hereinafter called the corporation, in addition to the moneys, if any, heretofore authorized to be advanced to the corporation by the Governor in Council by any Act, and which have not at the date of the passing of any Act founded upon these resolutions been so advanced, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of six million dollars, as are required:—
>
> (a) to pay off and retire debentures of the corporation of the par value of six hundred thousand dollars, maturing at the rate of two hundred dollars per annum in each of the years, 1913, 1914 and 1915, and,
>
> (b) to enable the corporation to complete the construction of the terminal facilities of the port of Montreal, for which the plans, specifications and estimates have been approved by the Governor in Council, and to construct such additional terminal facilities as are necessary to properly equip the said port, and in respect of which plans, specifications and estimates have, previous to advances being made, been approved by the Governor in Council;
>
> 2. That during the period of construction of the terminal facilities mentioned in these resolutions, the interest payable on the debentures receivable by the Minister of Finance in exchange for such advances, shall be deemed to be money required to complete and

to be part of the cost of construction thereof, and such interest may be paid out of the said sum of six million dollars.

3. That the corporation shall upon any advances being made deposit with the Minister of Finance debentures of the corporation equal in par value to the advance so made, repayable within twenty-five years from the date of issue, and bearing interest payable half yearly, at the rate of three and one half per centum per annum.

4. That the principal and interest of any sums advanced under any Act founded on these resolutions shall be payable, subject to the second of these resolutions, out of the revenue of the corporation mentioned in section 8 of chapter 10 of the statutes of 1896, (first session), and shall be a charge thereon as if the sums so advanced had been borrowed by the corporation under said chapter 10.

He said: I may inform the House that this resolution has been submitted to His Royal Highness the Governor General and he has been pleased to give his assent. In the copy of the resolution that appears on the orders of the day it is clear that there is an omission in clause (a). The resolution will be found, however, on page 317 of the Votes and Proceedings. But even there I find there is one word omitted. In subsection (a) the word 'thousand' is omitted, because it reads: 'at the rate of two hundred dollars per annum', where it should read: 'at the rate of two hundred thousand dollars per annum'. The object of the Bill to be founded on this resolution is to enable the government to advance a further sum of $6,000,000 to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners for the purpose of developing that port. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that in 1910 plans were prepared by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal or under their direction, after they had consulted with harbour experts, not only in Canada, but in other parts of the world, and the plans prepared were approved by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for work on that harbour which contemplated a total expenditure of $18,000,000. That work was to be performed in 12 years and provided for:

1. New high level quays, (having an aggregate frontage of 16,800,000 feet) so arranged as to give 24 new ocean berths for vessels of from 600 to 800 feet.

2. The creation of a new level quay for the accommodation of the rapidly growing river business, 5,800 feet.

3. Will afford a combined area of new high and low level wharf space and extension equal to 74 acres.

4. Will provide new permanent shed accommodation with a floor area of 1,386,000 square feet.

5. Will create new grain storage capacity of 4,000,000 bushels and increase grain handling capacity of the port five-fold.

6. Will add additional railway accommodation on the quays equal to 22 miles of track.

By Act of Parliament 9-10 Edward VII, chapter 40, the first section of $6,000,000 was voted, and has been employed in the development scheme, so as to make the harbour fit for the great work which it has to do in connection with the export and import business of Canada. It will be necessary, if that work is to be continued according to the original scheme, for this parliament to vote a further sum of money to be used by the commissioners, under exactly the same terms as the money that is voted under the old Act, and subject, as provided by the old Act, to orders in council being passed from time to time placing the funds at the disposal of the Harbour Commissioners, and approving the plans which the Harbour Commissioners have for the development of the port. The first $6,000,000 has been very largely expended. As a matter of fact, the whole of it, with the exception I think of about $286,000, has been authorized to be spent by order in council. A portion of it has not yet been expended, but before the season terminates the whole amount will have been, and unless a further sum is placed at the disposal of the government to enable it to advance from time to time to the Harbour Commissioners further moneys, the work cannot proceed as it was intended by the original scheme that it should proceed until the work of development according to the original plan is completed. No doubt by the time that plan is completed, if the country continues to develop and trade continues to grow as it is doing now, a further expenditure will have to be made in order to keep the port of Montreal up to the requirements of the trade of the country. I may say for the information of the House that these sums that are advanced from time to time to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners are not by way of subsidy, not by way of gift, but by way of loan, and the Harbour Commissioners will pay from time to time, as they have done in the past, interest on the sums that have been so advanced, so that there is no loss to the country whatever; the country has been and will be paid back by the Harbour Commissioners the amount of interest which Canada has to pay on the sums which are so advanced. The Harbour Commissioners firmly believe that with the increased growth and development of business which is likely to take place, they will be able to continue to pay back to the government, as they have done in the past, the interest on the larger sums that will be advanced under this Bill, and under the provisions of future Bills which

may have to be brought before the House in years to come. Now with the $6,000,000 that it is proposed to authorize the government to advance by this Bill it is contemplated to make the following expenditures:

1. During the next three years they intend to pay off $600,000 of debentures, that is to say $200,000 this year, $200,000 in 1913 and $200,000 in 1914.

2. They propose a further extension of elevator No. 2, adding 1,500,000 bushels capacity, at a cost of $550,000.

3. Rebuilding Victoria pier and Market basin, for river business, $640,000.

4. Sheds and equipment Victoria pier, $1,000,000.

5. Construction of high level wharfs, eastward of Market basin to section 30, $350,000.

6. The diversion and alteration of the lower end of the Mackay pier and works required to lessen the St. Mary's current, $400,000.

7. The lengthening of the present pier, $500,000.

8. Provision for the permanent paving of the wharfs and railway extension, $500,000.

9. General improvement and plant, $500,000.

10. Tarte pier, permanent sheds, $250,000.

11. New wharfs, $300,000.

12. Commencement of construction of new pier No. 1, up above Alexandra pier, extension of Bickerdike pier, with lift bridge connections, $710,000.

These moneys are to be advanced from time to time by the government to the commissioners. The commissioners, from time to time, may request the government for an advance, their plans and specifications will be carefully examined by the engineers of the department, and after an order in council is passed approving of the plans and work the commission may be doing, and of their proposed expenditure, the moneys will be advanced for the purpose of carrying on this work. The development of the port of Montreal has gone on very rapidly indeed, during the last few years, as is shown by the income and expenditure in that time, and it may not, perhaps, in this connection, be altogether a waste of time if I should give some of the figures regarding that to the House. I may say in the first place that the port of Montreal to-day has debentures outstanding, but held by the government, to the amount of $14,060,000. As the government from time to time make advances to the Harbour Commissioners they give to the government a debenture for the amount so advanced payable with interest, and these debentures held by the government to-day amount to $14,060,000. In addition to that there are harbour debentures held by other parties amounting to $1,872,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What is the rate of interest to be paid on the new debentures that are now proposed to be issued? I think the rate of interest paid on the $9,000,000 of the present loan is 3 per cent. The average rate of interest that the government is paying for money is 3½ per cent; so that we are contributing something to the harbour of Montreal in the way of interest. My question is: What rate of interest is now proposed to be charged by the government for the loan that is being made?

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

BARCELONA TRAMWAY LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 36), respecting Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

On section 1,

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Why is this clause stricken out?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand that simply affects the change in the name and that should be done on motion after the third reading .

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I do not think this parliament should, without very good cause, amend or extend the powers of a company which secures its charter under the Companies Act, or from a provincial legislature. I know such legislation as this has been granted in the past, but there seems to be very little good reason for it. Such powers as these may be given by means of amending the Companies Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand the company is incorporated under the Dominion Companies Act, and as they want to build railways, they cannot get that power under the Companies Act, and so they come for this legislation. In the country where they intend to operate they are hampered in their efforts to get a charter by reason of what is called a cloud on the title of the original charter.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). They should come to parliament and get a new charter including in it the power to build railways in other countries. It is a very awkward thing to have the powers of a company separated. One naturally would look to find their powers under the Companies Act, and would never think of looking in the Statutes of Canada to find an extension

of their powers there and a change of name.

Mr. MACDONALD. The object here is to change the name of the company by special legislation and therefore it should be incorporated in the Bill. If the motion were to change the name of the Bill that would come up by motion after the third reading.

Mr. CURRIE. The Railway Committee discussed this Bill for over two hours and I did not see either of these gentlemen present.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I should have said that the company did set out to change its title, but the Railway Committee has not agreed, and that is why the first clause was struck out, so that my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) is right in saying that the motion would be to change the title of the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is another thing.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) if there is anything in the Bill that says members of the Railway Committee must attend the meetings of that committee.

Mr. CURRIE. No, but it is rather a hardship after a Bill has been discussed in the Railway Committee to waste time discussing it here.

Mr. MACDONALD. We will reserve our right to anything we want here.

On section 8,

Mr. NESBITT. I took exception to this clause in the Railway Committee. The directors and not the company are allowed to vary the conditions of the share warrant and I wanted to have that authority in the company. I submit my objection now so that the company may deal with it as they see fit.

Mr. CURRIE. I understood they were to change that in the committee.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think that is a matter more for the directors than for the shareholders, because the only purpose in giving the company power to issue warrants is to make it easy to circulate and dispose of the securities of the company in foreign markets, and I think it would be very awkard for the company if that were left to the shareholders.

Mr. NESBITT. While the directors might vary the warrants in accordance with the interests of the shareholders, they might vary them in accordance with their own interests. That was the exception taken in the Railway Committee.

Mr. CURRIE. I think the promoters of the Bill agreed to accept an amendment

providing that the company could, by by-law, vary the warrants. A holder of a share warrant is a stockholder but not a voter, and a contingency might arise in connection with the business of the company requiring some important matter to be put through at a special meeting at which it would be necessary for him to be present and vote. If his share warrant could be transferred into stock, he could be present and vote at that meeting. If you give the directors power to make regulations as to how that transfer shall be made, they might make a regulation whereby nobody could have his share warrant transferred till five or six months after the meeting took place, like closing the books of the company and preventing the stock being transferred. For that reason when a person buys the stock he should know what the provisions of the by-laws are in regard to these share warrants. Therefore, I supported the amendment of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), providing that that matter should be under the control of the shareholders.

Mr. NESBITT. As the promoter of the Bill is not here, I would not care to move the amendment in the absence of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Under rule 112 an important amendment cannot be moved unless one day's notice of the same has been given.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not feel like consenting to the Bill standing unless the hon. gentlemen feel that this is a matter of serious importance.

Mr. CURRIE. As this company is applying for a renewal of its charter, the fees for the Bill are based on the amount of its capital stock, and I would like to ask, if the amount of the capital stock is not shown on the face of the Bill, can the company get off with paying the ordinary fees. Might it not be necessary to mention the total capital stock of the company in the Bill in order that it should be liable for the proper fee ?

Mr. NESBITT. I would like to see the Bill stand. It is rather unsatisfactory as it is.

Mr. CURRIE. I understand this company is chartered for $40,000,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. I think the Minister of Railways should be there to give his opinion on these matters, and the Bill should remain in committee until he is here.

Mr. CURRIE. I would suggest that we let the Bill pass the committee with the understanding that the statement shall be made on the third reading that the fees are paid on the total capital stock.

Bill reported.

Mr. MEIGHEN moved the Third Reading of the Bill.

Mr. NESBITT. Is not this the Bill that was not to be read the third time?

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the Bill be read the third time? At the next sitting of the House?

Mr. MEIGHEN. So far as I know, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why this Bill should be treated differently from the others. The title is supposed to be changed on the third reading. And, as I understand, the statement is to be made when the Bill is read the third time, that the fees are to be paid on the total capital stock of the company.

Mr. SPEAKER. In my judgment, that could not be done here. The Clerk of the Committee sees to the fees before it goes to the Committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understood that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) simply wished to have it stated, so that it should be before the clerk. I do not know that it has any effect.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

Mr. MEIGHEN moved that the Bill do now pass and that the title be changed to: 'An Act respecting the Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.'

Motion agreed to and Bill passed.

ONTARIO AND OTTAWA RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 50) respecting the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company—Mr. Currie.

On the preamble,

Mr. CURRIE. Notice was given in the Railway Committee of an amendment to this Bill. It seems that the Canadian Northern Railway Company are desirous of purchasing the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company. Both railway companies had power to sell or amalgamate one with the other. They proceeded with the purchase, but after proceeding a certain length they found that eight bonds for small amounts could not be located, and so the Brockville and Westport had to be placed in the hands of a receiver and a judicial sale made so as to make a perfect sale. They therefore ask to have the following clause added to this Bill as they have not sufficient time to go on with a new Bill. It is urgent that the railway should be taken over by the Canadian Northern at once, in order to make improvements to the road this summer. The amendment of which notice has been given is as follows:

Subject to the provisions of sections 361, 362 and 363 of the Railway Act the company, and the purchaser under judicial sale of the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern railway, may respectively enter into an agreement with each other for the selling to and the purchase by the company of the whole of the railway and undertaking of the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company as included in such judicial sale.

Notice of that amendment has been given and I would ask the committee to be kind enough to insert it in the Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am instructed that the requisite notice has not been given, that is to say it came this morning, and I would suggest to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie), that the Bill, at this stage, be allowed to stand, and the notice stand to come up at the next meeting of the committee.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman means that the ordinary notice did not arrive by mail this morning?

Mr. MEIGHEN. It did arrive this morning; but a day's notice is necessary.

Mr. CURRIE. The notice was given in the Railway Committee and the amendment was read there. I understand that, under the rule, that is a sufficient notice.

Mr. NESBITT. Notice has to be given here so that it may appear on the order paper in the usual way.

Mr. CURRIE. I may be absent when the Bill comes up on Monday. I do not know that the committee can bind its members, but if any objection is to be taken, I should like to have personal notice of it so that I may be here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Notice should be handed to the clerk.

Mr. CURRIE. The notice came to my house. I have been ill and could not attend to the matter.

Mr. NESBITT. As I understand the amendment, it provides that the railway company and the purchaser may enter into an agreement for purchase and sale. But what right have we to say that the purchaser may enter into this bargain. We have the right to say that the company which is under our jurisdiction may buy, but, as I understand it, we have not right to say that the other party shall sell.

On the Order for the third reading:—

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is one amendment in this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. It was reported without any amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It was read in the committee with the amendment. The

words 'authorized by' in the third line of section 2, are changed to 'mentioned in'. That was read by the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. I heard him.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was that amended in the Railway Committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then it was not amended here?

Order allowed to stand.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Kootenay and Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Coderre.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Guilbault.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Ames.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Northern Territorial Railway Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Bank of Saskatchewan.—Mr. Knowles.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia, Limited.—Mr. Buchanan.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMMISSIONERS.

House resumed consideration of proposed resolution for a loan to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. HAZEN. When you were about to leave the Chair at six o'clock the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) asked what rate of interest would be paid on advances to the Harbour Commissioners. I would call attention to section 6 of the printed Bill, which provides that:

> The corporation shall, upon any advances being made, deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General debentures of the corporation equal in par value to the advance so made, which debentures the corporation is hereby authorized to issue; and such debentures so issued shall be of such amounts as the Minister of Finance and Receiver General may determine, and shall bear date from the day when such advance is made, and shall be repayable in 25 years from the date of their issue, and in the meantime shall bear interest at the rate of three and a half per cent per annum, such interest to be payable half yearly on the 1st day of July and on the 1st day of January each year.

I might further say to my hon. friend that there was a similar provision in the Act that was passed a few years ago under which, during these few years, the Harbour Commission of Montreal have been carrying on the work of development.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the minister inform the House as to how much interest is overdue by the Harbour Commission?

Mr. HAZEN. My information is that there is no interest overdue, that the interest of the debentures of the Montreal harbour are promptly paid.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The reason I asked the question was that a few days ago the following question was placed on the order paper and put to the government:

> Is there any accrued interest overdue? If so, how much?

The answer was:

> Interest due the Dominion on the 1st January, 1912, not yet paid, $218,430 99. The cammission stated that all interest due the public up to the 5th January instant has been paid.

That is the reason I asked this question, because it appeared that there was over $200,000 overdue and unpaid.

Mr. HAZEN. I think that says accrued and not paid, and of course there might be interest accrued and yet not be overdue. If I understand the matter, the interest is paid; there was practically a settlement of accounts as between the government and the harbour commissioners and there is no interest due.

Mr. SINCLAIR. But the question was:

> How much interest is accrued and overdue?

While the answer gave this amount it did not specify that it was accrued at all. There seems to have been an error in the answer and I would be glad to have it put right.

Mr. HAZEN. I will take much pleasure in looking into the matter and getting any further information I can, but I am advised that there is no interest due at the present time and that the statement may be due to the fact that there is to be an adjustment of accounts which will probably wipe out any balance of interest apparently due.

I have a statement here showing the receipts and disbursements on revenue account for the last twenty years in connection with the harbour of Montreal. It is as follows:

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements on Revenue Account.

Year.	Receipts.	Disbursements.
1891..	$263,965 95	$202,737 35
1892..	291,430 24	231,925 74
1893..	318,936 98	232,300 92
1894..	274,556 56	251,328 40
1895..	275,453 75	227,912 57
1896..	261,840 13	232,351 62
1897..	257,654 70	294,518 36
1898..	302,511 06	247,922 12
1899..	296,774 41	243,997 36
1900..	287,069 18	250,249 19
1901..	270,411 17	305,207 32
1902..	327,236 07	308,103 55
1903..	416,032 68	399,702 81
1904..	330,659 22	408,100 24
1905..	377,492 41	415,821 77
1906..	388,183 53	454,689 35
1907..	498,661 12	497,837 86
1908..	530,062 29	651,093 13
1909..	687,772 16	686,710 73
1910..	836,115 17	756,352 56
	$7,492,818 78	$7,298,862 95

It will be seen that in 1910 the receipts of the harbour were nearly four times as much as they were twenty years ago, and that there has been a very substantial increase during the last four or five years, the increase from 1909 to 1910 being nearly $150,000. The disbursements, of course, on revenue account have increased in almost equal degree. In respect to this large increase in the disbursements the commissioners have been able to go on carrying out the work that has been entrusted to them for the development of the port, to pay the interest to the country on the sums of money that have been advanced not only during the past few years, but in previous years, amounting to nearly $15,000,000, and in addition to that to pay the interest on over a million dollars of debentures which are held by the public outside of and apart from the debentures which are held to-day in the treasury of the Dominion.

The interest charges, of course, have largely increased as the work has been proceeded with. I have here the following statement:—

1900, interest paid..	$164,134 18
1901 "	176,030 53
1902 "	191,116 39
1903 "	221,950 71
1904 "	255,012 58
1905 "	294,764 12
1906 "	283,721 14
1907 "	336,277 86
1908 "	386,131 16
1909 "	411,538 78
1910 "	445,813 63
1911, estimated..	505,000 00
	$3,671,491 08

It is the belief of the commissioners, a belief in which the government shares, that as the port is developed and with the tremendous increase in the business that is going on, the revenues of the harbour will be sufficient in the future, as they have been in the past, to pay the interest on these sums of money that the country is advancing for the development of this great national port. The policy of the commissioners and the policy of the government is that the dues of the port shall be as light as possible and what the commissioners are striving at, and aiming to do is to collect only enough money in the port for the purpose of paying the cost of its maintenance and interest on the sums of money that are being advanced from time to time.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is there a sinking fund?

Mr. HAZEN. I do not think there is a sinking fund. It is claimed by the commissioners that the charges upon shipping at the port of Montreal are light in comparison with what they are at many other ports. No tonnage dues are exacted from the steamers that come to that port. Practically the only dues which the steamers pay are the sick mariners and pilotage dues such as would be paid by steamers at any other ports. There is no tonnage tax for the use of the port or the wharfs further than the revenues from the rental of sheds or the wharfage on goods that pass over the wharfs or through the sheds or the revenues from the grain elevators and the railway alongside of the dock. It is claimed by the commissioners that in the course of time the facilities provided at the port of Montreal will be equal to the facilities that are provided at any shipping port in the world and that they are now far in advance of what they were a few years ago, while at the same time the dues are being so arranged as not to be an undue exaction upon the shipping of the port or upon the trade of the country that is done through that port. As far as I can gather from conversations with people from Montreal with whom I come in contact, from the reports which are submitted to the department over which I preside and from other sources of information, I believe that the work is proceeding along lines which are approved of by the people of Montreal and would be approved of, were they generally known, by the general business community of this country, who are just as much interested as the people of Montreal in the development of a great national harbour there. I do not think for a moment that the money which is being spent on the harbour of Montreal can fairly be regarded as a local expenditure. It is true it is of very great advantage to the harbour and it is naturally of great advantage to the community, but at

the same time it is of still greater or, at all events, just as much advantage, to the country which lies behind and of which the port of Montreal is the great entrepot in the summer season. This work, I think will have to continue possibly for many years to come. it certainly will have to go on, and the port will have to continue to be developed if the business of the country increases as it has done in the past and when the $18,000,000 have been expended according to the original plan worked out by the Harbour Commissioners, I believe that whoever are charged with the administration of the government at that time will find that even with that expenditure they have scarcely been able to keep pace with the great growth and development of the country and further sums will have to be spent in order that that growth and development may be assisted through having a throughly equipped and up to date port in the summer season through which commerce can pass in and out of the country. It might not perhaps be uninteresting to the House if I read a few extracts from the report which the Harbour Commissioners submitted to me on the 27th of November last.

Montreal, November 27, 1911.

Hon. J. D. Hazen, K.C., M.P.,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—In submitting for your consideration the financial requirements for the coming few years, the commissioners take the liberty of placing before you a concise statement explanatory of the improvement scheme for the development of the port of Montreal, of which the proposed expenditures form a part.

The commissioners assumed their responsibilities on the 2nd January, 1907, and almost the whole of that year was devoted to a careful investigation into the needs of a national port with special reference to the development of the port of Montreal. During the summer of 1907, one of the best known English dock engineers was invited to study the particular conditions prevailing in the port of Montreal and spent several months in watching actual conditions during the busy part of the navigation season. The information thus collected was later embodied in a report in which a complete development scheme was laid down.

In January, 1908, the commissioners decided to send their president and chief engineer to Europe to study the most modern port development in Great Britain and the continent. Four months were devoted to this work, and a report and recommendation were made to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the 1st of May, 1908.

The chief engineer of the commission was instructed to draw up a development scheme to be submitted to the commissioners and the whole of 1908 was occupied in working out the broad lines for the port's development.

The commissioners at the end of 1908 had before them two complete suggested schemes of port development, the one drawn up by the English expert; the other designed by Mr. F. W. Cowie, the commissioners' chief engineer. These two were carefully studied and it was determined to submit both these schemes to a board of Canadian engineers. This was done in April, 1909, and in October of the same year a complete and unanious port development scheme was recommended to the commissioners by this board of Canadian engineers, and the opening of 1910 saw its approval and adoption by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the work was immediately put in hand.

The entire scheme contemplates the expenditure of $18,000,000 in 12 years.

This afternoon I explained to the House what it was intended to provide with the expenditure of $18,000,000, what had been provided with the expenditure of $6,000,000, which has not all been expended yet, but the authority for the expenditure of which is given by the different orders in council, and, what it is proposed to do in the second stage with the expenditure of this six million dollars which the House is now being asked to authorize. It is to be hoped that that expenditure will go on in the future as satisfactorily as it has gone on in the past. I believe the people of Canada view the expenditure on the harbour of Montreal from the broad national standpoint, as I believe they will view expenditure upon other ports in this country which are necessary, both in the summer and winter season, for the development of the trade of Canada, and for the purpose of enabling the vast and ever increasing products of the west to be carried to the markets of the world. I know that the people of Canada will deal with these other ports, when their representatives in parliament are asked to do so, as generously as they have dealt with the port of Montreal. I beg to move the resolution, Sir, which stands in my name.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on the resolution.

Mr. HAZEN. I beg to move to add the word 'thousand' after the word 'hundred' in the second line, so as to correct a clerical error. It reads now 'two hundred dollars a year and it should read 'two hundred thousand dollars.'

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. HAZEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 97) to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—IMPERIAL NATURALIZATION.

Mr. MONK moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, on this motion I desire to direct

the attention of the government, and of the House generally to a matter which I think is of the very greatest importance, and to which I had occasion to refer at an earlier period in the session, when I had the honour of moving for all the papers in regard to imperial naturalization, and the communications that passed between the home government and this government with reference to the passing of a measure which would enable persons who are naturalized in Canada to become in truth and verity citizens of the British Empire, as under the existing laws they are not. As a result of the motion I then made, a return has been brought down, which I have before me, and which shows that following upon the proceedings of the Imperial Conference, which were discussed on the occasion of that motion, the imperial authorities prepared, to be sent to each of the self-governing colonies, a draft Bill dealing with this question; and they desire to receive from each of these colonies its approval of the measure in order that it may be passed by the imperial parliament, and that legislation of a subsidiary character may also be passed in the various colonies in order to remove the difficulty. That Bill was sent to this government during the past summer. The home government apparently acted very promptly after the action of the Imperial Conference in proceeding with the draft measure. In brief, that measure provides for a complete change in the naturalization laws of the empire. It purports in its first clause to define natural-born British subjects. The language used in the beginning of that section is as follows:

The following persons shall be deemed to be naturalized British subjects.

It then goes on to define those born within His Majesty's allegiance, and certain other classes of persons who are said to be naturalized British subjects. I think this must be a mistake in the Bill for natural-born British subjects. The second section provides for the Secretary of State granting a certificate of naturalization to an alien who makes an application for the purpose, and satisfies the Secretary of State that he has resided for a period of five years in His Majesty's dominions, or has been in the service of the Crown for not less than five years within the last eight years before the application. The use of the phrase 'His Majesty's dominions' makes this a wider provision than that of the present law, which requires that residence must have been within the United Kingdom. The second requirement is that the applicant is of good character and has adequate knowledge of the English language. There are certain other provisions in that section which are not particularly apropos to this discussion. Then, the certificate of naturalization is not to take effect until the applicant has taken the oath of allegiance. This is an outline of the principles on which it is proposed that the naturalization may be granted—five years residence in any of His Majesty's dominions or five years in the service of the Crown, not necessarily within those dominions; that the applicant should be of good character and have an adequate knowledge of the English language, and that the oath of allegiance should be taken. If that section were passed by the imperial parliament—though it seems to me there might be some improvement in the drafting—it would be open to any person who had resided in Canada for that period to make application to the British Secretary of State for imperial naturalization. There is a provision later on which enables each one of the colonial governments to grant a certificate. But before coming to that I would take the sections in their order. A most material one, which applies to the certificate granted by any of the governments, is worthy of consideration. It provides:

A person to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted by a Secretary of State, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, and be subject to all obligations, duties and liabilities to which a natural-born British subject is entitled and, as from the date of his naturalization, have to all intents and purposes the status of a natural-born British subject.

That section is a new one and is very wide in its effect. It practically creates the Imperial naturalization of aliens. There are other provisions with reference to peculiar cases, such as the Secretary of State granting a certificate in the case of doubt as to naturalization, or where a person has previously obtained a certificate of naturalization, power is given to the Secretary of State to grant a new one having a wider effect. Then, section 7 gives power to the Colonies as follows:

The government of any British possession shall have the same power to grant a certificate of naturalization as the Secretary of State has under this Act, and the provisions of this Act as to the grant and revocation of such a certificate shall apply accordingly, with the substitution of the government of the possession for the Secretary of State, and the possession for the United Kingdom, and also, in a possession where any language is recognized as on an equality with the English language, with the substitution of that language for the English language.

I hope that the government, in looking into this Act, will give special attention to this clause, which is a vital one so far as this colony is concerned, and there ought to be no doubt about the colony's right which is intended to be created. The

right which is supposed to be conferred upon each one of the colonial governments is one which cannot be exercised until certain things are done:

This section shall not take effect in any of the dominions specified in the first schedule to this Act unless the legislature of that dominion adopt the section.

Then there is this general clause which also makes wide and clear the power of the colonial governments:

Any certificate of naturalization granted under this section shall have the same effect as a certificate of naturalization granted by the Secretary of State under this Act in all parts of His Majesty's dominions other than a dominion as defined by this Act, the legislature of which has not adopted this section.

The right of the colonial legislatures or parliaments to deal with the question of the exclusion of aliens or British subjects is preserved under this proposed Act in the following clause:

Nothing in this Act shall take away or abridge any power vested in or exerciseable by the legislature or government of any British possession or prevent any such legislature or government from treating differently different classes of British subjects.

That would, of course, reserve the right to Canada to discriminate against Hindus or any other class of British subjects if this colonial parliament desire to do so. Then there is the validity of statutes that may be passed by the parliaments—I notice the word 'legislature' is used by the drafter at home which is not the apt word either here or in Australia, although I suppose the word may be used in some other colonies. This section says:

All laws, statutes and ordinances made by the legislature of a British possession for imparting to any person any of the privileges of naturalization to be enjoyed by him within the limits of that possession shall within those limits have the authority of law, but subject to be confirmed or disallowed by His Majesty.

That preserves to the parliament of Canada, of which we are speaking more particularly now, the right to continue the naturalization of aliens by the granting of a limited certificate which would not be of as full effect as those which were granted under the Imperial laws. We grant certificates of naturalization in Canada on three years residence; the right to continue to do that would be preserved by this Act, but two years more of residence would be necessary as supplementary in order to entitle them to the wider certificate.

This Act, which was drafted by home authorities, was the product of the proceedings of the Imperial Conference and the understanding arrived at in a general way by representatives of the self-governing dominions there with the Colonial Secretary who made an attempt to prepare a Bill that would be satisfactory to all the self-governing colonies as well as to the home authorities. This Bill has been submitted to all the colonies and has been approved of by the government of South Africa, as appears by letter of Mr. Harcourt, dated November 18, 1911, in which he communicates to the Governor General the fact that he had received a telegram from the Governor General of the Union of South Africa, on the subject of the Draft Imperial British Nationality and Status of Aliens Bill, and asking that the Canadian ministers should forward their views on the Draft Bill at an early date. The telegram from South Africa is as follows:

November 2, 1911.

Your despatch 14th July, naturalization Bill, ministers state that objections raised by government of union South Africa in this matter are fairly met by the new draft and they have no alterations to propose.—Gladstone.

The result is that the matter is now before the government for consideration here and it is desirable that at as early a date as possible the government should take steps to deal with the question and be prepared to advise the home authorities as to whether the provisions of this Bill are satisfactory or not or what alterations or amendments they would suggest.

Time, I think, is an object in regard to this matter. The discussion upon this question has gone on in an academic way for something like the last ten years. I do not pretend to say that there is a very strong public opinion upon the question in Canada for the reason that I do not believe that very many people in Canada appreciate just the status which is occupied by a naturalized alien in this country. The tremendous immigration of the last 16 years, the influx of Americans to the west and the number of men who have come from all parts of the globe has been so great that here and there you see that the attention of people who think about these matters has been directed to the situation and the demand for a remedy. I have noticed, as many other members have, the communication which has been placed upon our desks, entitled: 'The Man Without a Country,' in which a magazine article written by Mr. Roden Kingsmill in the 'Busy Man's Magazine' portrays the ridiculous position in which the naturalized Canadian citizen stands to-day. For instance, the Berlin 'News-Record', quoting from Mr. Kingsmill, tells us the difference between the passports that are given to naturalized aliens in Canada who

go abroad and to those who are British subjects by birth. I do not know whether the passport is in the language stated by this newspaper, but I have no reason to doubt its accuracy. The statement is that:

> When a naturalized citizen applies for a passport his papers read as follows:—
> This certificate is granted with the qualification that the said John Smith is only entitled, beyond the limits of the Dominion of Canada, as a matter of courtesy, to the general good offices and assistance of His Majesty's representatives abroad.

This, of course, is no protection at all, and does not enable any one who has come under the advantages of citizenship in this country if he gets in difficulties in travelling anywhere to obtain relief from the representatives of the empire in the slightest degree. I may say that this article in the 'Busy Man's Magazine,' on which this newspaper review is based, tells of a case in which application was made for some relief in Paris, and where the greatest difficulty was experienced in obtaining recognition on account of the fact that the person applying was only a naturalized British citizen under our Canadian laws. On the other hand the passport issued to a native-born citizen is as follows:

> It is requested in the name of His Britannic Majesty, of all those whom it may concern to allow John Smith, a British subject travelling in foreign parts, to pass freely, and to afford every assistance and protection of which he may stand in need.

The situation that exists in this matter is one that demands a remedy. I am sure that if all the hon. gentlemen in the House fully realized the anomalous position of our law in regard to this matter they would be anxious that the most prompt action should be taken in regard to it and that the anomaly should be removed. I would commend to hon. gentlemen who have not read this little statement entitled, 'The Man without a country,' the facts that are contained in it because in a very illuminative way the situation that exists in regard to citizens coming into this country and obtaining the benefit of naturalization under our laws, is set forth.

To-day the man who comes to Canada and resides for three years goes before a justice of the peace, makes an affidavit to this effect and takes the oath of allegiance. He gets a certificate ultimately from a judge of a court that he has become a British citizen. No doubt hundreds of men who do become naturalized think they become British citizens, I have seen lots of them who thought so. All that we do as the result of that naturalization is to give these men the right to vote and to a certain extent they are citizens of Canada. The statement is made that there are in this parliament hon. gentlemen who are not British subjects in the imperial sense by reason of the fact that they have only become naturalized in the limited Canadian way. Certainly in the western legislatures there are numbers of men who are in that position. It may be that it is only a difference in name, but I apprehend that this is not the important consideration. We talk a great deal in this country, and very rightly too it seems to me, about the desirability of drawing closer the ties that bind the empire together, and it is a case which demands and receives the sympathy and support of every lover of Canada and of the empire. But, if in this the greatest Dominion of all, with people who come from other lands occupying all the positions that are open to them here, we continue a situation under which such men, after a residence here of five or six or even ten years cannot call themselves British subjects, and are not entitled to the protection of the flag or of the empire abroad, we will have a very great departure from that true and proper imperialism which ought to be the very basis of the tie which would bind the whole empire together. I need not elaborate on that.

Mr. BRODER. Would the hon. member allow them to get all these rights on residence of three years in Canada?

Mr. MACDONALD. The proposal is not to give them these rights on account of three years', but five years' residence in Canada, and after taking the oath of allegiance. That has been the difficulty in the past—that men could go to England, and, after five years' residence, could be naturalized and become citizens of the empire, but if they came to Canada, no matter how long they might live here, could never become citizens of the empire. It is to remove that anomaly that this legislation is proposed. My idea was to impress upon the government the importance and necessity of dealing with the question at an early date to submit to the home authorities as speedily as possible their views with regard to the Bill, so, that if possible we might have legislation from the Imperial parliament before its session is brought to a close. I have no doubt that every other self-governing colony is moving in the matter, and the communications will be made to the home authorities. I trust the government will deal with it early, so that there may be no delay in the settlement of what seems to me a very important question.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The question is a very important question as my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) has stated. It has been agitated now for about twelve years and has not yet been brought to a conclusion sat-

isfactory to us or to any part of the empire. All the time the discussion has been going on, there has been a very strong desire, not only in Great Britain but in the dominions across the seas, for the advantages of imperial citizenship. The very fact that, under these circumstances the matter has been so long under discussion, without a satisfactory conclusion being reached, indicates the existence of important difficulties in the matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) says there are important difficulties.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). They are pretty well cleared now.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We are very diverse not only in our geographical distribution but in the conditions which underlie nationalities in different parts of the world belonging to the British Empire. But the matter is in a more forward position than it has ever been before. There is a deeper sense of the necessity for some arrangement being come to that shall be adequate to the status of the empire as it at present exists and to the great component parts of the empire outside of the home country. The despatches from which my hon friend has quoted are before the government, and I may tell my hon. friend that a Committee of the Privy Council is now studying the question with a view to sending an answer to the home authorities at the very earliest possible moment.

Mr. MONK. I should like to say, in reference to the pronouncement by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald)—which I had not expected this evening—that according to my recollection of the discussion that took place in the conference of 1910, the contention of the colonies was in favour a very short time pending the naturalization which would give the party the benefits of the measure now submitted to us by the British government. I think the contention of the dependencies that it was absolutely necessary to make the time short, based upon the fact that persons came to settle definitely in the colonies was well founded. I think that what we have now before us is an evidence of the desire of the British government to meet the great want that has been discussed during all these years, the necessity for a naturalization which should be recognized throughout the whole British Empire. But it requires to be carefully examined; for I am afraid that people who have been naturalized under the colonial laws will not readily take the additional proceedings which, I understand from my hon. friend's explanation, would be necessary to give the larger rights of citizenship of the empire. A man who has settled in Canada is eager to see the three years expire that he may get his certificate. But once he gets it, it would be very difficult to move him to take the other proceedings necessary to the wider citizenship. He will not do it unless obliged to. That is why, at the conference of 1910, it was so strongly contended that we should all agree upon a fixed time for adoption everywhere, so that one proceeding only should be necessary. Take the case of Canadians who go to the United States and take out papers there. They very often come back to Canada; and, though there are proceedings by which they may resume the quality of British subjects, unless absolutely obliged, they neglect to do so. So, in this new proposal, I think you will find that not readily will the man who has become naturalized take the necessary proceedings to obtain British citizenship throughout the empire. I think that is worth considering, and also to consider whether, in view of the discussion at that conference, it would not be possible to further urge the British government to recognize a shorter term than five years. In the meantime, we can certainly avail ourselves of this step in the right direction.

Mr. MACDONALD. With the permission of the House, I will say a word with regard to the points raised by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). The time stipulated by the colonies varied from nothing at all in New Zealand, up to five years in the mother country. And the New Zealand people were very strong in their desire to obtain that right to give a status as a citizen of the empire to the person coming into their colony, though they required no term of residence, but only some certificate as to character. While there is some force in what the minister (Mr. Monk) says about people taking new proceedings for a second certificate, that does not affect the proposal made here, that you create the machinery under which those who desire to get the rights may obtain them. No machinery exists to-day; and unless you have the machinery provided in some such way as is set forth in this Bill, there is no way by which a newcomer to a colony can acquire status as a citizen of the British Empire.

Mr. OLIVER. While it is very desirable from our point of view that we should have, under all circumstances, the full privileges of British citizenship, there is a difficulty in putting into a form of words that which will give a right to every person to secure the same privileges, and at the same time preserve to us within the Dominion of Canada the right to control of our own citizenship within our own borders. In this draft Bill section 8 makes provision, first, that every legislature or government shall have the right to treat

different classes of British subjects differently, and that all statutes and ordinances passed by the legislature in regard to citizenship shall have effect of law unless disallowed by His Majesty. These two provisions cover the point that I have in my mind. But I would suggest to the government, in considering this matter, that the points involved in the two parts of that section should be kept very clearly in mind, and considered to be quite as essential as the securing of the full privileges of British citizenship to people who have become naturalized Canadians.

Mr. CARVELL. I fully realize the objection pointed out by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). Perhaps he has forgotten the fact that the naturalization which we are granting at the present time satisfies all the necessities of perhaps ninety-five per cent of the people who come to this country, and become naturalized. It is only in rare instances that a foreigner coming to this country and getting naturalized wishes to leave Canada, and it seems to me that if the provisions found in this draft Bill were carried out we would have machinery by which the one man who wishes to travel abroad can do so under the full rights of a British subject. I had an illustration within the last three months where a gentleman came to me who originally belonged to Armenia. He wanted to get home and he wanted a certificate of some kind, he called it a passport, and I had to advise him that his naturalization in Canada was of no value whatever excepting as a matter of courtesy. There is a case where, if the law as proposed in the draft Bill were the law of Canada as well as of the empire, that man could have taken advantage of the machinery, and could have qualified himself to receive a certificate. In Canada we have many hundreds of thousands of foreigners coming in and they want to get naturalized as soon as they can under the law and obtain the right of citizenship. Therefore. it seems to me rather a hardship to these people, as well as a disadvantage to the country, if the time is extended to five years instead of three as at present. But if this law were passed they could become citizens of Canada within three years, and if it became necessary, or to their advantage later on, to take advantage of the rest of the machinery, they could do so and thus become citizens of the empire, which really is the object of this legislation. I think if the Minister of Public Work will consider that phase of it he will see that there is not as much difficulty in working it out as he thought at the beginning.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am pleased indeed that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has brought up this question. I have taken considerable interest in it for a number of years. As far back as 1900 when representing the Toronto Board of Trade before the Chambers of Commerce of the empire, I presented a resolution asking for the unification of the naturalization laws of the empire. That resolution was endorsed by all the representatives assembled. There is no doubt that a great anomaly exists in Canada at the present time with regard to the naturalization of aliens. We are taking away to-day a complete citizenship from all those who come to our country, and we are handing out to them an incomplete citizenship. They lose their naturalization, at least the advantage of their naturalization, the moment they are three miles off our coast, and their naturalization is of no avail in any foreign country except by courtesy of the mother country. What is wanted, in my judgment, is a common system of naturalization for the whole empire, and whether those conditions exist in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa or Great Britain, they ought to have the same effect throughout the British Empire. For instance, a German may come to Canada and be naturalized under our laws, and live here 15 or 20 years, become a member of this House and have all the rights of citizenship in the empire; but when he goes to Great Britain, to Australia or New Zealand, he is a German, or a Frenchman, or whatever he was when he first came here; he does not belong to the British Empire under the present arrangement. That is a serious anomaly, and it is a great reflection I think upon the empire that this has not been put right long years ago. The hon. member for Pictou I think has shown us the necessity of it, and I believe that if this draft Act that he has submitted is adopted throughout the empire, it will be a great advantage to many of our citizens. I quite disagree with the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) when he says that this only affects probably one per cent of our population; I think it will affect at least ten per cent. Many American citizens know that we are taking away from them at the present time complete citizenship in the United States, and are handing them a citizenship that is no good beyond our own Dominion. Only recently I saw a gentleman from Toronto who pointed this out to me. He said he had been in Russia, and he found his passport was little or no good; and he said, to use his own words: This is an outrage upon aliens who are coming to our country. They believe they are really naturalized citizens, and when they go abroad they find that they have no status at all as citizens of the empire. A naturalization law, whatever it may be, should be uniform throughout the empire, and whether the term is three

or five years, once those terms are complied with in any part of the empire, the citizenship that he receives should be just as good in one part of the empire as another. That can only be accomplished by adopting some uniform naturalization law that is good throughout the empire. I think there will be some trouble in some of the words that the member for Pictou drew our attention to, that is, 'an adequate knowledge of English'. Now we know that 'adequate' is used quite frequently, and an adequate knowledge of English might mean in the minds of some a very different thing from what it means in the minds of others. There might be difficulty there, but that is a matter of little moment as compared with the difference between a good and real citizenship and a sham citizenship, as we are at present handing out. In the city from which I come we have about 2,000 of a population to whom this is an important and necessary requisite. Many of them are Armenians; we have about 12 or 15 nationalities in the city of Brantford, many of whom want to visit their homeland from time to time. Only recently I had two or three cases before me in which I had a great deal of difficulty to get them the necessary passports to travel with safety to their own native shores.

It is well known that some countries of Europe to-day do not acknowledge this passport that we give them and the protection that is afforded to those citizens, and which they believe to be something valid, is of no use when they get there. They are liable to be held by those countries and their wives have been known to have been held there for years after their husbands have become citizens of Canada. They cannot get their families together until they can go over to Europe and prove to the satisfaction of the country in which their families are residing that they are now British subjects and entitled to the full rights of British citizenship. I trust that this matter will be pushed, and pushed rapidly, because I beleive it is one that is becoming an important factor in Canadian national life and it is one of serious consideration for the whole British Empire. Although we boast of the great privilege it is to be a citizen of the British Empire, really all those who are coming to our shores and who have fulfilled the conditions in Canada, find, when they go abroad, on the high seas, or visit any country in Europe, or the United States, or wherever it may be, that their British citizenship is of no avail. I trust that the draft Bill which is presented will be looked into and, if necessary, amended in such a way that the trouble which I have mentioned, will disappear and that a person who becomes a naturalized citizen of Canada will be able to make the proud boast that he is a citizen of the British Empire, and that he will be able to say that wherever the British flag flies he has a perfect right to citizenship.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to trespass upon the time of the House to any considerable extent, but merely to make a few observations in respect to this matter. I remember that when Mr. Geoffrey Drage and Sir Frederick Pollock visited western Canada some few years ago to interest public opinion on this subject, their efforts were crowned with very considerable success. It seems to me that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), as well as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, (Mr. Cockshutt), have indicated exactly the difficulties that have been experienced in connection with this matter. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) also dealt with exactly the same sort of difficulty that had to be considered by the Imperial authorities. I think we all agree that it is essential that the autonomous rights of the dependencies of the Empire should be preserved. That is of the utmost importance. Every one of the King's dominions claims the right to pass a statute providing for the naturalization of aliens on such terms as to the legislature of each dependency seems best. That is a sine qua non. They insist upon that right. As the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has just said, the Dominion of New Zealand claims the right to confer citizenship upon a person the next day after he lands and takes the oath of allegiance. Some of the old provinces in Australia exacted five years' residence while we exact only three years, residence. It is therefore perfectly clear that if there are to be different terms of residence exacted before the domestic tribunals confer rights of citizenship that citizenship should be limited in its application to the boundaries of the country that grants it. Then comes a further question and the difficulty which was experienced is the very difficulty that the hon. member for Edmonton has just referred to, namely, whether or not there might be a uniform arrangement throughout the British Empire as to the terms of citizenship, whether or not a man should have to reside in New Zealand, Australia, Canada or any other British colony or dependency a given number of years absolutely regardless of other considerations and then have conferred upon him, by some domestic tribunal, a citizenship that would be accepted in every portion of the Empire, or whether we should attempt to deal with it in the way that the draft Bill does, namely, by preserving the right of each colony and of each Dominion to legislate as they please in regard to the requirements which may be exacted from

those who came within her boundaries and who seek the rights of citizenship, and then to adopt one general provision, that in addition to the residence or other qualifications necessary to attain the status of a citizen within the boundaries of the country that conferred the citizenship, the individual should have to live a longer period still in that Dominion before he could obtain Empire citizenship. The Minister of Public Works has pointed out that in the Imperial Conference of 1911 the matter was discussed at length and two schools of thought there found expression. On the one hand it was strongly urged that there should be a uniform term of residence in the empire and that then the domestic tribunal might confer empire citizenship. On the other hand there was a suggestion made which is now given force and effect in the draft Bill before us. It is proposed that while preserving the right that every self-governing colony or dependency may have to make such laws and regulations as to it seems best for granting citizenship to those who come within its boundaries, nevertheless, a residence of five years within that colony or dependency by any person shall entitle him to apply for a certificate of naturalization that will give him empire citizenship. That is the purpose of this draft Bill, and I may point out to the hon. member for Edmonton that it preserves to us all our autonomous rights, all our rights to make such rules and regulations as we may desire in so far as regards the domestic citizenship, while the larger or empire citizenship is to be conferred only when there has been a residence for five years, when the oath of allegiance has been taken to the sovereign and when there has been a certificate given as to the good character of the person in question. With regard to the pamphlet that was referred to by the hon. member for Pictou, I happen to know of a case that came under my own observation in which a passport had been issued that did not make the reservation or provision that is now inserted in a passport issued to naturalized citizens, and it was found in Russia that the person to whom the passport had been issued was wanted for a criminal offence under the laws of that country. He produced his passport, and the passport having been issued upon a form that it should not have been issued upon, international complications arose by reason of it and it gave a great deal of trouble. They came to the conclusion that a man has no right to have a full passport based only on domestic citizenship and that if he desires to have a passport which will give him the protection of his Britannic Majesty throughout the empire he must have empire citizenship. I entirely approve of this Bill and I trust that the government, in the words of the despatch to Earl Grey, will give it its earliest possible attention.

With regard to early action being taken, South Africa has acted and I am informed that Australia has also acted. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MACDONALD. There is no advice since November.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). I am informed that Australia has acted, or, if it has not acted, has come to a conclusion with regard to it. I trust that Canada will also take immediate action because this is one of the first steps towards a practical realization of the desire that most of us have for some consolidation of imperial interests, for the unity of the empire and the finding of our proper position in it, so that we may, as the hon. gentleman has just said, be citizens in fact of the Britsh Empire and not of any particular section of it. I welcome legislation along that line and if it will bring about that much desired purpose I trust that the government will early arrive at a conclusion and that they may be able to accept this measure because we realize how difficult it would be to induce New Zealand to change its present domestic law of one day of residence for the man who takes the oath of allegiance, how difficult it might be to induce the people of Canada to change the standard from three years, and I think we should be content to accept this secondary test that has been imposed, namely, residence for five years within the King's dominions and the obtaining of a certificate which gives a man that quality of citizenship that will ensure to him in future empire citizenship. That is a practical kind of imperialism. There are other questions of the same character that might be dealt with in this way in reference to copyrights, patents and the whole series of questions which have been agitating the public mind for some time. I trust that the government may be able to arrive at an early decision and that they may take advantage of this Bill because it is a Bill that does not work any great hardships and it will provide a remedy for the difficulties that have arisen and will enable persons coming into this country and who have attained to citizenship to be able to say, with a little expense and trouble, that they have secured a citizenship that is the highest and best that can be conferred upon any people under any flag under the sun.

But there is a difficulty in connection with the treaty matter. A German does not lose his citizenship because he becomes naturalized in Canada; a Japanese never loses his citizenship. A Japanese may take the oath of allegiance to our sovereign and become naturalized, but the moment he

gets back to Japan he is the same Japanese, so far as nationality is concerned, as he was when he left Japan. One hon. gentleman who spoke was in error in saying that in England the citizenship was better than here. The Naturalization Act that confers rights on aliens in England is in the same terms as the Act here, our Act being changed only to meet the conditions of our being a Colonial parliament and the other being the Imperial parliament. The Japanese or German who becomes a British subject in England gets no higher right beyond the three mile limit around the British isles than does the man who gets his citizenship here beyond the three mile limit of the Dominion. In both instances what they obtain is subject to treaty rights that exist between the two countries if there be a treaty, and the position he occupies is regulated by the treaty between the land from whence he came and the land to which he comes. On a casual reading of the Bill, I assume that treaty rights are preserved by the saving section which my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) has referred to. I think the House is indebted to the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) for bringing this matter to our attention, and I trust the government will take speedy action because I observe from the depatches that the imperial parliament may deal with the question at its coming session, and then legislation will be necessary on the part of the great self-governing colonies to manifest their approval of the action taken by the imperial parliament.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understand that the naturalization of an alien naturalized in Great Britain after having spent five years there, is recognized when he comes to Canada, but the naturalization of an alien naturalized in Canada, does not hold good in Great Britain, where he has to live five years again; the three years he has lived in Canada count for nothing.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). My present appreciation of the fact is that we do give effect in Canada to the naturalization certificate that comes from any part of the King's dominions. Whether we do that lawfully or not is another matter but I believe that is the practice. I think we will even respect a New Zealand certificate although probably we should not because there a man can take the oath of allegiance and become a citizen the next morning.

Mr. MONK. A certificate issued in England is recognized throughout the empire, but I do not think we recognize a certificate issued in any of the dependencies, for the same reason that the law has not force and effect beyond the confines of these dependencies themselves.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary).

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

SUPPLY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to correct a mistake I made last evening in respect to the amount of the appropriation for New Brunswick. I stated that for the current year the total amount of the appropriation which was submitted to parliament by the late government, and which was voted, amounted to $506,860.71, but that was only seven-twelfths of the vote, and I should have stated that the total amount for the current year, chargeable to consolidated revenue, is $868,390, whereas the estimate for the coming year chargeable to consolidated revenue for harbours and rivers in the province of New Brunswick, amounts to only $286,925, or less than one-third of what was provided for in the current year in the estimates submitted by the late government. Then, if you take the total appropriation for New Brunswick in the present estimates, adding the amount charged to capital, including the harbour of St. John, $1,286,925 for the coming year, as against $1,818,390, which the late government submitted for the current year and which was actually voted by parliament. In other words, there is pretty nearly $600,000 less for the harbours and rivers in the province of New Brunswick, so far as these estimates are concerned, than was provided by the late government for the current year. I trust my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will consider that when he comes to make up his supplementary estimates, and that he will open his heart to the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. MONK. I fear I cannot claim all the credit my hon. friend atributes to me. The $868,000 was comprised in the main and supplementary estimates combined, and as you have not our supplementary estimates yet you cannot establish a comparison.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am looking forward with hope.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps when he sees the the supplementaries the hon. gentleman will be inclined to modify his opinion.

Mr. SINCLAIR. A good deal of discussion has been caused over the fact that a good many items which were voted in the last estimates have been stricken from the estimates now before the House. If the hon. gentleman intends to replace them in the supplementary estimates, then the procedure is hardly businesslike. I drew attention to New Harbour in my own constituency, for which $10,000 was voted in the estimates of the late government and where the work is absolutely necessary, but that vote is not included in the estimates now before the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) hinted that I might find

it in the supplementary estimates; but why it is left out of the present estimates puzzles me. I might draw attention to the fact that Nova Scotia has been treated even worse than New Brunswick, if we are to draw a conclusion from the present estimates. In the former estimates Nova Scotia had for harbours and rivers $1,309,166, and in the present estimates only $445,075 is provided. Therefore, the large sum of $824,066 has disappeared from the estimates of the province of Nova Scotia. I understand from my hon. friend that a large amount of that money is to be replaced in the supplementary estimates; but why he should go through the form of striking them out of the estimates and putting them back a few weeks later has puzzled me in all this discussion.

Mr. MONK. It is evident that I have not been able to make my argument clear to my hon. friend. What I stated was that we could not make a comparison between the general appropriation of last year and the appropriation contained in the main estimates for this year, because in the figures which my hon. friend has given for the last year he has included both the main estimates and the supplementaries. The main estimates of last year were about $17,000,000, but the supplementaries brought that figure up to $25,000,000. Therefore, I stated that to establish a true comparison, my hon. friends would have to wait until they had the whole appropriation of the year; but I did not say that it was intended to restore in the supplementary estimates certain items that were omitted from the main estimates. What I tried to explain was that the government had made its own estimates this year irrespective of what may have appeared in last year's estimates, and if certain items were left out of last year's estimates, that was due to the change of government and the appreciation of what expenditures could be made throughout the country. The same thing was done when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. You would find items in the estimates of one year which disappeared in the following year and after a certain period were restored.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understand the minister to say that unexpended items voted in last year's estimates and not appearing in these estimates he intends to drop, and not put them in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. MONK. Some may appear and some may not.

Mr. KNOWLES. If a contract has been entered into between the government and a contractor for a public work, are we to understand that the work will be gone on with even if the item is dropped in the new estimates? On Tuesday last I called the minister's attention to the fact that a contract has been let for a small building, to cost $4,200, at a place called Gravel, although it had appeared in the previous estimates. I want to ask if that work is to be gone on with?

Mr. MONK. It is my intention to restore that small item, because the work is under contract.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). In the estimates for 1912, there were appropriations for various works in the county which I have the honour to represent, amounting to $32,400. In the estimates for 1913, I find that this government is generous to the extent of only $500 for the whole county of Antigonish, which has a sea-coast of nearly 100 miles. In these estimates there are two items—one Arisaig, $1,500 and Livingston's Cove, $2,000, a total of $3,500, of which $3,000 is a revote. In the estimates for 1912, there were the following items: Arisaig, $1,500; Bayfield, $15,000; Cribbin's Point, $1,000; Livingston's Cove, $1,500; McNair's Cove, $5,400; Malignant Cove, $2,300; McAra's Brook, $1,700; and South Lake, $4,000; a total of $32,400. All these have been dropped except the two I have mentioned, which appears to be an injustice to the county of Antigonish. The hon. Minister of Public Works assured us a few evenings ago that he was not actuated at all by political considerations in dropping these items. We have to take his assurance, but I cannot understand why these items are not in the estimates for 1913. They are very important to the people of these districts, and were recognized by the minister's own engineers as proper to be in the estimates. They were not for works undertaken for election purposes, because nobody expected that there would be an election when there was one. The works must have been regarded by the engineers as necessary. I would ask the minister if it is his intention to make provision for these items in the supplementary estimates, and, if not, on what ground, and on whose recommendation have they been dropped?

Mr. MONK. I think there must be certain latitude granted hon. members who find themselves in the position of my hon. friend; but when the House gets into committee at this hour, I think the discussion ought to be limited largely to the item before the committee.

I can only repeat to my hon. friend that the government have not prosecuted those works because they have judged fit to make expenditures elsewhere, which in their opinion are more necessary and more ur-

gent. I cannot explain why works provided for and not begun have not been persisted in by this government. I am here to justify the different items which the government lays before the House, and it must occur to my hon. friend that a long discussion as to the reasons why the government has not brought down other items on other works is not pertinent.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). These are not new items, they are only repairs to works already in existence. The minister's argument would be readily understood if it were a case of new works such as the establishment of a new wharf or breakwater or a new harbour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I beg to remind the hon. member that subsection 5 of Rule 13 says that speeches must be strictly relevant to the time or clause under consideration.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not prepared to accept any such interpretation as you, Sir, put on that rule. It would be grossly unfair. No such rule has ever been recognized in this House as that the discussion should be confined to a particular breakwater.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that this is a new rule which has not been strictly followed.

Mr. MACDONALD. When was it made?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) I have to catch a train in a few moments, and as I wish to obtain information with reference to several Prince Edward Island items, I would ask to have one item stand in order that I may ask these questions on another occasion.

Mr. MONK. We can keep the general item for 'Harbours and Rivers, Prince Edward Island'.

Mr. KNOWLES. As the minister will remember, on Tuesday last we got into Supply unexpectedly, and passed some items from Saskatchewan and Alberta about which the minister was not then able to give full information as his deputy was not here. A delegation representing the Board of Trade of Moosejaw recently visited Ottawa, the most notable members being Mr. Willoughby and Dr. Wheeler. They interviewed a number of ministers, and I accompanied them on some of these visits, but I was not able to see the Minister of Public Works with them as I had a previous appointment. Those delegates could properly represent to him the views which they conveyed from Moosejaw with regard to the new building under contract in that city and I understand they made representations to him on a point on which they quite honestly thought they represented the views of that city. I would ask the minister if he would advise me as to their representation as to the change of site for that public building, as to what site they wished to have the new public building in Moosejaw moved to. If the minister cannot give the information now I would ask him to obtain it.

Mr. MONK. I am very sorry, indeed, but my hon. friend must accept my confession that I have not the slightest recollection of what these gentlemen represented. I have been receiving ten or twelve delegations each day for a month past.

Mr. KNOWLES. The tail end of my remarks constituted a request that the minister would ascertain and advise me.

Mr. MONK. I did not take anything in writing, I do not remember what they told me at all.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will the minister ascertain if there is anything official?

Maritime provinces generally—to purchase creosoted timber for works in the maritime provinces generally, $20,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is that to be purchased by tender?

Mr. MONK. Yes, except where only small quantities are required. Anything of over $5,000 will be bought by tender.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). There is a good deal of creosoted timber in the harbour at Inverness. What is the intention of the government in regard to it?

Mr. MONK. It will be used in repairing the works that we have in that vicinity.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I do not think it can be much used in repairing; the only work there is what was done last year, all the old works having been carried away. There was a vote of over $5,000 for works at Inverness, and I would like to know if the government intends to use this timber for construction by day work or to call for tenders?

Mr. MONK. There is an item of $5,300 for harbour improvements at Inverness, and if the timber is there it will be used for the purpose of those repairs.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). In purchasing this timber, are tenders called for? If so, to whom is the call for tenders addressed?

Mr. MONK. I do not think we have purchased much creosoted timber; when a sufficiently large quantity is purchased it is done by tender and contract.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). How many companies in Canada are in the creosoted timber business?

Mr. MONK. Not many, but we ask for tenders from those whose names we learn. At one time, this timber was bought from one man only, but there are several now.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Will a copy of the specifications be sent to the representatives of all these concerns?

Mr. MONK. Any representative who applies for permission to tender, is certainly asked to tender.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Are tenders actually called for through the public press?

Mr. MONK. Not through the press.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Or do you send out to agents who are in the business of selling creosoted timber?

Mr. MONK. That is the way it has been done in the past. If this can be improved, I will try to improve it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Then am I right in assuming that tenders will be invited from all who are in the business?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask whether there has been $30,000 already expended, and is this an additional item, or is it a revote?

Mr. MONK. It is intended to expend $30,000. The total cost will be about $60,000.

Rivières des Prairies—Improvements of navigation, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that to carry out the work which was inaugurated on the recommendation of my hon. friend the member for Laval (Mr. Wilson)?

Mr. MONK. I had already asked that these works be carried out. The hon. member for Laval came in, and in a short time he seemed to be more potent in the House than I was.

Three Rivers harbour—Completion of deep water wharf at west end of harbour, $118,000.

Mr. MONK. I move to add the words 'and for other improvements'.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Three Rivers is not here. I wished to ask him if it was intended to carry on these works according to the plan which was prepared when I was minister.

Mr. MONK. Yes. Most of these works are begun, there will be no change.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm). (Translation.) Before these items for the province of Quebec are all passed, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works the reason why we do not find in the estimates the amount of $15,000 already voted for the construction of a post office in St. Jacques de l'Achigan, in the county of Montcalm. I have asked for this vote after the property had been purchased, when Mr. Justice Dugas was the member for Montcalm. The site having been purchased, I got this vote for the construction of a post office. When I came in this House in 1909, that amount was put in the estimates, but was not expended because it was too late to begin the works, and as the Department of Public Works did not wish to have the works performed during the winter, I was given the assurance that they would be started in the spring. At the next session I asked once more for that vote of $15,000, which was again granted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Translation.) As the item under consideration has no relation whatever to this question, I would ask the hon. member to comply with the rule I have mentioned a few minutes ago.

Mr. LAFORTUNTE. (Translation.) I am simply asking the hon. minister what has become of this vote of $15,000. It has been answered to a question asked by myself that the plans had been submitted for examination, and that there had been delays due to some complications in connection with the limits of the property. I would like to know from the minister if it is his intention to have that post office erected this year?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I may answer the hon. member that it is not the intention of the department to erect that building this year; otherwise we would have asked a vote for that purpose. I do not know whether there was such an item in last year's estimates or not; if there was, the hon. member should have availed himself of it.

Mr. LAFORTUNE. (Translation.) I can tell the hon. minister the reason why the item was of no avail after being voted; it is because the estimates were blocked through obstructive discussions by the then members of the opposition.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Why did not you make use of it?

Mr. LAFORTUNE. (Translation.) Am I to understand that this item of $15,000 for that construction will be put in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) For the present we are not asking the committee

to vote that item. As regards the supplementary estimates, they are being prepared and I cannot now say anything about them.

Mr. LAFORTUNE. (Translation.) I can assure the hon. minister that this post office is absolutely needed.

Mr. E. FORTIER (Lotbinière). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister how it happens that we do not find this year in the estimates several items concerning my own riding that were in last year's estimates?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Translation.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but I must urge that he should confine himself to the item under consideration. It is a new rule that is rather frequently violated, but I must tell the hon. member that I am compelled to have it observed.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is the point of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order, as it has been stated before, is that speeches should be strictly relevant to the item under consideration.

Mr. FORTIER. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I simply want to ask the minister some information relating to the item under consideration. My intention is not to raise any discussion, but I wish to remind him that there were in the estimates for 1912 certain items for works in my county that are omitted this year. I would like to know why they have been omitted and if there will be provision made for those works in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Translation.) The item under consideration relates to Three Rivers.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I may tell the hon. member (Mr. Fortier) that our finances did not allow us to put that item in the estimates for next year. We have considered it more prudent and necessary to have some other works performed. As to whether such items will be put in the supplementary estimates, I cannot say this evening as these estimates are still under consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we ought not to be too closely bound by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, because it would hamper discussion if we were to adhere to the view which you have presented. I take it that discussion is absolutely relevant to any item in these estimates when a member seeks to compare the utility of a work that is provided for by an item in the estimates with other works of equal, or greater importance, which have been omitted. That is what my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm), was proposing to do, and what my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Lafortune), was proposing to do. We have the right to say that this committee ought not to be asked to vote an item of $40,000, say, for a work, because, in the same county or province, there are works which are more urgently needed than the item that is asked, and to urge upon the minister that he ought to drop the item that is in the estimates provided he cannot take care of both works and make provision for the other work. Does not my hon. friend remember how, in previous years, he condemned me for putting in items similar to this for wharfs and the improvement of harbours throughout the country? Does not my hon. friend remember the eloquent speeches he made in Committee of Supply urging that the government ought to make provision for starting such works as the Georgian Bay canal, pay more attention to the harbour of Montreal, spend money in nationalizing the harbours, and that it ought not, to use his language, to waste money in the construction of these useless, small wharfs and other works throughout the country? This is the same thing. My hon. friend from Antigonish was seeking to impress upon the committee that works of a more urgent character than those for which he had asked a vote of money had been omitted. It seems to me that this is entirely relevant to the item under discussion. I do not think it should be carried too far or the argument extended too widely, but, it seems to me that it is entirely relevant, and that a member is not discharging his duty unless he calls attention to an injustice to the portion of the province from which he comes.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend, I am sure, will appreciate the desire of the Chairman, by his ruling, to keep the discussion down to the item under consideration. I perfectly understand that an hon. member might argue against the adoption of an item, and contend that other works are more urgent and necessary, but my hon. friend, I think, will do me the justice to admit that we have expended several hours on this point as to why the government had omitted from these estimates this year, items which had appeared in last year's estimates for works that were not begun or under contract. That was explained several times, and I think we cannot enter into a full discussion of that point without going beyond the limits which ordinarily should apply under the circumstances.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have got along very rapidly. We have passed $600,000 in half an hour.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I was going to suggest to the Minister of Public Works

that this rule should be leniently enforced even if the Chairman puts the correct interpretation upon it. Of course, the ruling could be avoided by moving an amendment to the motion in each case covering each item. I would like to suggest to the minister that we have allowed him to get along pretty rapidly with his estimates during the session. All the items for harbours and rivers in Quebec have gone through and nearly $1,000,000 have been voted in less than ten minutes. He should allow members from the province of Quebec to discuss any one item in a general way.

Mr. MONK. Oh, yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I take it that when we agree to pass all the items for Quebec it is understood that if any member from Quebec wishes to speak on any item at some other time he will be allowed to do so?

Mr. MONK. Certainly. Now, we will take up harbours and rivers in Ontario.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Some of the Ontario members who desired to discuss these items are not here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose my hon. friend goes on with Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia?

Mr. MONK. We have not the information for those provinces, but we have it for Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We might take Ontario and leave a general item.

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The general item will stand.

Mr. MONK. Yes, stands.

Toronto harbour improvements, $195,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand the minister has recently had an opportunity of inspecting the work at the western channel of Toronto harbour, which is about completed. Will he state in what condition he found the work?

Mr. MONK. I visited the work and I found it in excellent condition. There is a very fine breakwater there and the improvements generally seem of the very best quality. There is still very considerable to be done. If we continue that breakwater and the other improvements as they have been going on so far we will be satisfied.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The late government made provision for improvements at Sarnia and entered into an agreement with the Grand Trunk railway with respect to some necessary property there and it was contemplated to afford facilities urgently required for shipping at that place. The item has been dropped from these estimates and my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) who represents the constituency, feels very strongly about that, and as to the necessity for this work going on. I would like the minister to bring down the papers before these items are concluded, and to be prepared to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) why the item has been dropped, and as to what may be hoped in the near future, as to the prosecution of that work.

Mr. MONK. I will get the information. I believe there was a tender for that work but it was altogether too high.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Monk, House adjourned at 11.17 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 5, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE DUTY ON LUMBER.

Mr. TURRIFF. Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether it is true, as reported in the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' that in a shipment of 20 cars of lumber that came in lately, the appraisers, under instructions, went through the cars and examined the lumber piece by piece, and found in one car nine pieces that showed marks of the planer on the edge, and in another car only four pieces that showed marks of the planer. What I want to ask is whether, if that was the case, the consignee was obliged to pay 25 per cent duty on all of the lumber, or was the portion that did not show marks of the planer allowed to come in free?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is scarcely the kind of a question that can be put, with the expectation that the answer can be given by the minister on the spur of the moment. It would require information being obtained from another source.

Mr. TURRIFF. I will give notice, then, that on the first convenient occasion I will bring the matter up.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would ask permission to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a report in the newspapers of the United States regarding the fixing of tolls on the Panama canal. Though it would seem a little early to deal with this ques-

tion, it is being discussed at Washington at the present time. As Canadian shipowners are largely interested in the question, I would call attention to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is scarcely in order in discussing that question at this stage.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I regard it as a question of special importance, Mr. Speaker, so much so that I hope I shall be permitted at the present time to ask the Prime Minister a question in regard to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House the hon. gentleman should not introduce anything of a controversial nature——

Mr. SINCLAIR. This is not controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER. Except it be to ask a question, an hon. member desires to bring up something of a special and urgent nature, he might do so by getting the permission to move the adjournment of the House.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). The hon. gentleman might be permitted to read the despatch for the purpose of asking a question, though I am afraid I cannot give him any answer in regard to it to-day. But I would like to know what it is, if the House has no objection.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The despatch which I find in the American papers is as follows:

Washington, D.C., Feb. 3, 1912.—Senators who discussed the symposium giving the views of shipping men and exporters on canal tolls, said the question of tolls should be soon settled.

Senator Brandeger, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals, said that he was emphatically in favour of rebating the tolls paid by American ships. 'American shipping interests,' he said, 'should be encouraged to use the canal to develop our foreign trade.'

Senator Penrose said: 'The canal is not alone a war measure, but is an industrial project which is expected to advance the commercial interests of the United States. As liberal concessions as are possible under the treaty should be made to our own ships, and wide discretion should be left with the President in fixing the tonnage rates.

The proposal is made in some of the papers of the United States that the ships of that country be admitted at a less rate than the ships of other nations. It has been proposed that $1 a ton should be charged to ships belonging to foreign countries, and 50 cents a ton to ships belonging to the United States. I would regard that as a violation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, which I think will be found to provide that no discrimination should be given to vessels of the United States passing through the canal. The proposal in the despatch which I have read is to give a rebate to American ships in order to encourage American commerce. I submit that that is also a violation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. The attention of the United States authorities might be drawn to the manner in which Canada has treated the United States in regard to the St. Lawrence route, on which we have spent something like $100,000,000 to provide a channel for ships from the ocean to the Great Lakes, through which we allow the ships of the United States to pass free.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is certainly going beyond the point of asking a question.

Mr. SINCLAIR. My suggestion to the Prime Minister is that he look into the matter, and endeavour to get for Canadian vessels passing through the Panama canal as good terms as possible.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman was good enough to give me an intimation that he proposed to ask me that question; but I only received it on entering the House to-day, when the despatch to which he alludes had not been brought to my attention. As far as I understand it, the despatch is based on nothing more than newspaper discussion on some proposal which has been made in Congress. There has been no definite action taken by the government of the United States up to the present time. However, I shall be glad to look at the despatch, and later perhaps it may be convenient to allude to the subject again. The government will give it consideration at the earliest possible moment.

PRIVATE BILLS.

STERLING LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Blain.

Mr. BLAIN. I have a little amendment to propose to this clause. I move that the name of William F. Clews be added to the directorate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As this is an important amendment, the clause will have to stand.

Mr. BLAIN. In that case I would give notice also of some other trifling amendments. I propose in clause five to substitute $100,000 for $75,000. In clause seven I intend to move that the words 'may take' be struck out and the words 'may make' substituted. As the Bill has to stand until to-morrow, I would ask you,

Mr. Chairman, to make a note of these proposed amendments.

Progress reported.

THE HARBOUR OF HAMILTON.

House in committee on Bill (No. 32) respecting the Harbour of Hamilton.—Mr. Stewart.

On section 14,

Mr. CROCKET. This section gives power to expropriate, and the Select Standing Committee reports that such power is not covered by the notice. The same objection applies to clause 18.

Section 14 allowed to stand.

Section 18 allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. I might draw attention to the fact that the Private Bills Committee in reporting this Bill to the House drew attention to it in the following words:

In regard to the last mentioned Bill, your committee desire to draw the attention of the House, pursuant to rule 106, to the powers of expropriation granted under sections 14 and 18 of the Bill which do not appear to have been contemplated in the notice or petition for the same as reported upon by the examiner of petitions for private Bills on 1st December last.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Architectural Institute of Canada, and to change its name to The Royal Architectural Institute of Canada.—Sir Edmund Osler.

Bill (No. 71) respecting a patent of the Spirella Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 53) respecting patents of Edmund F. Piper.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to The Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Premier Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Bennett (Calgary).

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CONTRACTS FOR GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENTS.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Who solicited the various contracts for government advertisements published in 'Le Devoir,' 'L'Evénement,' 'La Patrie' and the Quebec 'Chronicle'?

2. Were any tenders called for such advertisements?

3. Is it the intention of the government to call for tenders in the future when such advertisements are required?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. There was no solicitation.

2. No.

3. It has never been the practice of the government to ask for tenders for advertising. Accounts for advertising are audited by the Department of Public Printing and Stationery. It is the intention of the government to continue the practice which obtained in the past.

VICKERS-MAXIM COMPANY.

Mr. SEVIGNY:

1. Is the Vickers-Maxim Company, which contracted for the construction of a dry-dock at Montreal, incorporated under the Companies Act?

2. If so, what are the names of the shareholders of the said company?

3. How much has been paid by each of the shareholders on his shares?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Vickers Sons & Maxim Limited, the company which made application to the Department of Public Works for approval of plans and specifications of a dry-dock to be constructed at Montreal is not a Canadian company. The agreement with said department with concurrence of Vickers Sons & Maxim Limited, was entered into by Canadian Vickers Limited, a company incorporated under the Companies Act of Canada.

2. The names of the applicants for incorporation of Canadian Vickers, Limited, are as follows: Albert Vickers, chairman of Vickers, Limited; Sir Vincent Henry Penlaver Caillard, Knight Bachelor, both of London, England; Frederick Orr Lewis, and James Graham Lewis, Merchants; Sir Hugh Montague Allan, Knight Bachelor, and Preble MacIntosh, all of Montreal. There is no further information respecting the shareholders of the company.

3. The government has no information on this question.

I.C.R.—EMPLOYERS' RETIREMENT FUND.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

Does the government intend to give back to the employees of the Intercolonial railway who were dismissed for political reasons, the sums paid by them into the retirement fund for the employees of that railway, as provided for in the Statute 6-7 Edward VII., chapter 22?

Mr. COCHRANE:

This will be dealt with according to the statutes governing this matter.

IMMIGRATION OFFICE IN LONDON, ONTARIO.

Mr. ELSON:

Is it the intention of the government to open an immigration and distribution office in the city of London, Ontario, together with a suitable building in which farm labourers and others can be cared for during the time they are waiting for employment?

Mr. ROGERS. The matter is under consideration.

WHARF AT L'ASSOMPTION.

Mr. SEGUIN:

Would the hon. Minister of Public Works inform the House if the different amounts voted in the estimates for 1911-12 by the present parliament, but omitted in the estimates for 1912-13, for the construction of a wharf at L'Assomption, an ice-breaker at St. Gérard de Magella, an ice-breaker on the river L'Achigan and a public building in the town of Laurentides, will be placed in the supplementary estimates of this session, in order that these various works which are of great importance to the different localities concerned may be done during the present fiscal year?

Mr. MONK. These works are all under careful consideration, but it will be impossible to state, at this date, what items will be placed in the supplementary estimates, which will be laid before parliament this session.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT LAURENTIDES.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has the Public Works Department acquired a property in the town of Laurentides for the purpose of constructing a public building thereon?

2. If not, does the department purpose in the near future making such a purchase in having such building erected, for which a sum was placed in the estimates of 1911-12?

3. If the department has given up the idea of constructing such public building in the town of Laurentides, what are the reasons and at whose request?

Mr. MONK:

1. No.

2 and 3. The matter is now receiving consideration.

ICE-BREAKER AT ST. GERARD.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Did the department of Public Works during the year 1911 ask for tenders for the construction of an ice-breaker at St. Gérard in the County of L'Assomption?

2. If so, who tendered and what are the amounts?

3. Was the contract for such ice-breaker assigned? If so, to whom and for what amount?

4. If the contract has not been given, does the department intend to soon proceed with that work and utilize for that purpose the amount voted in the estimates of 1911-12?

Mr. COCHRANE.

5. If the department does not intend to use the money appropriated for such ice-breaker and to have it constructed, what reasons are given for the abandonment of the work and at whose request was it abandoned?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.

2. Eugène Patenaude, $3,457; Joseph Renaud, $4,090.

3. No.

4. No, the work is not considered necessary in the public interest.

5. Inquiry was made by the department, concerning this work, and from information secured, it was deemed to be unnecessary.

HON. MR. LEMIEUX AND DISMISSALS.

Mr. BELLEMARE:

1. Is the government aware that in the newspaper 'Le Devoir' on the 30th January last an article appeared the statements contained in which article are an alleged flagrant contradiction of declarations previously by an honourable member of this House, the ex-Postmaster General, and which article reeads as follows:—

Mr. Lemieux and the Dismissals.

Editor of 'Le Devoir,'

Dear sir,—In reply to the defiance of hon. Mr. Lemieux to produce the names of ten employees that were dismissed in 1896, you will find enclosed a list of the names of those who were dismissed on the 30th December, 1896, by the Laurier government, of which hon. Mr. Lemieux was then one of the most zealous friends, although simple member for Gaspé

On the 30th December, 1896, these brave fathers of families were, on the eve of New Year's Day, cast out on the street, as the hon. plenipotentiary to Japan would express it, and one of the number was my poor father. Hence it is that I speak whereof I know. They were sent off without any reason whatsoever, unless it be that they were Blues, and that the Rouges governed.

Now, Mr. Editor, Mr. Lemieux rages against Mr. Monk, asserting that he has dismissed hundreds of brave fathers of families. How comes it that, even as I write, in the county that the Hon. Minister of Public Works represents, at Lachine, no dismissals have yet been made? The Liberals of Lachine who may be dismissed have only to thank hon. Mr. Lemieux, for, despite that we kept them in their positions, that gentleman insults a man who is by far his superior. Learn, Mr. ex-minister, that in vain you shout, rage, fume it will have no effect. We know the love for the French Canadians that Mr. Monk has, and your hysterical cries will never make us forget the one who has ever been devoted to us.

You have asked for ten names; read now the following list and remember as you count them that these dismissals were only on the Lachine canal, at the Lachine locks. On the 30th December, 1896, were dismissed: Adolphe Leblanc, lockman, Lachine; Alex. Carigan, lockman, Lachine; Ephron Picard, boom guardian, Lachine; J. B. St. Aubin, lockman, Lachine; Alex. Clément, lockman, Lachine,

Camile Cousineau, bridge keeper, Lachine; Damase Chartrand, bridge keeper, Lachine; Oscar Bélanger, lockman, Lachine; James Teirney, lockman, Lachine; Edouard Lauzon, lockman. Lachine; Urgel Viau, lockman, Lachine; Theo. Davis, lockman, Lachine; Roderick Hogan, lockman, Lachine; Alexander Snider, lockman, Lachine.

And I will add that two years later they found a way to superannuate Messrs. J. B. Deschamps, canal collector, and Louis Paré, each with a small pension not sufficient for livlihood, happily they had some savings.

Amongst the dismissed was Mr. Damase Chartrand, who had the misfortune of losing a leg through an accident at the locks during the summer of 1896. The Conservative government had made him a bridge keeper, in order to let him have easy work. With the others, on the 31st December, he received, mercilessly, his dismissal. Is this enough, Mr. ex-Minister? You asked for ten names; count them well and let us see if the public will not take you for a joker? Get the facts before fuming against the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for your kindness, I remain, &c.,

RAOUL CARIGAN,
Lachine, son of one of the dismissed.

2. If so, does the government intend to take steps to find out the truth concerning these statements?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I rise to a question of privilege, before an answer is given to this question. I would point out that there is in this correspondence an alleged question of fact, to which I object. It is stated in the last paragraph:

The Liberals of Lachine who may be dismissed, have only to thank Hon. Mr. Lemieux for despite that we have kept them in their positions, that gentleman insults a man who is by far his superior.

I object to the expression that I insulted the Hon. the Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Monk), and I ask that the words be expunged from the order paper.

Mr. BORDEN. Stand.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Has Raoul Provost, a civil engineer employed by the Marine and Fisheries Department at Montreal, been dismissed from his position? If so, at whose request?
2. What are the reasons given in justification of the dismissal of Mr. Provost?
3. Was there an inquiry and was Mr. Provost informed of the complaint lodged against him?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes, Raoul Prevost was dismissed on the recommendation of the agent of the department at Montreal.
2. Incompetence and unreliability.
3. No.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has Pièrre Duchaine, boomkeeper, on the St. Maurice been dismissed from his position?
2. If so, when, why and was there an inquiry?
3. At whose request was he dismissed?
4. By whom was he replaced and who recommended his successor?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes. 2. (a) 21st November, 1911; (b) incompetency, and so reported by the engineer in charge.
3. Answered by number 2.
4. (a) Joseph Paquin; (b) Mr. Blondin, M.P.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has L. P. Dalaire, paymaster on the St. Maurice, been dismissed from his position? If so, when, and was there an inquiry?
2. At whose request was he dismissed?
3. By whom was he replaced, and who recommended his successor?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. (a) Yes. (b) On 28th December, 1911. (c) No formal inquiry.
2. At request of P. E. Blondin, M.P.
3. By Edward Bellefeuille, recommended by P. E. Blondin, M.P.

R. LAURIER IMMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Is R. Laurier, immigration agent at Detroit, Michigan, still in the employ of the government?
2. If so, what is his salary and the amount of his contingent expenses?
3. Has he reported during the past two years on his duties performed?
4. Is he a relative of Sir Wilfrid Laurier?

1. Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. Salary, $1,200 per annum. Average contingent expenses during past two years per annum $648.63.
3. Yes.
4. The government is not informed

C. A. LAURIER, IMMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Is C. A. Laurier, immigration agent at Marquette, Michigan, in 1910, still in the employ of the government?
2. If so, what is his salary and the amount of his contingent expenses?
3. Did he make any report on his duties performed during the past two years?
4. Is he a relative of Sir Wilfrid Laurier?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. Salary, $1,620 per annum; Average contingent expenses during past two years per annum $2,285.80.
3. Yes.

4. The government has no information in this regard.

UNITED SHOE MACHINERY CO.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York):

1. Have any proceedings been commenced under the Anti-Combines Act of 1910, except those in the matter of the United Shoe Machinery Company?
2. When was the complaint filed in the Shoe Machinery case?
3. When did the taking of testimony before the board of investigation begin and is testimony still being taken?
4. When will the taking of testimony be concluded, and will such testimony be reduced to writing and laid before the House?
5. What direction over the proceeding by the board is exercised by either the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Justice?
6. Did the Minister of Labour have a conference at the city of Ottawa in the fall of 1911 with the president, attorney or other representative of the United Shoe Machinery Company?
7. Was application made to the Minister at that interview to suspend or stop any further hearing before the board of investigation, upon the grounds that a satisfactory arrangement had been come to between the complainants and the company?
8. In an investigation under the Anti-Combines Act, is any one employed by the government to represent the public interests, or have the complainants the power to discontinue the investigation at any time?
9. What money has been expended and what liabilities have been incurred by the government of Canada to date under the Anti-Combine Act?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. The department has no knowledge of proceedings other than those in the matter of the United Shoe Machinery Company.
2. The application for the board was filed with Judge Cannon, at Quebec, November 10, 1910. The order establishing a board was received by the Minister of Labour, February 27, 1911.
3. (1) November 17, 1911. (2) The board on January 31 adjourned proceedings until February 6, presumably for the purpose of taking testimony.
4. (1) It is not known when the taking of testimony will be concluded. (2) Stenographic reports are made of the testimony. (3) The testimony will be laid before the House if ordered.
5. No direction has been exercised by the present Minister of Labour, nor, in so far as the present minister is aware, by the former minister.
6. Representatives of the United Shoe Machinery Company, as well as those of the petitioners, waited separately on the Minister of Labour at Ottawa.
7. No.
8. Section 30 of the Combines Investigation Act provides as follows: 'Whenever in the opinion of the minister the public interest so requires, the minister may apply to the Minister of Justice to instruct counsel to conduct the investigation before a board, and upon such application the Minister of Justice may instruct counsel accordingly. The fees and expenses allowed to such counsel by the Minister of Justice shall be paid out of such appropriations as are made by parliament to provide for the cost of administering this Act.' (2) The point raised appears to be dealt with in section 18, subsection 2 of the Combines Investigation Act, which provides as follows: 'In deciding any question that may affect the scope or extent of the investigation, the board shall consider what is required to make the investigation as thorough and complete as the public interest demands.'
9. (1) For the fiscal year 1910-11, $196.46; for the fiscal year 1911-12, to January 31, $1,701. Total $1,897.46.

(2) There is no knowledge of liabilities other than for expenditures arising out of proceedings before the board established in the case of the United Shoe Machinery Company, the complete accounts in this case have not been yet received.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRADE OF MONTREAL.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1 Has the government received the following resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Trade of Montreal at its annual meeting held on Wednesday the 31st January ultimo:

'That this board views with alarm the exploiting by corporation or individuals of the waters of the St. Lawrence for power purposes, and that in view of the fact that the city of Montreal is the centre of a district which is capable of more water-power development than most other cities in the world, it should have the advantage thereof in the shape of low electric power rates, which are so essential to the growth of a city and to have full development of its manufacturing industries;

'This board is of the opinion that before the Dominion Government sanctions the various schemes now being put forward for the development of hydro-electric power on both the St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers, it is essential in the interest of the country generally that the conservation commission should be requested to draw up a comprehensive scheme for the preservation of these rivers as great national waterways of the Dominion, and that such commission should take immediate action so as to prevent the natural resources of the public domain from passing into the hands of private parties;

'That the Dominion Government is hereby prayed to instruct the Conservation Commission to consider what means it is advisable to adopt, first in regard to the licensing of hydro-electric companies; second what check it is desirable to put on the increases in the capital of the various companies in order that some means may be evolved for giving the

public electric power at a minimum rate, yet at the same time allowing the various electrical companies to make a reasonable return for their shareholders on the paid-up capital; third, to prevent, if possible, such companies making unwarranted increases in their capital stock on the basis of earnings; and fourth, to consider whether a Hydro-Electric Commission should be established by the Dominion Government to govern rates of power companies on a similar basis to the Board of Railway Commissioners, or whether it would serve the public interest better for the government to itself develop hydro-electric power and distribute the same on lines similar to those of the Hydro-Electric Commission in Ontario;

'That the board is further of the opinion that all power developed in Canadian waters will be required for Canadian use, and that no power should be allowed to be diverted from this country;

'That this board respectfully reiterates its request that in the development of water-powers on the St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers navigation interests should be considered paramount, and that no works shall be permitted in these national waterways that would interfere with the development on a larger scale of their navigation facilities if the same should be found advisable.'

Mr. BORDEN. The resolution has been forwarded to a member of the government.

SIKHS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Minister of the Interior given a decision concerning the demand made by the Sikhs who have settled in British Columbia?
2. Will the Sikhs be allowed in the future to bring their wives into Canada?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.
2. The matter is receiving consideration.

COAL FOR INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have tenderers been called for the supply of coal for 1912 for the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway?
2. If so, when was the last day for receiving said tenders?
3. How many tenders were received, and who were the tenderers?
4. For what quantities did each company or person tender?
5. What was the price per ton offered by each tenderer?
6. Have any tenders been accepted? If so, what ones and what are the amounts and prices, respectively?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. January 29, 1912.
3. Tenders not dealt with.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. Answered by No. 3.
6. Answered by No. 3.

SALARY OF DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

* Mr. CRUISE:

1. What is the present salary of the Deputy Minister of Justice?
2. Since what date has he been receiving his present salary?
3. Is he allowed, in addition, to practise as a lawyer apart from his official duties?
4. Has he, since October 10, 1911, been paid large sum in addition to his salary for work done for the government?
5. If so, what amount has been paid to him?
6. When was said sum paid and for what service?
7. On what date was the order in council passed authorizing said payment?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. $7,000.
2. April 1, 1908.
3. Yes, as to briefs in appeal not conflicting with official duties, pursuant to stipulation upon appointment and ever since recognized.

4 and 5. He has been paid the sum of $9,899.24.

6. January 10, 1912. For services as solicitor and counsel in government cases down to the 4th of May, 1910—as duly certified by Sir Allen Aylesworth, then Minister of Justice, and former ministers.
7. January 9, 1912.

J. G. CHARD, INDIAN AGENT.

Mr. CRUISE:

1. Has J. G. Chard, Indian agent at Grand View, Manitoba, been dismisseed?
2. Was there any charge made against Chard? If so, by whom?
3. Was any investigation held to ascertain whether or not the charge, if any, was true?
4. Who has been appointed to fill the vacancy?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. Complaints have been made on different occasions by the department's responsible officers of Mr. Chard's unsatisfactory service.
3. The department did not consider an investigation necessary.
4. Mr. R. Tait, of Grand View.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, or other documents containing applications or requests for the establishment of a car ferry service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and of all correspondence, telegrams, reports, surveys and other documents, showing the cost of the same, and of widening the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway, together with all other information available as to the desirability or necessity of said projects.—Mr. Pardee.

For a copy of all ruling or decisions made by the Minister of Customs, or the tariff board of the Department of Customs, since the 10th day of October last, in reference to the duty payable in respect to jute cloth, traction engines and partially dressed lumber, respectively; and likewise in reference to any other articles imported into Canada concerning which there has been any change in the rate of duty exacted at any time since the said date, as compared to the rate of duty exacted on such articles respectively immediately prior to said date.—Mr. Turriff.

For a return showing whether any order for goods has been given by the Department of Public Works since October 1, 1911, at Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax; tenders asked for in each case; orders for goods given without tenders; names of firms, and amounts in each case.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions or other papers relating to any change or proposed change of postmasters at Powassan between January 1, 1906, and January 1, 1912.—Mr. Arthurs.

For a copy of all documents, letters, petitions reports, recommendations, declarations, proceedings of inquiry and all other documents relating to the dismissal of Méderic Picotte as messenger of the House of Commons and the appointment of his successor, Henry Coffin.—Mr. Seguin.

For a copy of all papers, letters, orders in council and other documents respecting the superannuation of the honourable judges Sir Alexander Lacoste, J. A. Ouimet and C. J. Doherty.—Mr. Ethier.

For a copy of all correspondence, memorials or communications of any kind between the government of the province of Ontario and the Dominion government since January 1, 1908, respecting the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba or the division of the territory of Keewatin.—Mr. Meighen.

For a copy of the inquiry made by the Railway Department respecting the accident incurred by Geoffrey Bourque, of Lac au Saumon, in the yard of the Intercolonial railway, at Campbellton, in the month of November or December, 1911, also for all papers and correspondence exchanged since on the subject. —Mr. Boulay.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, reports and other documents relating to the notice of cancellation of mail contract between Scott Junction and the station in the county of Beauce.—Mr. Béland.

For a copy of all tenders, contracts, reports and other memoranda of the engineers of the Department of Public Works, orders in council, correspondence and all other documents relating to the construction of a dam for storage purposes at the foot of Lake Temiskaming.—Mr. Pugsley.

For a copy of the memorandum of Admiral Kingsmill, dated October 9, 1911, referred to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in answer to a question put to him on the 15th January, 1912.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, complaints, charges or other documents in the possession of the Department of Customs, relating to the dismissal of S. M. Ferguson, preventive officer at Oyster Ponds, Guysborough county, Nova Scotia, and relating to the appointment of a man to fill the vacancy caused by such dismissal.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all letters, complaints, charges, telegrams, petitions, memorials, orders in council or other documents in the possession or under the control of the government, relating to the dismissal of William A. Hattie, from the position of preventive officer at Mulgrave, N.S., and relating to the appointment of a man to fill the vacancy caused by such dismissal.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all correspondenec and papers in connection with the appointment and subsequent dismissal of Eugène Guimond as postmaster at St. Angéle, county of Rimouski.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all correspondence addressed to the Minister of Public Works in connection with the dismissal of George T. Harbour, superintendent of the work at the deep water wharf at Gaspé.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of the petitions forwarded to the Minister of Public Works praying for the dismissal of Michel Campeau, and the appointment of Honoré Paquette, as caretaker of the postal station in Laurier Ward, Montreal.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all papers, memorials, resolutions, letters, received from boards of trade, officials or individuals during the years 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, respecting the location of a quarantine or inspecting station on Lawlor's island, Halifax harbour.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all reports, correspondence and papers, relating to the building of a breakwater at Port Richmond, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all reports, correspondence and papers relating to the building of a breakwater at Charles Forest's Cove, Richmond county, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all documents and of all the correspondence exchanged between A. E. Doucet, district engineer, on district B of the Transcontinental railway, and of all other persons relating to the selection of sites for railway stations in the parishes of St. Damien and St. Cajetan d'Armagh, in the county of Bellechasse.—Mr. Lavallée.

For a return showing all the contracts for the conveyance of His Majesty's mails, in which notice of cancellation has been given under the terms of the said contract, between October 10, 1911, and February 1, 1912, and also the name and address of each contractor and the amount of each contract.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all documents, papers, inquiries, letters, &c., relating to the dismissal of Thomas Dionne, as postmaster of Cacouna, also the dismissal of Miss Saindon, of Cacouna, and the reinstallation of the said Thomas Dionne in the post office at Cacouna.—Mr. Gauvreau.

For a copy of all reports, correspondence and papers relating to the building of the Saint John Valley railway from St. John to Grand Falls, New Brunswick.—Mr. Michaud.

RURAL TELEPHONE SYSTEMS.

On the notice of motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, wher-

ever a telephone system exists, or is hereafter established, in any rural section of Canada, a telephone should be placed in each post office in such sections by the Post Office Department.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would not care to go on with the discussion of this important question in the absence of the hon. Postmaster General. I would, therefore, ask that it be allowed to stand.

STEAM TRAWLING.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved:

For a copy of all letters, memorials or other documents in the hands or under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries or any department of the government, relating to any action taken on a resolution of the House passed the 6th day of February, 1911, relating to the prohibition of steam trawling on the coast of Canada outside of Canadian waters; also a copy of all departmental instructions, memoranda and reports relating thereto.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or in his absence, that of the Prime Minister, to the importance of dealing with this question. On the 6th of February of last year I had the honour to move in this House a resolution in regard to this matter, as follows:

That in the opinion of this House, as the mode of fishing known as steam trawling, prosecuted by ships of different nationalities on the coast of Canada outside Canadian waters, is destructive to fish life, it is expedient, in order to conserve the deep sea fisheries, that negotiations be opened with the view of securing an international agreement prohibiting steam trawling on such fishing grounds for deep sea fish, as the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the banks of the North Atlantic adjacent to the coasts of Canada and Newfoundland.

That resolution was passed by the House, last session and I understand that negotiations were opened by the late government with certain foreign powers and with the British government, looking towards some action which would carry out the views expressed in that resolution. The late government did considerable in the way of discouraging this mode of fishing on the Canadian coasts. Very shortly after the first trawlers appeared on the coasts of Canada, an order in council was passed prohibiting steam trawlers from fishing in Canadian waters, which of course include all the bays, harbours and coast lines of Canada on both the Atlantic and the Pacific. It is contended by the fishermen that this mode of fishing is very disastrous to their interests and very destructive of fish life. The facts in relation to the question were laid pretty fully before the House in the discussion which took place last year, so that I do not intend to repeat them. However, the step to which I have alluded was taken by the late government to prohibit that mode of fishing in Canadian waters.

Mr. BORDEN. On what date was that done?

Mr. SINCLAIR. In the summer of 1908; I have not the exact date. Another step was taken a little later. It was discovered that under the old regulations steam trawlers were entitled to share in the fishing bounty given to Canadian fishermen, and an amendment was passed prohibiting this. My principal object in drawing attention to the matter to-day is to press on the present administration the great importance of it, and to express the hope that they may carry on the negotiations which were commenced by the late government, and may arrive at some means of restricting or if possible prohibiting this mode of fishing in Canadian waters.

Mr. BORDEN. The subject to which the hon. gentleman has alluded engaged the attention of the House on more than one occasion. I did not quite gather from him what negotiations have been in progress with respect to the prohibition of such methods of fishing outside of Canadian waters. With whom were the negotiations, and what negotiations were in progress?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is what I am trying to find out. Of course I do not know because the documents are in the possession of the government.

Mr. BORDEN. I thought my hon. friend spoke of certain negotiations, and would like to know what negotiations he had in mind. Does the difficulty complained of arise altogether with the fishermen of the United States or with those of other countries as well?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I read a statement made by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), to the effect that the matter had been taken up with the United States and France. I think that statement was made at the Imperial Conference. I am not sure that we have any right to the production of the papers. In fact I have been told by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), that it would be irregular to produce them, and my only object at present is to draw attention to the matter.

Mr. HAZEN. In consequence of the motion of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), I had a little statement prepared which, perhaps, may be of some benefit, with regard to the effects of

steam trawling in different parts of the world. The correspondence in the hands of the government is of a confidential character, and consequently it would be impossible to lay it before the House without the consent of the British government. If there be any correspondence which is not of that character, I should have no objection to bringing it down, but I am informed by my department that there is none. This question as to the effect of steam trawling on the fisheries is a debatable one. As hon. members are aware, regulations have been passed under which steam trawling is prohibited within the three mile limit. Outside that limit, the matter is one for international consideration. The statement is as follows:

Whether or not steam trawling is an unduly destructive method of fishing is a question on which there always has been a strong division of opinion on the European side of the ocean. As it is revolutionary in its character, this was to be expected; but notwithstanding the very strong opposition that has been exerted against it, steam trawling has been continually developing and is rapidly replacing other modes of catching demersal fishes.

The arguments used against steam trawling are mainly:

(a) The destruction of set lines or hand trawls, by being carried away by the net or hauling ropes attached to it, from the steamer;

(b) The ruin of the spawning grounds;

(c) The capture of great quantities of immature fish, which being useless for market, are thrown away.

So far as (a) is concerned, there is no question but that the fishermen have much to fear if their gear is set in the track of steam trawlers, and it was to afford them all possible protection that steam trawling has been prohibited within the three mile limit all round our coasts. On many parts of the coast the inshore fishermen go out even ten or twelve miles from land, and there the trawlers are free to act; but while the fishermen are apprehensive, information of the carrying away of their gear by the trawlers that have been operating from Canada, has never reached the department. It of course may be that they will not take the risk of setting their hand trawls when they know that steam trawlers are operating in the locality.

With reference to (b) there is much misapprehension, as none of the fish caught by trawlers spawn at the bottom of the ocean. The eggs of these fishes are lighter than the water and float on or near the surface, so that steam trawling really does not injure the spawning areas.

With regard to (c) it does not pay to catch unmarketable fish. There are here and there around the coast, areas which might be called 'nurseries' to which young fish resort in large numbers, and steam trawling at such places would doubtless result in the capture of great quantities of immature fish; but as it is marketable fish that are being sought, these areas would be avoided by the trawling skippers when once located.

While it is a fact that owing to the innovation of steam trawling, whole fishing villages have been wiped out along the Scottish shores, this does not indicate that fewer people are now engaged in connection with the fisheries than formerly. What has happened is that owing to the much larger and quicker landings of fish, it has been found more paying to handle them from convenient centres. Hence many of these villagers have moved to the large ports from which the trawlers operate, and though perhaps not engaged in fishing from there, are employed in handling the fish in preparing them for and sending them off to market.

While steam trawling tends to revolutionize fishing, and to replace existing methods, an unbiased examination of its results does not seem to leave room for much fear that it will result in depletion of the fisheries. In the North Sea, for instance, over 2,000 such vessels operate from Great Britain's ports alone, and not for seven or eight months in the year, but for the whole twelve. This has been going on for years; but there is no evidence of depletion of the yield. On the contrary, an ever increasing quantity is being taken. It is a fact that in some years, for causes which are generally conceded to be natural, but which are not so far explainable, there is a decrease; but possibly in the very next, the yield is bigger than ever. It will be urged that in order to keep up the supply, the trawlers are continually extending the scope of their operations. With the increasing size of steam trawlers, the perfecting of their gear, and large use of ice, it has become possible for them to go much farther from port than formerly, and for a number of years past, these vessels have been operating as far south as the coast of Morocco, as far north as the White Sea, and as far west as Iceland; but ever since 1905, at the request of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, the statistics have been collected to show the water areas from which the fish are taken, and the statement as to the yield in the North Sea is made in the light of these statistics. This sea continues to supply about 60 per cent of the total quantity of fish taken by the European trawlers.

It is somewhat remarkable how history repeats itself. In the fifties hand trawling began to be introduced. Before that time, the fish were caught with hand lines, or long lines as they are sometimes called. The line fishermen protested against hand trawling so strongly that in 1862 the Fisheries Committee of the then colonial government, expressed regret that remonstrances, through Great Britain, to the French government, against hand trawling, were unavailing, 'and recommended that representations be made to the United States, as soon as peace was restored to the nation, that this mode of fishing demanded their co-operation to abolish it.'

A report submitted to the Newfoundland House in 1862 attributed the falling off in the Newfoundland fisheries 'during three or four years past, to the system adopted by the French fishermen of using "bultows" (hand trawls) on the banks.' It was considered by these trawls the large spawn fish would be taken, thus preventing propagation. Indeed, so strong was the feeling on some parts of the coast of Canada, that such method of fishing was prohibited in territorial waters for many

years; but now this method of fishing has become general on this side of the Atlantic, and from the fishermen using it, come the objections to steam trawling.

Apart from the catching power of steam trawlers, they can be operated in practically all weathers, and thus assure a steady supply. In the past the trouble has been all along the Atlantic seaboard that in times of good weather, there was plenty of fish but in rough weather the demand could not be filled, and if a big trade in fresh fish, which is by far the most remunerative one, is to be built up a steady supply of fish must be available.

It is not a fact that the use of the steam trawlers—2 in number—that have been operating in Canada for the past few years, has lowered the price of fish to the fishermen, or has in any way interfered with their markets. Indeed, the opposite is the case. Prices have been better, and the work of the trawlers has enabled the supplying of the markets, when the inshore boats could not get out.

It is realized, however, that if many steam trawlers are shortly placed in commission on the Canadian coasts, the hand trawl and long line fishermen will find it hard to compete, and anything that the government can do to protect them, it is anxious to do. It must not be forgotten, however, that there are great obstacles in the way of an international agreement for the abolition of trawling, or even preventing their use in extensive areas. Steam trawling has already been firmly established in the United States. Six such vessels are now operating continuously from Boston, and some four or six more are being built for work from that port. Every year varying numbers of steam trawlers come over from France—last year nine—and operate from St. Pierre as a base. Since the abolition of the treaty rights of France on the coast of Newfoundland, French vessels have no reliable source of bait, and if trawling were given up, that country would largely have to go out of fishing on this side of the Atlantic.

Again, it cannot be said with assurance that trawling is unduly destructive. Ever since 1904, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, which is made up of some of the best scientific authorities of Great Britain, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Russia, Norway and Sweden, has been investigating the matter; but has been unable to agree to advise against such method of fishing. It will, therefore, be seen that it is impossible to turn to any government which has taken action to prevent such trawling except in limited inshore areas, and Canada has gone farther than any other, by prohibiting trawling in all its territorial waters.

The House will see the very great difficulties in the way of this country getting any agreement entered into with other countries for the prevention of steam trawling in the international waters. It is a firmly established institution in Great Britain, in the United States, and in other countries and under these circumstances it will be very difficult for Canada, standing practically alone in regard to the matter, to secure an international arrangement under which trawling would be prevented in international waters outside the three-mile limit. It is being prevented within the three-mile limit which is the most we can do of ourselves. Negotiations have been entered into with a view of bringing about some international arrangements, but so far those negotiations have not been successful. If possible a conference will certainly be brought about, but I do not speak with any very great hope of this.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). What does the minister say about passing a regulation prohibiting the landing of fish caught by steam trawlers in the harbours of Canada? Would that not go a long way towards stopping this method of fishing?

Mr. HAZEN. Most of the steam trawlers at present operating, land their fish in the United States for United States markets.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Two were operating on the coast of Nova Scotia last year and landing fish at Canso.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Operating off Antigonish county.

Mr. HAZEN. While the subject is practically a new one to me, it is well worthy of consideration, and I shall consult with the officials especially charged with the duty of protecting the fisheries with a view to protecting the interests of our fishermen.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am afraid the minister has not realized the great importance of this question to the fishermen. Holding the views that he does in regard to it I would be afraid he would not take any very extreme or active steps in order to prohibit this mode of fishing in Canadian waters. I would refer the minister to a discussion which took place last year when proofs were adduced that this mode of fishing is really destructive to fish life, and that it is impossible for the line and net fishermen to carry on business in the same waters with a steam trawler. I would not like to accept the theory that steam trawling has not injured the fishing in the North Sea. My view is that it has. Investigations have been held in Great Britain and there is a great deal of literature on the question. The British government have gone so far as to employ trawlers of their own to operate in the North Sea and have tabulated the results, showing the large quantities of small and immature fish caught by the trawlers that had to be thrown overboard because they were too small to be placed on the market. Evidence of that kind was placed on 'Hansard' last session.

This mode of fishing has only commenced in the United States. The theory prevailed for many years that the bottom of the sea on the coasts of the United States

and Canada were too rough to enable trawlers to operate in our waters. Only a few days ago I received a copy of a resolution moved by Mr. Gardner, of Massachusetts, in the Congress at Washington in regard to this matter. The resolution reads:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

1. That the Commissioner of Fisheries be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to make an investigation into the method of fishing known as beam trawling and to report to Congress whether or not this method of fishing is destructive to the fish species or is otherwise harmful or undesirable.

Sec. 2. That in the event that the Commissioner of Fisheries finds this method of fishing to be destructive, harmful, or undesirable he shall recommend to Congress such legislation as he may deem necessary.

Sec. 3. That an appropriation is hereby authorized for carrying into effect the provisions of this resolution.

Thus it will be seen that this is a live question in the United States, and in Washington last year I found a great deal of interest taken in it by members of Congress representing districts along the coast. As far as I could judge the sympathy was altogether in favour of standing by the shore fishermen and prohibiting trawling altogether on the coast of the United States. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) will continue the correspondence that has been opened with Washington, he will find a good deal of sympathy there in regard to the abolition of this mode of fishing on the coast. It is only now when it is commencing that it can be stopped. If it is true that it has been destructive in the North sea, it should certainly be stopped here before it becomes established, and before large amounts of capital are invested in it.

I do not wish to make this a controversial question, although certain members of the opposition last year—now on the Speaker's right did endeavour to raise trouble about it in that way; but I will say to my hon. friend that if he can devise any means of dealing with this question, I feel that I can say for my colleagues on this side of the House that he will have their cordial support.

FISHERY PROTECTION SERVICE ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (Comox-Atlin) moved:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence and reports between Capt. Newcombe and the Marine and Fishery Department, relating to the patrol and protection service for fisheries on the Pacific coast?

He said: This is not the first time that this subject has been before the House. In 1906 when I had the honour of being a member of this House, the question of the protection of the fisheries of the Dominion, and especially of the Pacific coast, was under discussion. To my mind, this is a very important question, and worthy of the most careful consideration of the House. The fisheries of this Dominion, and especially of the Pacific coast, are of exceeding value. I find that last year the fisheries of the whole Dominion were valued at $29,629,169. Of that sum the fisheries of the Pacific coast contributed $10,314,755, considerably over one-third of the total value of all the fisheries of the Dominion. What I want especially to draw attention to is the inadequate patrol service that is given on the Pacific coast, especially in British Columbia. I understand that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is fully alive to this question, and I sincerely trust that he will see that a proper protection service is placed upon that coast, sufficient to protect adequately this great national asset. I think that every hon. member of this House who is aware of the conditions will admit that there is, and has been for a number of years past, a very inadequate service provided on that coast. It was in 1904, I think, that the first urgent demand was made for a protective service. In 1906 it appears that there were 52 foreign vessels poaching in waters that rightly belong to this Dominion, and it is estimated that they made an illegal catch of 41,664,329 lbs. of fish, which is valued at 5 cents a lb. I want the House to understand that I am now especially referring to halibut fishing on that coast. The value of fish caught that I have already mentioned, is estimated at $2,083,216. In 1906 we find that over 200 foreign vessels, that is, other than British or Canadian bottoms, were poaching in those waters, and it is estimated that the average catch since then has been 65,000,000 lbs. to say nothing about the possible 20,000,000, or 25,000,000 lbs. of edible fish which are thrown away and do not reach the markets. I think these figures will convince the House of the great importance of this question, and I trust they will interest every hon. member, whether he represents a fishing district or not. It is, I say, a national asset of very great importance, which the government ought to use every endeavour adequately to protect.

Now the boats which are chartered for this fishery protective service are absolutely inadequate for the purpose. They are boats which do not make more than eight or ten knots an hour, and they are not properly equipped to cope with the up-to-date boats that are employed in the poaching business. These latter boats are well equipped with wireless, whereby they may keep in touch with each other, and are able to evade the protective service that has been paid for by this government during the last two or three years. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will

see to it that we have at least three thoroughly up-to-date steamers employed on that service, steamers which are able to make at least 15 to 18 knots an hour, thoroughly equipped with wireless, and able to cope successfully with the illegal fishing. Now I do not propose to go back and discuss the different treaties governing this fishing. I understand that the treaty of 1818 which gives us our proper rights and that it was only in 1909 that it was put into force, I think the treaty of 1818 ought to be henceforth rigorously carried out, but to my mind the service that has been employed on that coast for the last two or three years has not mended matters a particle.

Prior to that treaty being enforced our own Canadian fishermen were allowed to catch and sell bait to the foreign fishermen who were then coming into our waters. As it is now, without any protection on the coast of British Columbia, these poachers come in and immediately set about preparing their nets and other equipment to catch their own bait in our bays and inlets and with that bait they catch fish in our waters. My own personal opinion is that, with boats properly equipped, the fishery protection service should not be under the control of the navy. It should be a separate service and the officers in charge of the vessels should be guided by their own judgment and not be hampered by a command to be at a certain point at a certain time. With a proper service these foreign boats that are now poaching would be absolutely driven from our Canadian waters and put out of business. I sincerely trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that a vote is placed in the estimates for a service to assist in protecting British subjects in the enjoyment of the fisheries of our own waters. If these poachers are not allowed to fish illegally within the three mile limit, if they are driven from our bays so that they cannot clean, dress and pack their fish, they will be absolutely put out of business. It will take a good deal of money to equip a fleet of steamers for this protective service, but when you consider the importance of this great asset and the fact that British Columbia is contributing more than a third of the total product of the fisheries of this Dominion, I think you will admit that it is a service that ought to be equipped at the earliest possible moment. I have much pleasure in stating to the House that I understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is thoroughly alive to the importance of this question. There is one other matter in connection with that service which I think is very important, and that has reference to the establishment and operation of wireless telegraph stations along the coast. I understand that at the present time wireless stations are under the control of the naval service. I think it would be much better if that policy were changed and if proper wireless stations were equipped along the coast, not altogether as an aid to the fishery protection service, but from the public standpoint as well as from the protective standpoint. I do not wish to detain the House because I know that my associates from British Columba are far more conversant with this vast subject than I am. I am only speaking from the knowledge which I have gained from having resided in British Columbia, and from what I have learned as to the extent and importance of the fisheries there, and I can only repeat that I sincerely trust that this House, and especially the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will give this very important question careful consideration. If time would permit I would take up the consideration of the salmon, herring, and other fisheries of that province, but I do not propose to discuss them at the present moment. I think that many suggestions could be offered to the minister with respect to the fisheries other than the halibut fishery to which I have especially referred in my remarks.

There are many things that could be done in the interests of our own actual fishermen. The legislation which has been enforced during the last few years has operated greatly to the detriment of white, Canadian fishermen in that province and some very drastic change must be made if we want to ensure to the actual, white fisherman, the rights to which he is entitled and which he does not enjoy at the present time. It is not in the interest of this Dominion, or of the province, that Japs should engage in the fisheries in the manner in which they are now permitted to do. I could give you many reasons for that opinion, but the question is such a broad one that it would take many hours to discuss it. But, they are depriving the actual white fisherman in that province of his rights.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of a regulation prohibiting Oriental fishermen from fishing in the waters of the Pacific coast?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think I can give the hon. gentleman the information that that question will be dealt with at an early date and in a proper manner. Our actual fishermen are deprived of the rights which belong to them. I could go on and discuss many subjects outside of the Asiatic question with reference to the rights of our own white fishermen. I beleive that the large streams of the province of British Columbia should be thrown open to the actual white fisherman whereby he may save those rights which belong to him and which he does not enjoy at the present time. Li-

censes are to-day granted to actual white fishermen, but, they do not control those licenses. They are controlled by corporations, but, while I believe that vested interests should be protected, I also believe that the white fisherman, the fisherman who pulls an oar, should have the right to catch and sell fish to the canners or in the market which will give him the best value for it. He does not have that right to-day, especially in the waters of the Pacific coast. I should like to go on and discuss many other items in connection with this question, but I know that my associates who have lived in the province for many years and who are more familiar with it than I am, will have something to say with regard to it and therefore I do not propose to say very much more on the subject. I only trust that the minister will give every consideration to the remarks which I have addressed to the House this afternoon on this very important question.

Mr. GEORGE H. BARNARD (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, as this is a question in which I have taken an active interest, I would not like to have a vote taken upon the resolution without saying a word or two in corroboration of what has been stated by my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements).

He has covered all the ground so far as the question of poaching is concerned so fully that there is very little that I can add. That poaching exists and has existed for a number of years, and that it has existed unchecked can hardly be denied. It has become so open, that it is a common thing to take up a daily newspaper, published in the city of Seattle in the state of Washington, and to find there items reporting the catches taken by American vessels along the coast of British Columbia, and in particular on the coast of Vancouver island. It is also an ordinary thing to read in the American newspapers that certain vessels are being constructed for the express purpose of going into this business. It has become also common to read the reports of the officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department saying that they are unquestionably unable, with the means at their command, to cope with this abuse. It is common to find the passenger steamers engaged in the coasting trade along the shores of British Columbia coming into port and reporting that they had seen here and there in the different ports along the coast numbers of American vessels using Canadian harbours. It was stated on one occasion, I remember, by the captain of one of these coasting vessels, that the lights of the American fishing schooners in one of the ports of Vancouver island seemed like the lights in the streets of a city. In addition to this, the poachers have become so bold that last year they actually at the point of the rifle drove the men off the Canadian salmon traps and stole the fish. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a nice sort of thing for Canadians to contemplate. Of course, altogether apart from the wasteful methods of these poachers, it puts the people of the province of British Columbia and the people of the whole Dominion in a humiliating position to think that they have a valuable asset in the fisheries of that coast which they are unable to protect. I may say, apropos of the wasteful methods of these poachers that it is a fact that in numbers of cases the halibut beds are being rapidly depleted and that the average size of the fish has dropped from about one hundred pounds to twenty pounds. Now so far as I can ascertain there have been no efforts on the part of the government of Canada to protect the Pacific coast fisheries. The steamer 'Kestrel' which has now been scrapped was until last summer the vessel upon which the department directly relied for the prevention of this poaching. Well, Mr. Speaker, you might as well try to catch a canary bird by putting salt on its tail as to try to catch one of these gasoline poachers with the 'Kestrel.' During the past six or seven years there have been I think, only three or four of these vessels caught, notwithstanding the fact that poaching has become a regular line of trade, in the neighbourhood of the city of Seattle, and the ports of Puget Sound, in British Columbia waters. About two years ago a vessel called the 'Levi Woodbury,' was seized and condemned, and I am advised on pretty good authority that she was afterwards released by the late government on payment of a fine of $50, because the vessel was reported to be owned by a friend of the then administration. In addition to the 'Kestrel' there are one or two small boats engaged for the ostensible purpose of preventing poaching, and there have been from time to time a couple of whaling boats chartered in addition to a boat called the 'William Joliffe,' but all of these are absolutely unfit for the purpose they are intended for. Since 1907, the year it may be remembered before the general election, there has been an appropriation annually in the estimates for the building of a fishery protection cruiser, but no fishery protection cruiser has ever materialized. The late administration seemed to be somewhat of the opinion that that item in the estimates was going to prevent our American friends from taking the fish, but curiously enough it has not had that effect. Now, Mr, Speaker, I want to say to this House that these fisheries are worth protecting. Professor Prince has made a report on the Pacific coast fisheries, in which he says they are probably the finest fisheries belonging to any one country anywhere in the world. He also says that they

are unique in regard to the fact that they are wholly within protected waters, and that they can be operated with more safety and less loss of life than is experienced in connection with the fisheries on the Atlantic coast. That shows, Sir, that these fisheries are an asset which it is well worth our while protecting. I venture to say that the cost of properly protecting these fisheries will be more than amply repaid by the saving to the country in the fish which would otherwise be poached. I am glad to see that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has provided in the estimates for this year for the building of two or more cruisers. I would like to impress on him the absolute necessity there is for getting these cruisers into commission as soon as possible. I would also suggest to him that these cruisers be built in the province of British Columbia, if that can be done. I do not see any reason why they should not be built in that province. We find that the Canadian Pacific railway, and other large concerns are building vessels in British Columbia, and there can be no reason why the Dominion government should not also do so. It may be said that it would cost a little more to build a vessel on the Pacific coast than in this part of Canada. I would point out that the late administration did not find that an objection, for they were committed to the principle of encouraging shipbuilding in Canada even though they had to pay more than if the ships were built in the old country. In connection with their naval policy, when they called for tenders for the ships it was provided that they should be built in Canada, although they would probably cost thirty per cent more than if built in England. If it is a good thing for Canada that we should pay this increased cost for the benefit of having ships built on the Atlantic coast, it would be equally good for the country to have these ships built on the Pacific coast, so as to establish the industry there, even though they should cost fifty per cent more. I trust the minister will at a very early date give out the contracts for these fishery protection cruisers, and that when he does so he will endeavour to have them built in British Columbia.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements), for bringing this question before the House. It is a very important and burning question on the Pacific coast. We have felt very keenly the inattention and negligence of the former administration in regard to our deep-sea fisheries, and wish to take advantage of this opportunity to place ourselves on record, as supporters of the government, in favour of adequate protection for those fisheries. The natural physical features of the Pacific coast lend themselves to the abuse of this great industry, particularly to poaching. At the present time poaching is carried on to such an extent that we might almost as well have our fisheries under the control of our American friends in Puget Sound. Between two and three hundred American boats leave Puget Sound constantly to fish in our waters, whereas our own fishermen have only six or seven. This could not be, but for the fact that, by our policy, we permit American fishermen to receive shelter, to purchase bait, to clean their fish, and to do other things necessary to the life of the industry. Were we to enforce the law as it should be enforced, very few of these boats could fish in our waters, because they would be too far from their ports to carry on the business successfully. As you know, it is necessary for the fishing boats, especially those engaged in the halibut industry, to go into harbour to put their fish in shape, owing to the stormy nature of the sea. This great fishing industry of the Pacific coast belongs peculiarly to the Canadian people, and I believe our laws should be enforced in such a way as to protect the interests of our own people in that industry. Reference has already been made to the kind of protection we have at present. We have two old boats, the 'Quadra' and the 'Kestrel,' which are the laughing stock of the fishing people of the Pacific coast. They never were adequate, they never had any speed, they have never been able to catch up to the average fishing boat on the coast. Consequently, as years went by, the American fishermen came to ignore entirely the presence of these fishery cruisers, or protectors, as they are falsely called. What we require on the Pacific coast is at least three fairly large fishery cruisers of a type similar to that of the American fishing boats, of 100 tons burden, and of a speed of at least 15 knots an hour. If we had boats of that type it would not be long before the poachers would find their business to be so unprofitable that they would leave our fisheries alone. We should also have stationed at all the harbours along the coast, where these American boats are wont to come, a number of officials who could advise the cruisers what boats had been illegally in any of these harbours. It would cost very little to have these officials, and I recommend it to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There are men living at these harbours who have other means of support, and who would be willing, for $12 or $15 a month, to watch these American poachers, and give information concerning them. This fishery protection service should be placed under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the fishery superintendent. I understand that at the present time it is under

the Canadian Naval Department. Without any desire to reflect too severely on the hon. gentlemen opposite who inaugurated the Canadian navy, I think I speak the sentiments of the people of the Pacific coast when I say, that the Canadian navy is regarded there as a joke, and I do not think that department should administer the fishery protection service. I think it would be far better administered directly under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries through his superintendents, who understand the requirements of the business. I would like to impress on the House the importance of this question. We are in the habit, in the eastern part of Canada, of regarding the resources of our country, which lie at considerable distances from the centres of population and activity as so remote as to be worthy of very little attention. I wish to tell this House that the fishery industry on the Pacific coast is of vital importance to the whole Dominion of Canada, and not simply as a source of revenue to the country. As we have pointed out, our fisheries in British Columbia produced last year over $10,000,000. To give some idea of the growth of the industry, I will give some figures of the product of the fisheries of Canada and British Columbia, respectively, at different periods:

	Canada.	British Columbia.
1876	$11,000,000	$105,000
1889	21,000,000	5,300,000
1906	29,000,000	10,000,000

Had our policy been such as to conserve the fisheries of the Pacific coast, I believe that their product would have reached the value to-day of $20,000,000. There is no question in my mind that, within the next five years, the value of this product will easily double, especially in view of the fact that, as I understand, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is inclined seriously to take this question up and deal with it on its merits.

I wish to draw attention briefly to a most remarkable change which has come over the personnel of the fishermen of the Pacific coast. Ten or twelve years ago that business was carried on almost exclusively by white men and a few Indians. In 1889 there were between 9,000 and 10,000 white men and Indians, mostly white men, engaged in the business. At the present time it is a rare thing to see a white man working at it.

On the contrary, we have upwards of 10,000 Japanese engaged in this business. I submit, Sir, that it is an outrage to the people of Canada that such a condition should have been allowed to develop under our very eyes. Yet it is the direct result of the immigration policy we have had under the late administration during the recent years. Possibly people in the east may think that this is an insignificant matter but I would point out to them the fact that this industry, one of the most prosperous in the Dominion, has practically passed entirely into the hands of aliens, and these aliens belong to a race which is making great progress in their home land, and is developing one of the most progressive foreign policies of any nation in the world. All you have to do is to take a map, and examine the centres of activity of the Japanese, and you will find that their activities extend from Japan, around the north by the Aleutian islands, down the Pacific coast of British Columbia, Oregon and California, thence through Mexico to the South American continent. Wherever any commercial advancement is to be gained, you will find the Japanese. I have no quarrel with them for extending their business activities, but the people of British Columbia have been protesting during many years, and are protesting even more seriously to-day, against our government allowing these people to invade our shores and take control of one of the most profitable industries we have at present. Just see the effect of this influx on the life of British Columbia. If we have not sufficient white labour to take hold of this fishing industry, and other lines of business, it is because the class of people from whom we should draw that labour has been kept out of our country by the immigration laws we have had in force the last fifteen years which permit the immigration of Orientals. Take the fish-curing industry, under proper conditions that ought to be carried on by the boys and young men growing up in the families of white fishermen, but as that supply is to-day lacking, we are obliged to call in the assistance of Japanese and other Orientals. The same thing applies to other lines. Take the domestic help problem, you have all no doubt heard of the scarcity of domestic help on the Pacific coast. What is the reason? It is because the class of people from whom we otherwise would draw our domestic help has been kept out of the country and we have become entirely dependent on these Orientals. And what is to become of our merchant marine, if we allow this condition to continue? Hitherto we have drawn the masters of our vessels sailing into the port of Vancouver largely from the families of fishermen in the maritime provinces. It is from that source that we have obtained the captains, mates and sailors of vessels in our merchant marine. But, under our immigration policy, instead of our encouraging the building up of a class of people from whom we could draw our seamen for our commercial marine, we are encouraging an alien race, from which we can never expect to get the class of men best fitted to command and man our vessels, and we

shall be dependent on a class on whom we can never rely, and who cannot fail to be a detriment to our Canadian interests in time of need. Hon. gentlemen opposite have advanced a policy of building up in Canada the nucleus of a Canadian navy? We have heard hon. members from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick tell us that the fishing industry on the Atlantic coast was in a most deplorable condition. That on the Pacific coast is in a still worse condition, and it is being monopolized by aliens. Consequently we have no white men brought up on the sea and competent to man our vessels, and have to depend on boys taken from the interior who never saw the sea. And, of course, you cannot expect 'land-lubbers' to make good seamen. Recently the 'Rainbow' cast anchor in the harbour of Comox and had not sufficient men to lift it again; most of them having deserted. You cannot expect boys, who have never seen the sea, to take willingly to it. As far as a Canadian navy is concerned, I am opposed to the policy of the late administration, but I would ask hon. members opposite where they expected to get men to man their navy, unless they were going to depend on Admiral Togo to run their navy department and have their cruisers manned by Japanese. That would be the only solution, under the policy of the late administration.

Not only has the immigration policy which we have followed with regard to Asiatics been most injurious to our country, but we have had, under the late administration, any amount of political jugglery in the handling of licenses. It is notorious that licenses were granted on the Pacific coast for $50 each to individuals who had no claim to them except on the ground that they were political friends of the party in power. And these favoured individuals resold those licenses at $1,500 to Japanese, or they would go into partnership with Japanese fishermen and share in the profits. It was high time indeed that such political jugglery was stopped.

Another point to which I wish to draw attention is this. In order to give the Japanese the right to obtain fishing and other licenses, a system of naturalization was inaugurated on the Pacific coast. Under which any lawyer could go into court with a list of Japanese names, and take out naturalization papers by the wholesale. Yet, at that very time, these aliens still retained their allegiance to the Mikado of Japan. If we are serious in granting these naturalization papers, we must also grant the right to vote; but I would not like to stand up at any meeting in British Columbia and advocate giving the franchise to the Japanese or any other Orientals. Every hon. member will agree with me that it would be most inadvisable to give these Orientals, who are alien to us in every respect, any voice in our politics. You give them the naturalization papers, you would not dare to give them the vote, you simply give them the naturalization papers to enable them to get control of our natural resources which belong to our own citizens. The whole thing is a contradiction and the method and the policy of the late government has been condemned by their own procedure.

In 1889 the canners paid for fish on the Fraser river, 25 cents a fish, and canned salmon sold for 3 tins for a quarter, or at least 2 for a quarter. In 1909, 10 years later, the fishermen were paid 10 and 12 cents per fish and canned salmon sold at 20 cents a tin. Some people will argue that the canner on the Pacific coast cannot afford to pay the fishermen a price which will induce white men to fish. I say that is absolutely false and these figures I have quoted prove it. To say that the canners cannot afford to pay white fishermen is absolute twaddle of the most ridiculous kind.

We should have, as far as possible, free trade in fishing licenses on the Pacific coast. I do not think we should create a monopoly of the fishing business. Take, for instance, the herring fishery. Only a certain number of licenses are issued at $50 a license, with the result that these licenses are farmed out and sold for from $1,000 to $1,500. In other words, you create a monopoly of exceedingly great value. I believe the Minister of Marine should control the issuing of these licenses in such a way that the government would get the unearned increment if there is any; there should be a royalty on the licenses which would bring the government a handsome revenue. If that license is worth $1,500 to a man on the Pacific coast it is worth $1,500 to the Dominion government. Any benefit of this kind should accrue to the state and not to some political heeler.

Let us take the halibut fishery. I intimated that halibut was one of the most profitable classes of fishing we had, and yet it is one from which our fishermen on the Pacific coast derive the least advantage. I read from the Year Book of the British Columbia government which, I think, is accurate on these matters. It says:

> The halibut industry on the Pacific coast had its inception about 20 years ago, and for many years it languished, as there was but a limited local demand and the existing means of transport did not permit shipment to the eastern markets which, moreover, were then well supplied from the Atlantic fisheries. But conditions changed, the centres of population moved westward, the Atlantic catch declined, the cold storage system and fast freight service came into use, and Pacific halibut became a leading feature in the fresh fish markets of the east. On the Pacific

coast, the history of the industry is reversed, for the production rose from 6,877,640 pounds in 1899, to 21,706,000 pounds in 1909, over twelve times the total Atlantic catch. The bulk of the halibut fishing is done by vessels outfitted at Seattle and Tacoma, in the State of Washington, but a great deal of their fishing is done in Canadian water, notably in Hecate strait.

It is a disputed point between the Canadian and American authorities whether Hecate strait is neutral or Canadian water. We claim it is Canadian water. But the Dominion government some years ago granted a privilege to the New England Fish Company, an American corporation, which practically admits that Hecate strait is neutral or open water. They granted to this company the privilege of shipping its fish through Canadian ports in bond to the eastern markets. The reason the New England Fish Company wanted that privilege was, that if they could run into Vancouver they were fifteen hours nearer the American market than at Seattle. This is a great advantage. It will be realized at once that in the transportation of fresh fish this is an advantage that should be reserved to the Canadian people to whom it by right belongs. It has been claimed by supporters of the late government that this concession was distinctly an advantage to Vancouver. I contend it is not because this fishing company have been able to control the market to such an extent that the Canadian fishermen have not been able to go into the fishing business in Vancouver. I will explain how this is brought about. When the New England Fish Company bring fish into Vancouver the choice fish is shipped to the American markets, but in fishing for heavy fish, like halibut, there is always some soft or bruised fish which it is impossible to ship to the eastern market, these fish are dumped on the local market. Hon. members will say that, according to the regulations, they are not permitted to sell in Vancouver or on the local market. To overcome that they place these inferior fish in cars, and bill them out to Bellingham. But in many cases the cars would not leave Vancouver. The freight and duty would be paid and then they would be sold in the market at Vancouver as A-1 fish. In some cases, these fish are actually sent out of the country, but they are shipped back in the same cars. This practice has gone on for many years. If this privilege had not been granted to the New England Fish Company, Canadian companies would have sprung up who could have shipped fish through as the New England Fish Company does to the markets on the Atlantic coast. It is true they would have had to pay a duty of a cent a pound on going into the American markets, but my contention is that the natural advantage we enjoy on the Pacific coast, if the laws were enforced, would more than offset the one cent a pound duty. We have a great natural advantage in having our harbours 15 hours nearer the market, and this more than offsets the handicap of a one-cent per pound duty. So I say that the regulation or privilege that was extended to the New England Fish Company is inimical to the best interests of the Canadian fishermen on the Pacific coasts, and I trust that the Minister of Marine and the present government will see their way clear to cancel that permit and to secure a more thorough enforcement of the laws on the Pacific coast.

I wish to say a few words on the whaling industry of the Pacific coast. This is also a most profitable industry. I am quite aware that whaling must be carried on on the high seas, but if whales can be caught contiguous to a whaling station, it stands to reason, they can be handled more profitably than if they had to be carried several hundreds or thousands of miles. On the Pacific coast we have had considerable returns from the whaling in-industry. I have here in this report of the British Columbia government, a recommendation to which I would call the attention of the Dominion government.

Whalers, operating in the sea of Japan and Behring sea, do a considerable trade in whale meat, which is extensively used for food in Japan. Instead of converting the 'beef' into fertilizer it is salted and in this form commands a better price. The importation of whale meat into Japan amounts to over two million pounds annually, representing a value of over $50,000. Pickled whales' tails are estimated a delicacy in Japan, and large quantities are shipped from this coast.

About two-thirds of the whales captured are cow-whales, either with suckling calves, or with young unborn, the females being broader across the body and slower in movement, as well as yielding more oil, are more easily captured than the males.

This and the fact that whales are hunted at all seasons, should induce the authorities to adopt reasonable restrictive measures for the preservation of these valuable creatures. The indiscriminate slaughter of whales in the North sea, the Atlantic, and Gulf of St. Lawrence, has practically destroyed the industry in those waters, and without protection the same thing is likely to occur on this coast.

I am informed by men who live on the coast that the practice prevails of capturing the young calf whale, harpooning and anchoring it at the shore, and waiting till the mother whale comes up, seeking its release, when both are slaughtered together. I say that is a practice absolutely inhuman and should not be tolerated in a civilized country. If this whaling industry is going

to last for any time it must be conserved. I am told that the profits from whaling amounts to from twenty to forty per cent. Now it can easily be seen that in consequence of such methods the whaling industry in a few years will be totally extinct. I trust the present government will take these things into consideration, and if it be necessary to do so, take the question up with other nations who are interested, and see that the whaling industry on the Northern Pacific coast is adequately protected, and that such inhuman and unreasonable methods of fishing, as I have described, should be put a stop to. From every standpoint the fishing industry is one that the government should endeavour to conserve, both from the standpoint of revenue, and the standpoint of building up a population on the Pacific coast which will constitute a bulwark for the Dominion of Canada. For the prairie provinces it is essential that they should have a port on the Pacific coast, if their development is going to be what they hope it will be. If the Pacific coast is going to be of any use to Canada then it must be under the direct control and dominance of our own countrymen, people of our own race and sentiment, of our own religion, morals and national ideas. I do not think that we should any longer permit the present condition to obtain, and continue to issue licenses to Japanese and Chinese, thereby fostering a policy which has already proved most suicidal to the fisheries. It is necessary for our future welfare that we build up on the Pacific coast a population which will be a credit to Canada, and a bulwark to this Dominion; and permit me to say in conclusion, that I think the time is not far distant when the Dominion and the empire will need a bulwark on the Pacific coast.

Mr. F. H. SHEPHERD (Nanaimo). I have no hesitation in endorsing every word that has been uttered by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard). They laid great stress upon the fact of the inadequate patrol of the fisheries on the Pacific coast. I am credibly informed that when the present patrol is out of sight, on the south and west coasts of Vancouver island, which is partly in my constituency, no less than from 200 to 300 vessels of various descriptions are waiting to enter the protected zone and to poach in our Canadian fisheries. I am pleased to hear that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has consented to a very substantial appropriation for the establishment of an efficient patrol service for the protection of our fisheries. I might also add that it would serve a very good purpose on the west coast of Vancouver Island, which is known probably as the most disastrous locality to the mercantile marine on the Pacific coast, and which has become known as the graveyard of the mercantile business—I say that an efficient patrol service might well be used as an aid to the present life-saving service. My friends and colleagues from British Columbia have pretty well covered the ground, but there is one thing I would like to draw attention of hon. members to. It is not the salmon fisheries or the larger fisheries in which I am particularly interested, but it is the herring fishery. The town of Nanaimo my home town is the home of the herring industry, and I regret to say that this industry is entirely in the hands of Japanese fishermen. I want also, to criticise the method of issuing licenses which has been heretofore in vogue for herring fisheries, and which has been much abused. I am credibly informed, although this is a hard matter to prove, that licenses given to white people have been farmed out to Japanese fishermen for a consideration, ranging all the way from $750 to $1,500. As I say, this is difficult to prove, but it is generally believed to be a fact. It is an easy matter for the white man who has got a license to establish, at least ostensibly a half interest or otherwise with Japanese fishermen. After the 21st of September last when I was elected to represent the constituency of Nanaimo, I was requested to thoroughly investigate the question of issuing licenses for the herring fisheries. I did so in conjunction with the local inspector, and we made a thorough investigation into the method of issuing licenses. The result of that investigation was to convince me that the process at present in vogue has resulted in a great number of these licenses being transferred from white men to Japanese in an illicit manner, and consequently I recommended that these licenses should be refused to other than bona fide operators which has accordingly been done. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has this matter in hand will carefully look into the matter and see that this scandal with regard to the issuing of fishery licenses is removed. I am of the opinion which has been expressed by the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements), that these fishery licenses should be given to the actual fishermen themselves and only to them. Fish is the people's food and should be as free as the air. At present the licenses fall into the hands of corporations and combinations of capitalists, so that the poor fishermen stand but a slim chance of gaining a livelihood out of the fishing industry. I believe it is contrary to the British fishery law to refuse a license to any applicant offering to pay the fee. I will quote a few words from the British Fishery Act of 1865, which I do not think has been since amended in any way so as to alter the principle laid down.

All persons demanding to purchase licenses, and tendering to any person appointed by the board to distribute the same the amount of license duty to be paid under the provisions of this Act, shall be entitled to receive the same without any question or objection whatsoever.

Now, is there any reason why such a permit or license should be withheld from our fishermen on the Pacific coast, or anywhere else? Reverting to the question of the patrol, some of my colleagues from British Columbia have dwelt more particularly upon the need of better prevention against poaching in our waters. But we have another patrol, which is the inside patrol, whose duty it is to deal with the offenders against the stipulations of the Fishery Act. In my town of Nanaimo there is stationed the patrol 'Alcedo,' which has a speed of about 8 knots an hour, while every Japanese fishing launch in that harbour has a greater speed, and every one of those launches is fitted up with powerful searchlights. One of these launches always remains constantly in sight of the 'Alcedo,' and when the 'Alcedo' gets up steam for the purpose of going out to patrol the fisheries, by a system of telegraphy and signals the news is flashed to every other launch in the vicinity. It follows, consequently, that as the government patrol is a slow boat, comparatively, she is unable to overtake the illicit poaching vessels. I believe that the government patrol vessels should be obliged to carry a searchlight, but in point of fact she has none; and when we referred the matter to the proper authorities we were simply told that a searchlight was not necessary. I think that not only is a searchlight necessary, but that the patrol, both inside and outside, should be of such speed that no other fishing vessel should be allowed to get away, and evade the law in this manner. With regard to persons to whom the licenses should issue, I am of opinion that every man who pulls an oar should be granted a license, and should have an opportunity of disposing of his fish in the best market and at the best obtainable price. Now the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) put a question to the hon. member from Comox-Atlin, and while I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if it is permissible for one member to answer a question put to another member, I would assure the hon. member from Guysborough that as far as I am concerned I would have no hesitation whatever in stating that I certainly would eliminate the Orientals from the fishing industry. Now the question of naturalizing the Japanese into British subjects and giving them the rights of citizenship will doubtless present some difficulties, if we are going to eliminate them from the fishing industry. However, I go so far as to say that not only in the fishing industry, but in every other industry of British Columbia where the Japanese or other Orientals enter into competition with our own workers, and notwithstanding anything in international law or international agreement, it is manifestly unfair to allow these Orientals to enter into competition with our white men.

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to say a word or two with regard to the Oriental question.

There is no quid pro quo. Our own people cannot engage in the fisheries or enter into any other industry in Japan or India. Therefore, the advantage is clearly on the side of the Asiatic and the present system is manifestly unfair to our own workers. I sincerely trust that the members of this House, will, without regard to party politics, endeavour to frame laws for this country such as will eventually tend to a white Canada. I do not know that I have anything further to say. The Oriental question will probably come up before this House at an early date and I shall then have more to say on the subject, but in the meantime I am thoroughly in accord with the sentiments which have been expressed here this afternoon. I trust that hon. members on both sides of this House will give us their support in our endeavour to eliminate some of the disadvantages under which our people are labouring on the Pacific coast.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon). Mr. Speaker, this is a question in which I am very much interested. I represent a territory adjoining the riding which is represented by my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements), and we derive our fish from the waters that lave the shores of northern British Columbia. I am informed by men who are competent to give an opinion that there are to-day in Hecate straits the most valuable halibut fisheries not only in Canada, but in the world, and if that is so—and I believe it is so—we have there a perennial asset which, it strikes me, it would be well for us as Canadians to conserve. The evidence which has been presented here this afternoon by gentlemen who represent constituencies in British Columbia is to the effect that American fishermen are invading our northern waters and taking the fish which are rightfully ours. Up to the present time we have not protected the fisheries in British Columbia. The fisheries of our country form an asset which, I think, has never been properly valued and the fisheries of the Pacific coast have not been properly investigated or protected. That is shown by the fact that the size of the halibut has been reduced from 100 pounds to 20 pounds as was mentioned by one hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon. That is a strik-

ing fact. If, in the few years which have elapsed since the fisheries in British Columbia began to be exploited, the size of the halibut has decreased from 100 pounds, it is a striking illustration of how these fisheries are being depleted. We are building the Transcontinental railway which has its Pacific terminals at Prince Rupert and nearly opposite are the valuable fishing grounds of Hecate straits. There are to-day fish companies who are putting in large investments of capital to care for the fish which shall eventually be taken in Hecate straits and transported to western Canada. We have west of here the prairie provinces which are being populated at a very rapid rate. Those provinces have practically no fisheries of their own except those of their lakes and rivers. The result is that in a very few years we are going to have a vast fish market in Canada, and in those prairie provinces particularly, and we have beyond the range of mountains on the Pacific coast the greatest halibut fisheries to be found anywhere. It is a matter that calls for the consideration of this parliament and the consideration of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) in order to see that these valuable fisheries are conserved. What about the fisheries that surround the coasts of the British Isles? These fisheries have existed since the time the Romans invaded Britain and they are still one of the greatest assets of the British Isles because there they pay particular attention to the conservation of that great national asset. Some one mentioned here this afternoon the value of training on our maritime province coasts men who can man a merchant marine. There is no doubt in my mind that the time is not far distant when we shall have again a great merchant marine not only in the maritime provinces, as we had in years gone by, but also on the Pacific coast as well. It is an important factor in the development of the country, particularly a country like ours which has a line of seacoast on the Atlantic as well as the Pacific, that we should have men who are capable of manning such a merchant marine as I think we may reasonably hope to have in a few years. The merchant marine upon the Pacific coast has not, up to the present time, been as important a factor as we would like to have had it, but time will change that. I am glad to know that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has placed a sum in the estimates sufficient to cover the purchase of boats to protect the great fisheries like those of Hecate straits and other parts of the British Columbia coast and which represent such a great national asset.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

79½

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HAZEN. The House must have listened with pleasure and profit to the discussion we have had in regard to fishery matters in the province of British Columbia, and I believe the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements) and the other gentlemen from British Columbia who have spoken in reference to this question, are entitled to the thanks of the House for the very great amount of information they have given us concerning these British Columbia fisheries. I would point out to my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements), that the motion as made would call for all letters written by Captain Newcombe upon the subject of the movements of the ship, and crew, and for all formal letters, and such a motion would cover a vast amount of correspondence. I presume that my hon. friend does not want all the papers that would be included in the scope of such a motion, and I would suggest that he let me know just what the papers are that he desires to have brought before the House, in order that there may be a time limit fixed, and then there would be no difficulty whatever in giving to my hon. friend at an early date the information he desires. I may say that the information the department has in its possession with regard to the fishery protection service in British Columbia waters is entirely in agreement with the views expressed by the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements) and other hon. gentlemen from British Columbia. There is no doubt at all that the fisheries of British Columbia are a very great national asset. The fishing industry is a growing industry on the Pacific coast, and the fisheries of that province are increasing not only along the shores of the mainland and the adjoining islands, but also on both shores of the Queen Charlotte Islands, and on the west coast of the Island of Vancouver. There is no doubt whatever but that if these fisheries are carefully preserved and wise laws enacted to that end, and these laws fairly enforced, that the fisheries of British Columbia will be an increasing source of wealth to the country for very many years to come. From biblical times down to the present, fish has largely been the food of the people whose purses are not so large or so long as those of the wealthy classes. I think the universal opinion of this House would be that moneys expended for the purpose of protecting fisheries, and increasing them as a national asset by stocking with fish streams, and lakes and rivers that have been depleted, by unwise conduct in the past, would be well spent in the interests of the country. I am sure this House would not begrudge making appropriations of a

generous character for that work. There is no doubt whatever that the money so expended, if wisely spent, will be returned to the people of Canada many times over in the increased wealth of their fisheries. I have said that the information which the department has at its disposal with regard to the protection of the fisheries in British Columbia agrees very largely indeed with the views which hon. gentlemen have expressed in this House this afternoon. The belief of the department is that the protection afforded to our fisheries, by the fishery protection service, within the three mile limit has been inadequate and inefficient. I may say in this connection that I do not think that the statement made to-day by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Shepherd) as to the tremendous amount of poaching that goes on within the three mile limit in the waters contiguous to British Columbia, is at all exaggerated or overdrawn. It might seem at first thought, that the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Shepherd), that sometimes several hundred vessels come within the three mile limit for the purpose of poaching on the wealth that belongs to the Dominion of Canada, was to some extent overdrawn. But the information received from official reports, and from the officers of the department, as well as from the members who represent British Columbia constituencies, and others who are interested in the fisheries there, would lead me to the conclusion that these statements have not been exaggerated in the least. It is my belief that up to the present time there has not been adequate protection to preserve these fisheries from the encroachments of those who have no right to fish in our waters within the three mile limit. It is my belief, also, that there has not been a sufficient patrol to enforce our laws within that three mile limit. Bearing that in mind, I would ask my hon. friends to look at the estimates submitted to the House for the present year and there they will see that provision is made for the better protection of the British Columbia fisheries. There is a vote taken in these estimates for two more vessels to be added to the protection fleet and also provision is being made for another vessel for the purpose of patrolling the waters. Criticism has been made to-day by one hon. gentleman on the fact that the Fishery Protection Service is at present under the control of the Naval Service Department, and it was said that it would be more effective if it were placed under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I have noticed a similar contention set up in a resolution which has been sent to me from a meeting of the Fishermens' Association of the county of Charlotte, New Brunswick, a county which has most extensive fisheries, in which are situated the islands of Grand Manan, Campobello, Deer Island and others, the population of which chiefly derive their living from the seas, Well, I am not very much impressed with the force of that argument. It must be remembered that the Naval Service Department is as much under the control of the Minister of the Marine and Fisheries Deparment as is the Marine and Fisheries branch itself, and I do not see how the service would be any better enforced under the one branch than under the other.

Every day the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in consultation with the Deputy Head of the Naval Service, and there is no reason in the world why the fishery protection service should not be just as well administered where it now is, as if it were transferred to the Marine and Fisheries branch. Probably, one reason which caused the late government to place the fishery protection under the Department of Naval Affairs, is, that in a certain sense the fishery protection fleet is a militant fleet. It exists for the purpose of keeping poachers, chiefly our American friends, from coming into the waters of Canada, and therefore it would seem fitting that it should be under the naval service department. I may say that the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service is a gentleman who was previously deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and consequently he is thoroughly conversant with all matters affecting fishery protection, and I believe he is rendering excellent service in administering the affairs of the department subject to the control of the minister who is responsible to this House. In the estimates of this year there is an appropriation of $275,000 for additional vessels for the fishery protection fleet of British Columbia. It is hoped that with this money we will be able to purchase a vessel that will be able to go into commission at a very early date so as to be effective this year. Heretofore the protection cruisers employed in the waters of British Columbia have not been suited for the purpose. They were too slow, they were not able to move about quickly from one place to another in order to drive off the American poachers who, tempted by the wealth of our fisheries, paid no regard to our laws. It is to be hoped that with this vote we will be able to get two effective vessels to protect our fisheries and to drive off those who come within our waters to poach on the heritage of Canadians in those fisheries.

The service in the past has been performed by the Canadian government steamer the 'Kestrel', with the assistance of some smaller vessels. The steamer 'Kestrel" never will be fitted for the service, has been dismantled, and will shortly be sold. Negotiations are now proceeding for the

purchase of a suitable vessel, and in addition it is proposed to ask for tenders at a very early date, as soon as the necessary funds are placed at our disposal by parliament, for the construction of a vessel which in point of size, speed equipment and everything else, will be well suited for the protection of our fisheries on the Pacific coast. One of the hon. gentlemen who addressed the House this afternoon expressed the hope that that vessel would be built in British Columbia. I sincerely hope that will be the case. It will largely depend on the tenders we receive from British Columbia. The tenders are open to all; but I agree with my hon. friend that it is well for us to have work of this kind performed by Canadian mechanics, so that the money will be spent among our people, provided the percentage of cost above the cost on the other side of the Atlantic is not too great to justify us in taking that course. That will have to be determined when the tenders are received. I hope that the result of those tenders will be that we can fairly and properly, having regard to the interests of Canada, have the vessel built in British Columbia, where its work will be, and where I believe people should be able to construct vessels on as favourable terms and conditions as in any other part of Canada. In the meantime, before that other vessel is constructed, something will have to be done for the protection of the fisheries, and an item of $50,000 will be found in the estimates submitted to the House by the Naval Department this year, for vessels to patrol the Pacific coast. It is intended to charter two whaling steamers to do the patrol work on the Pacific coast. These vessels it is calculated can be got at $100 a day, pending the construction of new vessels for the service. I trust that when these vessels are obtained and in commission, there will be very much less complaint about vessels from the United States and other countries coming and poaching in our waters and taking the fish which belong to the Canadian people. In addition to that, there is in the estimates of the Fisheries Department this year an item of $75,000 for the purpose of providing the cost of building a fisheries patrol steamer for British Columbia. The difference between the fisheries protection vessels which are under the control of the Naval Department and the fisheries patrol vessels is probably well known to hon. members. The primary object and purpose of the fisheries protection steamers is to protect our waters against smugglers. The object of the fisheries patrol steamers is to enforce the laws and regulations of the department with regard to our fisheries in those waters. In addition to the patrol work, it is absolutely necessary that the inspectors should have a boat which can go along the coast at a fair rate of speed and practically in all weathers, as there are no railways along the shore and no means of communication except what is afforded by vessels of this sort. The fisheries of the province are rapidly extending, not only along the main shore and the islands contiguous thereto, but as I said before both sides of the Queen Charlotte Islands and on the west coast of Vancouver Island. It is necessary to protect this great wealth, which will be much greater in the future, and therefore these vessels should be provided. When these plans are carried out, I think we shall have an effective protective service, and if it is not perfectly effective, I shall not hesitate to ask parliament for further provision to enable us adequately to protect the fisheries in the province of British Columbia.

My hon. friends from British Columbia this afternoon dealt with some other matters outside of the four corners of the resolution submitted to the House by my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin. There was a very general interesting discussion with regard to the fishery conditions that exist in British Columbia. While I do not want to draw general conclusions from insufficient data, and while my knowledge and experience of the department are as yet of such a character that I cannot speak with the authority that I would like, I believe there is reason for the very strong criticism indulged in by my hon. friends from British Columbia with regard to the fishery laws and regulations generally in that province. There was some discussion with regard to the issue of licenses. These licenses are issued by the department, and at $25 each. The British Columbian government exacts a license fee of a similar amount; and, according to the records of the department and the information I have obtained from the officials, it has been the habit in the past to grant these licenses to many people who are not fishermen and who are not connected with the fisheries on the Pacific coast. In some cases they have been granted to men engaged in mercantile life, sometimes to clerks in mercantile establishments. These men have obtained the licenses, not with the intention of embarking in fishing enterprises themselves, but for the purpose of selling them to those who did. In some cases licenses obtained from the government in this way for $25 have been sold for as high as $1,500. This year up to the present time no licenses have been issued. This is a matter which is engaging the attention of the department. The fishery officers of the department in British Columbia have been instructed not to issue licenses to the persons who obtains them last year, and who did not bona fide engage in the fishing indus-

try. The whole question of these licenses is under consideration. I have had audiences on the subject with gentlemen from British Columbia, I have consulted the British Columbia government, and I have summoned here the inspector of British Columbia, so that there will be a full discussion of the whole matter with the view, if possible, of remedying the conditions which have been the subject of so much complaint for years. It seems to me indefensible that persons should be able to obtain a license for $25, and sell it again for a large sum of money without rendering any service therefor. If these licenses are worth these large sums of money, it is fair to consider whether we should not so arrange the issue of them that these large sums should come into the coffers of the Dominion, and not go into the pockets of private individuals who have rendered no value for them.

In New Brunswick, where we have valuable inland fisheries—salmon and trout fisheries suitable for angling—the practice is to lease them for periods of ten years, the lease being put up to auction, and granted to the highest bidders. Whether that be practicable in connection with the British Columbia fisheries, I am not prepared to say; but it is worth considering whether the country could not derive greater benefit from those extensive salmon, herring and other fisheries than by granting licenses at nominal prices to persons who simply get those licenses for the purpose of selling them out to others. There is one condition in connection with those British Columbia fisheries, which caused me a great deal of surprise and made me doubt whether hon. gentlemen opposite could have been aware of its existence. From the little study I have been able to give the subject, it seems to me that the fisheries of British Columbia have been administered in the interest of the canners and their establishments rather than that of the fishermen. While the canners have been protected by regulations in every possible way, the fishermen have been left to their own resources. In fact they have been absolutely hampered in their business. Every cannery has a certain number of licenses issued in connection with it. There is what is called a boat rating for every cannery. One cannery, for instance, is allowed 200 fishing boats, another 100, and so on, according to the size of the establishment, and outside of those licenses the fishermen are not allowed to pursue their calling. The canneries form practically a close corporation, and the regulations have been framed in the past for the protection of the canners and not at all in the interests of the fishermen. The other day there was brought to my attention a most extraordinary regulation. Under it the fishermen were absolutely prohibited from sending their fresh fish out of the country. They had to have their fish canned or smoked or they could not sell them outside the province. The effect of that regulation was this. A boat might catch 300 or 400 salmon, and on bringing its catch to the cannery would find a notice posted up to the effect that on that day the cannery would not take more than 100. One would think that the fisherman then could take his fish either to the American or some other market. No, under the regulation he was absolutely prohibited from doing so, so that he had to dump his extra supply—in some cases 200 or 300 salmon—back into the sea. Thus the catch was entirely lost to him, and no one else got any advantage from it. Under the law he had no right to throw his dead salmon back into the sea, but that was the easiest way of getting rid of them. Nor was he allowed to use them on land for the purpose of fertilizing. Were the law strictly enforced, all he could do would be to dig a hole in the ground and there bury his fish. Acting on the representations of representatives from British Columbia, endorsed by the officials of my department, on Saturday last I had that regulation repealed so that now the fishermen can send their fresh fish to other markets than to the canneries. The regulation we have repealed was probably passed years ago, before the fisheries were properly understood and when probably some wealthy men had sufficient influence to have this regulation made in their own interest. It was then continued in force from year to year until it became a serious scandal, and a great subject of grievance to the fishermen.

It is very desirable that the question of our fisheries should be fully discussed in this House. It is very desirable from the standpoint of the general public and also from that of the minister who is the responsible head of the department concerned, and also because such discussion cannot fail to attract attention to the fisheries of British Columbia and other parts of our country.

With reference to the whale fisheries, to which one hon. member from British Columbia has referred, that is a question which can only be dealt with by international arrangement. Whales are caught outside of the three mile limit—outside of waters which are within the territorial jurisdiction of Canada—and, therefore, any regulation for the preservation of those fisheries will have to be a matter of arrangement between the United States and Canada. In a report submitted a short time ago by Captain Bernier of the 'Arctic', he drew attention to the fact that these fish in the northern waters were becoming exterminated and would soon become a thing of the past if regulations were not made to prohibit the fishing and the selling of them for a number of years. I talked the mat-

ter over with the officials of my department and instructed them to take proper steps for the purpose of endeavouring to have an international arrangement come to with the United States and thus prevent valuable fisheries from becoming entirely destroyed.

I assure the House that the desire of the Marine and Fisheries Department is to afford as adequate protection as possible to the very valuable fisheries we possess in British Columbia, so that that great source of supply may not only be continued for years to come, but that the catch may be increased under such wise regulations as may commend themselves to our approval. The papers called for will be laid on the table, and I shall be happy at any time to discuss this interesting question with any of the representatives from British Columbia.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have listened this afternoon with great interest to the discussion regarding the fisheries on our Pacific coast. But two questions were raised by hon. members from British Columbia without drawing any comment from the hon. minister. Yet these questions have been discussed in that province for a number of years, and I understood were issues there in the recent election. The first one is the abolition of Oriental labour in connection with the prosecution of fisheries on the Pacific coast. That question was raised by a number of hon. gentlemen this afternoon, and the minister will remember that the prohibition of Oriental labour was advocated by them very strongly. The second question is the abolition of the bonding privilege which enables American fishing vessels to catch fish on the Pacific coast and enables the Canadian Pacific railway to carry that catch free of duty to the Boston market. The abolition of that bonding privilege also was advocated by supporters of this government during the recent election in the Pacific province and was strongly urged this afternoon. But I have not heard the hon. minister say what the policy of the government is on these two important questions.

Mr. HAZEN. I did not refer to what was said regarding the fishing by Japanese in the waters of British Columbia as I did not wish to do so until I had studied the question further, and felt I could speak on it with more authority than at present. The question is in a large measure an entirely new one to me. It is very important and far reaching, involving not only domestic and local conritions, but to some extent our international relations as well, and until I have had more time to study it, I would not feel warranted in giving expression to any decided opinion.

With reference to the bonding privilege, that is worthy of most careful consideration. It is a question that will be considered by the government in the very near future.

Everything relating to that very important asset, our fisheries on the Pacific coast, will have the most careful study at the hands of the government. The matter is one outside of party politics altogether, but none the less of great importance to the province of British Columbia and the other provinces as well, and I can assure the House that it will have at my hands the most serious consideration.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BRANCH LINES ESTMERE TO BADDECK.

Mr. McKENZIE moved:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence and orders in council, relating to or in any way connected with the surveying and calling for tenders for the construction of the line of railway from Estmere to Baddeck, in the county of Victoria.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the question of the extension of branch lines of the Intercolonial Railway in Nova Scotia, has been brought before this House from time to time during the last 30 years. The result of the agitation carried on by members on both sides of politics has been an extension of only 90 miles of railway in Cape Breton. I need not point out that it is impossible to serve that country which is 125 or 150 miles long by from 80 to 90 miles wide with a straight single line of railway. It may be that the Minister of Railways and other members of the government do not understand that the Island of Cape Breton is practically two islands. It is cut in two by that magnificent body of salt water the Bras D'Or lakes, from the mouth of the Big Bras D'or to the St. Peter canal, at which point the two sections of the island are connected by a narrow isthmus of half a mile which is cut through by the St. Peter's canal. You have two large areas of land, one to the north and one to the south of the canal and a large salt water lake, in some places 25 miles wide, dividing them. The immense task has been attempted of serving these two bodies of land by one railway. The best possible course was adopted when that line of railway was run down through the centre crossing at the Grand Narrows, which is approached by a very substantial steel bridge, thus avoiding a ferry at that point. But we can never have a satisfactory or suitable service until there is a railway running through the northern island, and also through the southern end. We are glad to know that a desirable route on the southern side of St. Peter's has been surveyed, and if the road is extended as we

hope it will be extended, down through Loch Lomond by Mira Valley and through to Lewisburg, that magnificent section of country will be served. Until that is done, that section will not get a proper service. We hear a great deal from hon. gentlemen from British Columbia, who put before this House the necessity and the great demand of their great province.

When I witness the zeal and determination with which those gentlemen present to this House the interests of their great province, I feel that we from the eastern part of Canada are far too timid, far too easily put off, and that we do not put the interest of the people of that part of the country before the House with that force of determination which are characteristic of our friends from the west, and from the province of British Columbia. We are proud to hear of the wealth of the fisheries in British Columbia. I come from the province of Nova Scotia, where we have a wealth of fisheries just as great, perhaps not as great in salmon, but a greater variety and better quality than they have even in British Columbia; and if it is necessary that they should have proper facilities to develop their fisheries, it is equally necessary that we should have them in the province of Nova Scotia. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister say a few days ago that his government intended giving facilities to the fisheries of Nova Scotia such as they never had before. Let me tell the Prime Minister that it is impossible for him to give us the proper means to develop the fisheries in Nova Scotia until he puts the great fishing points in touch with railway communication. It is unnecessary for me to tell the Prime Minister and the government that every year and every day the fresh fish of the Dominion are becoming more important, and any part of Canada that cannot compete in that great industry with regard to fresh fish is not in the race. It is the opinion of the best men in Nova Scotia engaged in the fishery that we cannot compete in the market until we are, from Yarmouth to Scattaree, put in touch with railway lines, and until the Department of Railways puts upon the Intercolonial and its branches refrigerator cars capable of catering to this trade. While we are dependent for the carrying of our fresh fish on freight trains and insufficiently equipped freight cars we are not in the race with other parts of the country and other parts of the continent who are looking after this trade. Now it is impossible for the government to develop this fish business until we have facilities with which to develop it. We have all along the coast of Nova Scotia, from Yarmouth to Scattaree, and from Scattaree to Cape North, and all around the gulf shore back to Cumberland again, the finest fisheries in the world. Let the Prime Minister and the government consider that all the railway facilities we have east of Truro is the Intercolonial, a straight line running straight through the country, and not touching the seacoast at any point except at the Strait of Canso; and it was shown the other day that at the Strait of Canso great advantage has been taken of the railway, that the fishing business has been profitable to the Intercolonial as well as to the people engaged in that great industry. I must point out to the government that at the Strait of Canso, where this traffic in fish has been carried on, the facilities which I have pointed out have not been given, that we require better equipped cars and express trains.

But coming down more particularly to the county of Victoria, I have already pointed out to this House that there are no finer fishing grounds in any other port of Canada than along the eastern and northern part of the island of Cape Breton. But at this time of the year when the ice comes in, and they cannot send their fish away by water they are completely shut out from the world. They are shut out from the opportunity of getting their fish out at the best season of the market, or when the market is at its best. They are unable to obtain from the outside world the necessities of life at a time when they could buy at the best advantage. The only thing that will relieve the situation is the extension of this line of railway that I am now advocating to Baddeck, and then the opportunity will present itself to extend it north along the harbours of St. Ann, Ingonish, and Neil's Harbour, clean to the Bay of St. Lawrence to Meat Cove, skirting along the most magnificent fishing grounds in Canada, and giving the people of this country an opportunity of competing in the markets of the world with their codfish, their salmon, their haddock, their herring, and a hundred and one kinds of magnificent edible fish caught in these waters. That has been the situation for the last 150 years. And when, from time to time, ever since there was a parliament in Canada, the members from that part of the country coming here have always been advocating the expenditure of this pittance of money necessary for extending the railway, is it surprising that we should persist from time to time in keeping at it until the government will see to it that the interests of the people are met as they should be? I am not talking railways, because I am in opposition. I was talking railways when I was not in opposition. I am making the same speeches, putting forward the same arguments now that I was putting forward in

the local House when I was there ten years ago. This is my third parliament here, and I have been every session talking the same things before this House. So it cannot be said that I am talking in opposition in a way that I would not be talking if I were a supporter of the government. Last year I was told that at last we had reached the point where the good people of the county of Victoria, and of the island of Cape Breton generally were to receive that which was their due; a sum of $200,000, which would be a fair amount to start with, was put in the estimates. Of that sum five-twelfths were passed before prorogation, and since we came back here the other seven-twelfths have been passed by this government, adopting apparently the policy of the outgoing government. There was no criticism from either side that the amount was more than necessary to make a fair start on this railway. Everything was honourable, everything was fair and just, and tenders were called for, and I had every reason to believe that the work was going on. There was plenty of money then in the treasury to build this road, that money is in the treasury to-day; it cannot be said that the country is any worse off to-day than it was last year, and there is no reason to expect that the people of that country will be given shabby treatment after struggling so long as they have to get this money, or that the government is going to strike the cup from their mouth just as they are about to quaff it.

Mr. BORDEN. How long is that line?

Mr. McKENZIE. Only 22 or 23 miles, a very easy route. The hon. gentleman will find the report in the Department of Railways, and there cannot be any great difficulty in the way. I think it will be found to be as level a piece of country as there is anywhere on the island of Cape Breton, no large cuts at all. It is true the government will have to cross a very narrow arm at a place called the Little Narrows, and put a bridge there. But that is practically the only obstruction worth talking about on this whole line.

I have here resolutions, which I am not going to trouble the House with reading, passed by the county council of Victoria county and the board of trade of the town of Baddeck, and letters and petitions from end to end of the county, praying and begging that this work be pressed forward. I bring it up now, Mr. Speaker, as I hope that there may be supplementary estimates brought down and there is yet an opportunity for the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of Railways and Canals to reconsider it and restore the vote to the estimates. Should they do this it will give the good people of the county of Victoria this boon for which they have sought so long. In the summer time we could have by this branch direct or easy connection between the Bras d'Or lake and the Intercolonial railway. The nearest point, the ton of Baddeck, is ten or twelve miles away and the distance is traversed by boats. That is all very well in summer, but at this time of the year we have no way of getting there at all except by crossing over the ice, and it is in that manner that we are obliged to get the mails in the meantime. In spring it is impossible to cross the ice and we are shut out entirely. We were hoping that if this line were built these difficulties would be overcome, or at least, that we would have continuous connection between the town of Baddeck and the Intercolonial railway, and we also hope that the government will find it desirable and proper to extend the road north to those great fishing ports to which I have referred. I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House but I feel that it is my duty to the people I represent here to keep at this thing until something is done. There is something in the records of this House about the Widow Murphy's cow that gave a great deal of trouble to a former government, and this is going to be a Widow Murphy's cow until something is done to carry out the wishes of the people in that section of the country in regard to this project.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, there is no objection at all to the papers being brought down. Tenders were asked for this railway by newspaper advertisement on the 9th of September and they were to be in on the 12th October. Two tenders were submitted and they averaged $69,000 per mile. I could not see my way clear, when only $200,000 had been voted, to allow this work to go on. I did not think, notwithstanding the natural resources that are to be developed, that we were justified in building a road at that expense. But, when we get to look into the matter and see if a cheaper road which will answer the purpose——

Mr. McKENZIE. How did these tenders compare with the estimate of the engineer?

Mr. COCHRANE. That is quite a proper question. I think that the 22 miles for which tenders were asked were estimated by the engineers to cost $1,485,000. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) has told the House that it was a level country, easy to build a railway through, and yet we have two tenders under which the cost will average $69,000 a mile. I did not feel that we were justified in going on, but I have no hesitation in saying that it is the intention of the government to investigate this matter and see if a cheaper route cannot be got. I do not think the engineers had

sufficient time to work out this route. We will have no hesitation in bringing down the papers.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Turriff for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am ready to go on.

Mr. BORDEN. For the reasons already explained to my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) I do not think we can go on with this Bill. It is of course, his privilege if he so desires to have a vote taken on it. On a previous occasion I mentioned to him that it was the intention of the government to have the Railway Act revised and a consolidation made of the very numerous amendments which have been made to it. Up to the present time we have not had an opportunity of giving this subject sufficient consideration; in fact, we have given it very little consideration beyond this that we have arrived at the conclusion that the course to which I have alluded is necessary. The Department of Railways and Canals and the chairman of the Railway Commission are of the opinion that it ought to be done. Therefore, it seems undesirable to attempt to carry out the proposals embodied in the various Bills now upon the order paper, and it is for that reason that I have asked my hon. friend and other gentlemen who have proposed amendments, to allow them to stand until we can do that effectively.

I am anxious of course that any discussion that would be helpful in connection with this Bill should take place, in order that we may have suggestions from hon. members. I do not wish to limit discussion in any way, but I do desire that these various Bills should stand over until we have had an opportunity of considering them all. That, of course, will be followed by the bringing down of a Bill next session which will give the most ample opportunity to hon. gentlemen to put forward any of the proposals contained in these various Bills.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Next session only.

Mr. BORDEN. Next session, yes.

Mr. TURRIFF. My only object was to put these special tariffs under the control of the Railway Commission, just as the regular tariffs now are. There is a good deal of force in what the Prime Minister says, and I am quite willing to let the Bill stand.

Mr. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman desires to offer any additional reasons in support of this Bill or in connection with any other point relating to the Railway Act, I should be very glad to hear them.

Bill allowed to stand.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie) moved second reading of Bill (No. 7), to amend the Railway Act. He said: I presume that the remarks of the right hon. gentleman in reference to the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff), will have application to the Bill which I now move the second reading of. I appreciate the position taken by the right hon. gentleman, that in view of the purpose to immediately consolidate the Railway Act it would be well not to pass, at present, any legislation of this character. There is, however, a situation obtaining in the country to-day with regard to one feature of our railway legislation, to which the attention of parliament ought to be emphatically drawn, and I trust that when the government comes to consolidate the Railway Act it will introduce into it provisions along the lines laid down in this Bill. It will be observed at once that this legislation touches ground that has been fought over time and again in parliament, and that, I may say, has been battled upon for fifty years in the courts of Canada. It touches the question of the liability of railway companies for the loss caused by the killing or injuring of animals by their trains or engines. Legislation with respect to this matter was passed in 1903 at the instance of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and, as I understand it, that hon. gentleman is in great part, if not altogether, responsible for the present wording of sub-section 4 of section 294 of the Railway Act. It is this subsection which in one of its features the Bill purposes to alter in order to meet the conditions which prevail almost wholly I believe in western Canada. This Bill purposes to amend the present state of affairs by a method which has two features. The first is, by endeavouring to fix upon a standard cattle guard which shall be of real use for the purpose for which it is intended. It provides, by amending the subsection I have referred to, in cases where animals are injured on the tracks of a railway company and where the injury is caused by the negligence of the company, that the company shall be made to pay. In introducing this legislation I am not moved by any desire to cater to any unwarranted public feeling against railway corporations. I am one of those who believe that a corporation, however large, is entitled to the full benefit of just laws. But, I believe, that, whether by an error of parliament or not, the Railway Act at present is such that the owners of animals are placed at a serious disadvantage in con-

tending for their rights in the courts, a disadvantage which they would not suffer if even the common law prevailed. It will be necessary for me, in order to make clear the necessity for this amendment, to state what the present law is, and I shall endeavour to do so concisely and with the use of as few technical terms as possible.

Mr. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman now dealing with both his proposed amendments?

Mr. MEIGHEN. To the first amendment I do not attach anything like the importance I do to the second, in clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. In order to make it perfectly plain will the hon. gentleman in each case give the existing legislation, if he has it before him, so that it may be on 'Hansard.'

Mr. MEIGHEN. The first clause of the Bill provides that all cattle guards, to be constructed hereafter, indeed all cattle guards to be used hereafter, shall, as to their method of construction, style, and dimensions, be submitted to the Railway Commission and be approved by them. The existing law in this respect is in section 254 which provides that all fences, gates and cattle guards to be erected by railway companies shall be such as are suitable and sufficient to protect cattle or other animals getting upon the railway lands. It is hard to conceive of legislation more strict in terms than that, it puts upon the railway company the burden of having fences, gates and cattle guards suitable and sufficient to prevent animals getting on the tracks, and in that regard it is hard to improve upon the existing law.

The only addition I make to that is this. I have a clause providing that the cattle guards, which of all appliances of the railway company have proved most effective, be submitted to the Railway Commission, and be approved of by them before they shall be considered sufficient. It may be argued that if we do that, and if the Railway Commission approve of a certain form and size of cattle guard, should animals get over it the railway company might be relieved of liability. I am not prepared to say that will or will not happen; but I do think that if a railway company would provide the very best appliance in this regard, as it would be compelled to do if the commission had to approve of it, there would be much less injury and loss suffered than there is at the present time, when the railway company is compelled to provide no special kind of cattle guard, but just such as is sufficient. So that I think that a substantial reform without any serious risk would be effected if we compelled the companies to submit their cattle guards to the Railway Commission for approval. But I attach no such importance to section 1 as I do to section 2 of this Bill, because I believe that section 2 will effect the reform that section 1 is intended to assist in effecting. That is to say, section 2, in conjunction with the present law in this regard, will have the effect of making the companies pay where they ought to pay, and if they do, they will see to it that the cattle guard is suitable and sufficient. So that clause 2 is the vital clause of this Bill, and on it I desire to found the brief argument which I intend to present. Section 2 provides that subsection 4 of section 294 of the present Act shall read in this way:

> When any horses, sheep, swine or other cattle at large, whether upon the highway or not, get upon the property of the company, and by reason thereof damage is caused to or by such animal, the party suffering such damage shall, except in the cases otherwise provided for by the next following section, be entitled to recover the amount of such damage against the company in any action in any court of competent jurisdiction, unless the company establishes that such animal so got upon the property of the company, without the negligence of the company or the omission of any duty binding on the company under this Act.

Subsection 4 of section 294 is the section of the Railway Act which deals with the case of injury to or by animals when they get on a right of way after being at large. It has no reference, whatever, to injuries caused to or by animals at highway crossings, or animals that get upon the right of way from an inclosure where they are not at large. The cases of animals which get on the right of way through being at large constitute the large field of cases in which under the present law the railway company is able to escape. In other cases there is no serious complaint. At present the clause in the Act is the same as clause 2 of this Bill, except that after it states that damage can be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction, it has the following words:

> Unless the company proves that such animal got at large through the negligence or wilful act of the owner or his agent or the custodian of such animal or his agent.

So that under the present law the company shoulders the burden prima facie; that is to say, if an animal, after being at large, is killed or injured on the right of way, the company is prima facie liable, but it escapes the moment it shows that the animal got at large in the first place through the negligence or wilful act of the owner. The purpose of the Bill is to keep the burden on the company, but to alter that burden. Instead of permitting the company to prove that the animal got at large through the negligence or wilful act of the owner, it says to the company: prove that

your own skirts are clear; no matter how it got at large, prove that it got on your right of way without any negligence or omission on your part. The present burden which the company has to discharge is so light and so capable of being discharged, that in western Canada the company easily escapes in 90 per cent of all the cases that occur, the great majority of which never go to court at all. Now, in the law at present there is a provison that this does not affect the liability of a man who takes down a railway fence or otherwise interferes with railway property. I have omitted that, but I am quite willing that it should be added to the clause as I propose it. To my mind it will be unnecessary in the law, if amended as I propose, but it appears to some that it is necessary, and I have no objection to adding it.

The question before the House is whether the law amended as I propose, will meet the exigencies of present conditions better than the old law. I submit that it will. I am free to admit that conditions are not the same all over Canada. In eastern Canada, where industrial and farming life have reached a more advanced stage than in western Canada, the conditions are quite different. In eastern Canada animals are not found at large nor is there any necessity why they should be at large to anything like the same extent as in the west. I do not think it was ever the intention of parliament to legislate that it would be unlawful for animals to run at large in this country, but the effect of the present law is to go to that extent, for we might just as well legislate that it is unlawful for an animal to be at large as to legislate that if it should get at large by some omission of the owner and get into the right of way, where there is no fence, the owner has no redress should an accident occur. That was the judgment in the case of Clayton and the Canadian Northern, in which case Chief Justice Howell observed that the effect of the law was to prohibit the running at large of animals anywhere in Canada. Any one who knows anything of the west will understand that such a law would work most serious injury to that part of our country. The conditions there are such that it is essential that animals should be allowed to run at large within certain limits and restrictions. In eastern Canada however, that necessity is not so urgent and in that section the law may have worked fairly well. But in the west, there is a daily slaughter of animals by railway companies running up into thousands and thousands of dollars, and 90 per cent. of these cases are due to the negligence of the railway companies. I doubt if there is an hon. member from that western country who will not say that the slaughter of animals there by the railways, through night and day, is one of the chief causes of hardship and hard times in individual instances and one that most persistently reaches the ears of members of parliament. That is one of the complaints which is most earnestly and insistently urged by farmers and ranchers through their organizations, and relief from which they have been seeking from this parliament for years back. I doubt if there is one hon. member from the west who will not say that, within his own personal knowledge, the railway companies, through their negligence, whether wilful or not, have been the cause of determining the weal or woe of many of our settlers. Many a man struggling to lift his head above water has had it pushed down again by the slaughter of his animals by railway trains.

Why is this the case, and how is it going to be remedied? It is the case because the running at large of animals in that country is a commercial and industrial necessity. Under the present law, animals at large are not permitted to go within half a mile of the railway right of way. If they do and are killed at a crossing, the railway company is not responsible, unless the animal is in charge of some responsible person. The amendment I propose does not affect that law in any degree. The farmer who lets his animal run at large and whose animal is killed at a crossing will have to bear the loss. That is a risk which the farmer takes if he lets his animal at large in proximity to a railway. Whether that law be just or unjust, I am not saying, but it is the law, and this amendment which I propose does not interfere with it. The farmer takes the risk if his animal is killed on the highway crossing, but if it is killed on the railway company's track, the company is responsible. If an animal gets on the right of way, prima facie the railway company is responsible, because if the company had complied with the Act, the animal at large could not have got on its right of way. Therefore should the animal be injured, the burden of proof ought to be on the railway company. 90 per cent. of the animals injured or killed were necessarily turned out at large by the farmers.

What will be the result if the law is amended in this direction? It will mean that if a railway fence is down and an animal gets on the track, if the gate is open, if the cattle guard is defective, or if there is no cattle guard, and as a result an animal is killed, then the railway company will be bound to pay, and I ask who should pay in such a case? What is the common law? What is the law that through a thousand years of British jurisprudence has been established, as what is fair and right between man and man? Where there is negligence and loss results, the party whose negligence is the proximate cause of the loss is made to pay. Is that the case

under the present Railway Act? Things are reversed for the benefit of the company. If, through reckless driving of my automobile, I kill a horse on the highway I have to pay for it, and I cannot say that the farmer was negligent by letting his horse on the highway. Although he may have been negligent, his negligence was not the proximate cause of the loss. Why should that be reversed in the case of a railway? That simple common-sense principle is reversed in the case of the Railway Act. The railway company may neglect the simplest precautions in the construction of their road. In the west they seldom have cattle guards, they are not only negligent, but they are wilfully in default, and by reason of that, animals get on the right of way, and are killed. Whose negligence is the proximate cause? Not that of the farmer,who suffers the loss, his is the further cause; the proximate cause is the negligence of the railway company. This question has been argued in courts of law, the case I am presenting has been argued in Carruthers and the Canadian Pacific railway. The Supreme Court of Canada held that by subsection 4 of section 294, that plain condition of the common law was altered, and no matter how negligent the company were, no matter how flagrantly they had violated the provisions of the Railway Act, they utterly escaped liability for the loss caused proximately by that negligence, by simply showing that these animals were at large through the negligent or wilful act of the owner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I construe the present law, and I have followed my hon. friend's argument with great interest, by the amendment of 1910, whenever an accident takes place the conduct of the company is not at all in issue, it may be negligent or not negligent, the only question is whether or not the plaintiff himself was negligent. If the plaintiff is negligent he cannot recover, but if not, even although the company is not in default and has complied with the law, the plaintiff must recover.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I quite agree with the law as stated by my right hon. friend, but the law as interpreted has the effect of utterly reversing that plain rule of common law. The law as so interpreted holds that the conduct of the railway company is not in question, even if that conduct or misconduct is the proximate cause of the loss. Under the common law, their conduct would be seriously in question and the company would have to pay if it was the proximate cause of the loss. I need not argue whether or not that is the law as interpreted. Members who are familiar with the law will know that not only in Carruthers and the Canadian Pacific railway, but in several cases it has been so interpreted and hon. members will recall that in the case of Clayton and the Canadian Northern railway in 1908, where Chief Justice Howell of the Court of Appeals in Manitoba gave a dissenting judgment, His Lordship argued that all the holdings up to that time in favour of the law as I maintain it should not be, were wrong. but he was overruled by the majority of the court, and in that case as in every other one up to the present it has been held that the railway companies utterly escaped no matter how flagrantly negligent they were or how they violated the provisions of the Act. However, negligent they may be they escape by saying that somebody further back was negligent, and in that way they are enabled by the adjudgment of this parliament to reverse a rule of the common law. I should have said that the Supreme Court held the company liable in Carruthers and the Canadian Pacific railway, but the Supreme Court has held and it has been held in numerous cases that the company escape liability if they can throw on the farmer or owner the burden of having negligently allowed the animal at large.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is that the way you interpret the statute as it now stands?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I would interpret the statute as the courts do. I would not pretend to give an opinion that would be of value to the House, but I cannot see how the courts could otherwise interpret the law.

Mr. BURNHAM. Have the courts laid it down that where an animal is on the property of another, a trespasser, the onus is on the person who owns the property to prove that the animal was not on his property by right but improperly?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Yes, the courts have so interpreted subsection 4. This parliament has proceeded upon the assumption that if an animal is on the right of way of a railway company under our Act, and is injured, prima facie the company is responsible, the idea being that the animal could not be there if the company had complied with the law so that there has never been any question on that point, the burden has been on the company and so they have escaped.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The present statute provides that the company shall be liable unless it can prove that the animal got at large through the negligence or wilful act or omission of the owner or his agent or custodian. Then, as I understand the statute and construe the law, the only question for the court is not to examine what has been the conduct of the company, but what has been the conduct of the plain-

tiff. If the claimant shows that he has not been negligent the company is liable. It is not open to the company then to say: We have fulfilled all the conditions placed on us by the law. The law says that the company, whether it has fulfilled the conditions of the law or not, is liable and must be so unless it can show that the plaintiff is at fault.

Mr. MEIGHEN. And the onus is on the company.

Mr. BORDEN. If the onus is on the company the statute seems to make a prima facie case against the company, but it discharges the company, according to the argument of my hon. friend, upon proof of something which is not directly connected with the cause of the accident. It makes the company liable without proof of negligence. it then discharges the company by proof of some remote cause which is not directly connected with the destruction of the animal.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The only question is this—perhaps I am not getting to the point the leader of the opposition has said, the courts have held that the company is prima facie liable, but they escaped by proving something not immediately connected with the loss, just as the leader of the government states. Now the only question is this —I am not sure it pertains directly to the issue—if an animal is wilfully turned out by the farmer and then gets on the right of way without any neglect whatever on the part of the company, is the company responsible? That is to say, suppose the company has lived up to the law in every regard, take for example a case where they do not have a fence, where the Railway Commissioners do not compel them to fence, and an animal breaks out and gets upon the right of way, is the company responsible? I know of no case where the company has been held responsible in those circumstances. There was the case in British Columbia, Siegel vs. the Canadian Pacific railway, where the company was relieved, so that the leader of the opposition would not be correct in saying that the company's conduct is not in question. The company's conduct is not in question if they show that the owner of the animal negligently turned the animal out, in that case the company's conduct is not in question. But if, on the contrary, it is shown that the animal broke away, and without any negligence on the part of the owner, then the company's conduct may be in question under Siegel and the Canadian Pacific railway. I hope that the decision in Siegel and the Canadian Pacific railway is not good, though I do not wish to give an opinion different to that court in British Columbia. But what is laid down as undoubtedly the law in the western province is this, that once the company show the animal got at large by the negligence of the owner, their conduct is no longer in question. Now how should the law be amended? The proposal is to amend it by asking the company to pay the man who turned the animal out. If the animal is turned out negligently and is killed on the highway the farmer loses; but if it gets on the right of way he is prima facie responsible, and if it is killed there then the burden is on him to show that it got there without any negligence on his part, or in violation of the Railway Act. Surely that is simple, and that is what the law ought to be. If an animal is an extraordinary animal, and gets at large, or is turned at large, and the company, has complied with the law, and the animal is killed, the company should not pay. But if the company has not complied with the law, then the company's neglect, the company's defeasance, is the immediate and approximate cause of the loss, and they ought to pay in every case. Now to illustrate by particular cases, I have no doubt that hon. members of this House could give illustrations of the escape of the company where they should have paid, and every hon. member, if he thinks over his own case, will see that the reason the company escaped was just the reason I have given, because, in the first place, the animal was at large through the negligence, or even through the wilful act of the owner. I know, for instance, of one case where a man was leading a horse to water and two others were following. Only one was being led by the halter, and there was no fence between him and the highway. Something frightened the animals and they got away, including the one that was being led. There was no fence on the railway to protect the track, they got upon the railway track, two of them were killed, the one that was being led with the halter, and one of those that were following. Now it will be clear to the House where the owner of those animals will land in a court of law. In respect of the one that was being led, that one did not get at large through the negligence or wilful act of the owner, very likely the company would be made to pay. In the case of the other one that was not being led, although the company's negligence was the cause of its loss, the only cause of its loss, the immediate and proximate cause, the company escapes. Then take the other case. There have been cases of ranchers in the west, farmers in the west, having animals by the score at large because, in the great majority of cases, there is no fencing at all; it would be practically impossible to carry on business in that country to keep them always within an enclosure. Now, if the railway fences are up, and if the cattle guards are there as provided by

the Act, if the gates are up and closed as provided by the Act, and things are moderately safe, the animal may be killed at a crossing and the man loses, that is all there is about it. He takes that risk when he turns them out. But if the animal, through the negligence of the company, gets upon the right of way through there being no fence in violation of the law, or no cattle guard in violation of the law, or through there being no gate or a poor gate, or a poorly fastened gate, why should they not pay? The Court of Appeals has held the contrary, and there could be no doubt under their reading of the law. If what my friend behind me says were the law there would be no object in amending it; if it were not held that the company escapes when they prove that the animal got at large through the negligence or wilful act of the owner, there would be no purpose in amending the law. That would be all right. But the unfortunate thing is that that has not been held to be the law, and it appears to me that it is not intended to be the law by subsection 4 as it at present reads.

Now I wish to make reference to the present condition of the obligation of the company in regard to fencing, to gates and to cattle guards, because I wish to show that at the present time and under present conditions, there might possibly be a very few cases where, under the present law the owner might recover and under the law as amended he might not, there might possibly be cases, though extremely rare, if any at all, and in the course of a short time there could be none.

Now, it is well known that, under the authority of the Railway Act, the Board of Railway commissioners have power to compel railway companies to fence their right of way, or, in other words, the company has to fence its right of way and provide gates and cattle guards unless absolved by the Railway Commission. Under the authority of that Act, the Board of Railway commissioners undertook to make an order that, before the expiration of a certain date, all railway companies in this country should have their fences erected and their cattle guards and gates provided. That was a general order applicable to all railways in Canada and of effect throughout the whole country. From that order the railway companies appealed and, as I understand it, the Supreme Court of Canada held that the board had not power to make so general an order that their orders must be definite and confined to specific areas. In accordance with that ruling of the Supreme Court, the railway commissioners, have, since that time, made very sweeping orders, but none so sweeping as to be ruled ultra vires by the Supreme Court. The policy of the board has been to bring about, at the earliest possible date, the time when it shall be compulsory all over this country for fences, gates and cattle guards to be provided and that even though the neighbourhood is not fenced and closed or inhabited the company's right of way must be fenced and gates and cattle guards provided. I am informed, if not by the commission, at all events by a member, that it is expected within a year that all the railways of this country will be, under order from the board of railway commissioners, and that a valid order, compelled to have their fences, gates and cattle guards completed. Before the expiration of that time if a case arose where a railway company were not in default, that is where they did not have to erect a fence or cattle guard, and an animal got on the line by the negligence of the owner and was killed, if under such circumstances it were held by our courts that in the meantime under the present law the company would have to pay, they would not have to pay under this amendment. I do not say it would be so held, but I do say that the number of cases will be practically nil, and that we might just as well consider them a negligible quantity. The great class of cases that comes before the notice of the public, or before the notice of lawyers and the courts, is where the animals are out through the purpose, the designation, the intention of the owner himself and these animals, through the absolute neglect and defiance by the railway company of the law, get upon the right of way and are killed. This represents a great number of cases where injustice is suffered and for which a remedy is urgently needed and demanded. It is that class of cases that this amendment aims at effecting a remedy for and in my humble opinion it certainly effects the remedy. In the course of a year, as asserted by the commission, there should be no case where the railway companies could justly be held liable now and would not be held liable under the amended law. So, it seems to me we can be absolutely fair to the companies, make the law clear to them and clear to any man who runs and reads, by passing this legislation and then there will be no case, or very few if any cases at all, where an injustice can be perpetrated. I do not know whether I have made this clear. I have endeavoured to put the case as clearly as I could. I make no pretence of having a better knowledge of the law in reference to railways than any other hon. member of this House, and I have the utmost deference for the opinion of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) or any other hon. member who has interrupted me, but I have not come to the House without a thorough investigation in this regard and without actual experience in the courts of law where it has been held, held against me and held on appeal,

that the law was just as stated by myself at the present time. I know of cases that occur almost every day, of cases that come into small offices in the country, week after week, that never get to the courts at all, simply because it is well known and understood that the company can escape by showing that the animal got on the track through the negligence or wilful act of the owner, no matter what their default may be, and it is well known that the company can show this out of the mouth of the plaintiff himself the moment he goes into the box. This will not only alter the ruling of the courts and make it fairer to the farmer, and no more than fair to the railways, but in such cases as have already come to the court it will make the law so clear and plain and the liability so definite and fixed that there will be less litigation than in the past, or, in the great majority of cases, the railway will at once pay. They do at the present time, when they recognize their liability. It is very rarely, speaking comparatively, that they contest a claim in which they are liable at all; they usually pay or make a settlement of some kind, because, by reason of the decisions of the courts, the law has become fairly well known. If the Act is amended along the lines here urged, I believe that eight times for once they pay now, they will pay without any litigation at all, and that not in any case under this law, will they be compelled, where they have absolute right and justice on their side to pay; that is, wherever they are not responsible, they will not pay. I make no allegation at all that in all respects as affects the railway law in regard to the killing of cattle this goes the whole way in effecting the reform. I say in the case of animals at large which represents the great majority of cases that it goes a long way and effects a great reform.

There will still, perhaps, be a class of cases where loss results and nobody's negligence is the cause, where the railway company is not negligent and therefore not responsible and where the farmer is not negligent and therefore, not responsible. I believe myself that we should move to amend the law in that regard, and, as the Prime Minister stated, the Railway Act is to be amended, I throw out this suggestion, whatever it may be worth, that in that class of cases, where the loss results, and no man's negligence is the cause, namely, the class of cases where the loss results simply from the incidence of the railway companies themselves, that is to say, a loss caused by reason of the operation of a railway, which is a dangerous operation in the country, a loss incident to the running of railway trains, and is founded on the negligence of no person or company at all, I believe that justice would be better met by making the company pay rather than by making the farmer pay. I do not say that to play the role of demagogue in any way, but I say it after some little consideration and for this reason that while the railway company is a private corporation and a corporation entitled, generally speaking, to just as much protection under the law as a private individual, there is this difference that, especially in later times, a railway company partakes of the nature of a semi-public corporation. There is a great, and increasing sense in which the railway is a corporation of a public character in that its assets become more and more, as the years go by, socially created assets. It is serving a great public rather than a private end and by reason of that fact the gains that a railway company make, are, or should be, in part, the gains of the public and the losses that a railway company make are the losses of the public.

The gains a railway company makes are the gains of the public, and the losses of a railway company are the losses of the public, and, in the ultimate, the losses suffered by a corporation of this semi-public character fall back upon the public, and that is where losses of the class I have just last referred to should fall. That is to say: losses that are incidental to the operation of railway trains, and that are caused not by the negligence of any one or of any company. It, therefore, would appear to me, as the better legislation, and as the better purpose to be kept in view, to shoulder that class of legislation on the railway corporation instead of leaving it upon the shoulders of the individual. That again is a class of cases not directly affected by this amendment. The purpose to be affected by the amendment I have outlined at the beginning of my remarks, and I urge it upon the attention of the House with all the earnestness of which I am possessed. I believe it will effect an important reform, and that it will effect that reform without doing violence to the duty we owe to corporations, to individuals, or to anybody.

Mr. KYTE. I would like to know if the remedy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) is seeking for the conditions in the west by this legislation, would apply to the conditions in the province of Nova Scotia. A few years ago in the case of Gordon vs. Dickie, the Supreme Court of Canada held that in Nova Scotia cattle were not permitted to be at large, that the owner was obliged to keep his cattle fenced in, and that if cattle were killed or injured in any way while at large the owner had to bear the loss. The conditions prevailing in the west are similar in some respects to those prevailing in Nova Scotia, where large pastures are held in common, and where the farmers are obliged to allow their cattle to roam at

large. As the law at present is, if one of these animals should wander on the right of way, by reason of a defect in the fence, or through a gate being left open negligently by the company and the animal is killed, the owner has no recourse. I am heartily in favour of the principle of this Bill as explained by the hon. gentleman. Two years ago, a valuable horse belonging to a constituent of mine, and which was roaming at large, as is the custom in that part of the country, wandered on the Intercolonial through a defect in the fence which was known to the section foreman for several months, and the animal being killed, application was made to the department for compensation, and the owner was told that, inasmuch as the horse was roaming at large and had not strayed on the right of way from the owner's property, they were not liable for damages. I should be very glad, indeed, if this principle which the hon. gentleman is seeking to have incorporated in the Railway Act would apply to the Intercolonial as well as to every other railway, so that the residents in that part of the country through which the Intercolonial railway runs might get justice in such cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Of course, the entire Railway Act applies to the whole of Canada, and the only distinction I drew was that the exigencies of the conditions in western Canada demanded this legislation more than they did elsewhere. The Railway Act is no respecter of provinces, and has the same application to one province as to the other.

Mr. KYTE. The decision in Gordon vs Dickie was that cattle were not permitted to be at large in Nova Scotia, and I understand they are so permitted in the west.

Mr. MEIGHEN. In the west, the province delegates to the municipalities the power to allow the running at large of animals, but of course an animal must be kept on the property of the owner, and if it goes beyond that and it is injured the owner is responsible. But that does not affect this Bill. Even though that may be the law, the liability for the death of the animal if it gets on the right of way is altogether another question. I submit that the fact that an animal was killed on the right of way through the negligence of the company should not be a barrier to recovery, and if this Bill should become law it would not be a barrier in Nova Scotia, any more than in the western provinces. As to its application to the Intercolonial railway I do not feel myself qualified to speak.

Mr. OLIVER. What the hon. member from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) has said as to the importance of this matter might very well give reason for the Prime Minister to change his mind in regard to his decision not to permit any amendments to the Railway Act this session. I can assure the Prime Minister and the government that the condition in the west, because of the legislation as it stands, or, as it is interpreted, is a very great grievance and a very great hardship. It is a condition which has existed for some time, and I can tell the Prime Minister that the people of the west who are suffering under that grievance cannot look with equanimity upon his decision not to legislate this session in the direction proposed by this Bill. In this case, the right hon. gentleman might very well make an exception, and I think the hon. members representing western constituencies will back up what I say in this regard.

With the amendment itself, as stated in its purpose by the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) I am not altogether in agreement. His complaint against the present law is that the company escapes liability unless the owner of the animal can prove lack of negligence on his part. My fault with this proposal is that the company will under that legislation escape liability unless the claimant can prove negligence on the company's part.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The company has to disprove it.

Mr. OLIVER. Theoretically, the company has to disprove it, but in actual practice the claimant would have to prove and the company would thereby escape.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not understand my hon. friend. How could it be in actual practice if it is not the law.

Mr. OLIVER. I will explain. This legislation says that on the company fulfilling certain requirements laid down by the Railway Commission, the company shall not be liable. The Railway Commission cannot lay down a requirement that will be efficient and that the company can fulfil in regard to cattle guards. There is no cattle guard yet invented that will keep cattle off the track. Until such cattle guard is invented it is futile to say that this legislation would protect the owner of the cattle or would lay liability definitely on the railway company beyond the point I have stated.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is the first section.

Mr. OLIVER. The first section read in connection with the second. The two parts must be read together; the one affects the other; and, in my humble judgment, the provision of the first part read in connection with the provisions of the second part would absolutely relieve the railway company from liability. The matter is too serious to be left as a matter of opinion between my hon. friend and myself. He has stated his reason for bringing in the

Bill; I have stated my reasons for disagreeing with the provisions of the Bill as not being effective.

Mr. BORDEN. Has the hon. gentleman any suggestion?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. Before I make a suggestion, however, I wish to say that the law as it stands at present is, I understand, either entirely or measurably satisfactory to the part of the country where in the ordinary course of affairs all stock is kept in inclosures; but just for that very reason it is entirely unsatisfactory to those parts of the country where in the ordinary course of affairs the stock runs at large; and just as soon as the legislation now on the statute-book was passed, at that time and always afterwards those parts of the country where the stock generally speaking runs at large have felt themselves under a very great disadvantage. This legislation became effective in May, 1910, and during the sumer of 1910 and the summer of 1911 complaint was continually made against the consequences of that legislation. I am not sure who was directly and immediately responsible for that legistion, but I am under the impression that my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie had something to do with it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Yes, I introduced the legislation which the government adopted.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no doubt of the intent of the legislation, and no doubt of its efficiency in a very large part of the country; but the very thing that makes it efficient in one part of the country makes it inefficient in another part. I repeat that the condition is so urgent that I think the government would do well to meet the case at this session. As to the suggestion which I have to make, I merely wish to put before the House again the clause of the Bill amending the Railway Act that was introduced at the last session by the late Minister of Railways. That clause was one of a number of clauses amending the Railway Act. It met with such opposition in the House at the time it was brought forward that it was dropped out of the Bill in order that the other provisions might go through. But I think that on mature consideration the House will recognize that that provision would be comprehensive and adequate, and would be absolutely fair as between the railway company and the public, while I admit that it does not give the railway company that percentage of advantage which it seems to have been the principle of all previous legislation to concede. The proposed amendment, which was section 11 of Bill (No. 197) of last session, reads as follows:

Sections 294 and 295 of the principal Act, and sections 8 and 9 of chapter 50 of the statutes of 1910, are repealed, and the following is enacted as section 294 of the principal Act:—

294. The company shall be liable to the owner for the full value of all horses, sheep, swine or other cattle that may be killed or injured upon the company's lands through the operation of the railway, save where such killing or injury is caused by reason of any person—

(a) failing to keep the gates at any farm crossing, at each side of the railway closed, when not in use; or,

(b) leaving open any gate on either side of the railway provided for the use of any farm crossing without some competent person being at or near such gate to prevent animals passing through such gate on to the railway; or,

(c) other than an officer, contractor, or employee of the company, taking down any part of the railway fence; or,

(d) turning any animal upon or within the enclosure of any railway company; or,

(e) except as authorized by said Act, without the consent of the company, riding, leading or driving any animal, or suffering it to enter upon any railway and within the fences and guards thereof; or,

(f) leaving the gates of the company at railway stations open for the convenience of the company.

It will be observed that the principle is laid down in the first section that if the cattle are killed on the track the company is liable. There is no question about the kind of fence or the kind of cattle guard or whether there is a fence or cattle guard at all. It is up to the company to see that its cattle guard or fence is such as to keep the cattle out, and if the cattle are not kept out, that is all that has to be shown. Then there must be exceptions to that, and the list of exceptions which I have read practically follows the provisions that are already in the Act. These exceptions might be amended or might be added to if that were found necessary; but the main principle is the declaration that if the cattle are killed on the track, the company is liable for their full value. That principle I would wish to see embodied in legislation this session, the more so because since May of 1910, as my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie has graphically pointed out, the cattle owners of the western country, and, as my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) has pointed out, the cattle owners in Cape Breton as well, are in practice deprived of the protection of the law as against the railway companies. That is a condition that should not be allowed to remain for a moment longer than is necessary to pass legislation to cure it.

Last session the then Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) was so convinced of the necessity of remedying the situation that he brought in the legislation which I have already placed before the House. For reasons good or bad that legislation was opposed by my hon. friends from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) Souris,

(Mr. Schaffner) Macdonald, (Mr. Staples) Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster). It is for them to say why. In consequence of their opposition that provision had to be dropped out of the Bill in order that the rest of it might pass. Relief was in sight for the people of the west at that time. That opportunity passed by and another has come, and I am satisfied that the people of that country will feel that their interests are not being properly served unless this opportunity be taken advantage of to meet a very special and urgent condition due more particularly to legislation by this parliament which, while curing a certain evil in one part of the country, left the door open wide to evil in another part.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman not see that the legislation he has just read, takes the burden off the railway companies altogether?

Mr. OLIVER. I see quite the contrary.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does he not remember that when the legislation was before this House the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) moved an amendment making it clear that the burden of proof was on the companies, and the government rejected that amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not recall that incident, and I do not know that it is profitable to discuss matters of detail which occurred so long ago; but the point is that this proposal, purports to offer a remedy to an exceedingly undesirable condition. My hon. friend has placed his views before the House, and no one could place them better, and I have taken the liberty to submit mine. What I am urging is not so much that my views shall be accepted as that the government shall take up the question on its own responsibility and deal with it efficiently so as to bring about a change in the present undesirable conditions. If anyone has something better to offer than this proposal of mine, I shall be very glad to accept it; but the principle laid down in the first part of the section I have read, is one I certainly wish to see adopted and the only one that will be fair to all parties. My hon. friend from Portage La Prairie has stated several times that it was desirable we should deal justly with the railway companies. Well, we are not dealing unjustly with the railway company. We do not wish to deal unfairly or unjustly with them; but if an animal be killed, whoever killed it should pay for it. If a railway company should kill it, that company should pay for it. That is the principle laid down in this section which I should like to see incorporated in our legislation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have listened very attentively to the very able argument of my hon. friend from Portage La Prairie. I sympathize with him very much in the views he has advocated. As I understand he is the author of the law as it stands at present. It was upon his initiative that the statute of 1910 was accepted by the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am not the author of that law at all, nor was it enacted on my initiative. Subsection 4 of section 294 substantially as it is to-day, was enacted at the instance of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) some time before I was in this House. Two years ago I introduced an amendment which did not substantially affect the law. That amendment the government adopted, and it was useful in so far as it went. It went this far. Previously, under certain conditions, the railways were responsible for injuries caused to animals by their trains or engines. The amendment proposed and accepted by the government enlarges the classes of damages but not the conditions under which the company would have to pay. It did not affect the law as it substantially stood, and as, for all purposes, it stands yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What I submit is this. If an accident takes place and nobody is at fault—neither the company, nor the owners of the animal—the burden of the loss must fall upon the company. That is, I think, the way my hon. friend put his case. It seems to me that the law at present goes very far towards embodying in the statute that very idea, and I do not think the Bill my hon. friend proposes at all improves it in that respect.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not contend that it does in that respect. I contend that should be the law. It does not affect that class of cases at all, but a much larger class of cases.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At present unless the railway company establishes that the animal killed or injured got at large through the negligence, wilful act or omission of its owner or agent or custodian, the railway company is responsible. If a claim be made by the owner of an animal, what is the defence which the company may make? The company cannot say: I am not at fault, I have complied with all the requirements of the law. The company is liable even if its gates were closed, its fences in order, and its cattle guards in good condition. The only defence it can put up is this: You, the owner, were at fault because your animal was at large, and there was no one to look after it. If the company were to say that its fences were in good order, such a plea would not be entertained by the courts.

You cannot escape the law unless you can show that the man is at fault himself. All the issue under the statute as it exists to-day is not the conduct of the company, but of the claimant. If the statute were as my hon. friend suggests that would be reversed. The thing then in issue would be the conduct of the company, because this is the amendment of my hon. friend. The company will be liable.

Uuless the company establishes that such animal so got upon the property of the company without the negligence of the company or the omission of any duty binding on the company.

I think on the whole that the existing law is preferable to the proposed amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not think my right hon. friend can show a case where a company were made to pay, if they were not in default.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think my hon. friend is wrong in saying that there are no cases like that suggested by the right hon. the leader of the opposition. There is the case of Parks vs. the Canadian Northern railway, where it was decided that the company had no fences, not being bound by law to fence, but they were still held liable on the very principle laid down by the leader of the opposition. It was decided by Chief Justice Mathers, and the decision was maintained on appeal, (18 Western Law Reports, page 118).

Mr. BORDEN. What was decided?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think the question decided was that the company had not fenced, and were not bound by law to fence in that particular locality, but that under section 294 as amended they were liable. That must be the result of the law as it stands.

Mr. MEIGHEN. In practice there are very few cases where the company have not been negligent.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Such cases as I have mentioned may not be common, but they may and do happen. I quite approve of the principle laid down, but I think the hon. member may do well to take notice of the objection raised by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), as well as that since raised. Both of these might be easily overcome. The objection raised by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), is a most serious one, and I think if section 254 is left as it is, it will secure everything sought to be brought about by this amendment. By section 254, subsection 3, it will be seen that the duty is absolutely on the railway company, they must provide fences and guards according to the decisions; sufficient fences means absolutely sufficient fences and guards that the animals cannot get over. My hon. friend would do away with that entirely. The establishment of a standard 'guard' rests with the Railway Commission. The railway companies tell us they cannot invent a cattle guard that will be sufficient, and then, as there must be some decision, the result will be that a standard will be fixed that is not sufficient.

My hon. friend has put in something that he should not have put in. I think he will agree that if he wishes to get on with this amendment the safe way is to drop out that entirely, and leave the section as it was. Then it will be a tolerably effective amendment, as it will provide against the greater part of the evil. I think he would be wise to deal with the other objection too, that is, to leave it in such a way that the company is still liable. It would be a case where, though neither party had been guilty of wrong-doing, still there is a loss; and he says, and rightly says, that the railway company should bear that loss. I am anxious for this Bill to go through. It is important that it should go through at this particular stage, for we have been waiting too long already. The member from Portage la Prairie admits that he did not frame this other clause of the statute of 1910. No doubt he thought himself that those amendments were sufficient at that time. But he will agree with me that he is not infallible, and if he looks at this carefully he will admit that he has made two serious mistakes, but they can be easily rectified. It is largely a question of cattle guards. The railway company states that they cannot invent cattle guards which will keep out stock. I am not prepared to admit that, though I am not an expert on cattle guards. But I notice that when people have to do a certain thing or suffer a loss, they generally do it; and I have no doubt at all of the ability of the railway company to invent a cattle guard that will keep out cattle, but I do not believe they will ever do it until they have to. Necessity is the mother of invention, and they can invent something that will be effective. The law says they must but they don't, and the law protects them in case they don't. No doubt the hon. member for Calgary is well posted in all the arguments that favour railway companies; but the fact is that while the legislature says they must, the legislature provides that they should escape the penalty in case they do not. It provides that the farmer should suffer damage if they fail to carry out the requirements of the law. I think that is unreasonable. If the company openly violates the law, why should some one else have to suffer damage in consequence? The company is openly violating the law. Although they say they cannot carry it out, I doubt the correctness of their statement. They openly

violate the law, and the farmer whose cattle are killed suffers the damage. I think the House will agree that is not just. There is possibly a little prejudice against the contention of the farmer, raised, perhaps, by reason of the way this section is worded. It says that if a man is guilty of negligence or wilful omission, he should not have any remedy. But that is not the approximate cause of the damage. The party who is principally liable, should suffer the damage, and that is no doubt the railway company.

My hon. friend from Richmond, N.S., says that in his province it is not reasonable to expect that the farmers will keep their cattle enclosed all the time, it is usual to let them run at large. I know that in many parts of the west in the ranching country, you cannot carry on business in any other way than by letting them run at large. Even in the farming country of Saskatchewan it is not possible for farmers continually to keep their cattle in such a way that they may not occasionally get at large through the negligence or the wilful act or omission of the owner. Take the case of an ordinary farmer in Saskatchewan, where I understand the conditions best. I know a very large portion of the farmers in sections where railways are fenced do not generally enclose their lands. The other day the farmers of the west were given a little lecture by the Minister of Trade and Commerce as to the necessity of mixed farming. I do not think a lecture in this House is ever going to make the farmers of the west go into mixed farming. You must give them a reason for becoming mixed farmers, but if you tell them that they must not keep any stock around their place unless they keep their animals enclosed, then you are going to discourage mixed farming in the west. Even in cases where the farmers have their lands enclosed, it is not usual throughout the winter to keep their lands inclosed all the time, or to keep their lands inclosed in such a manner that no animal can escape. On the open prairie the snow drifts badly, and it is practically impossible to keep a gate so clear of drifts that you can open and close it every time you go through. As a matter of course, that gate will be left open some time in the winter, and an animal may get at large. I hope that this House will be satisfied with the arguments that have been given, and acknowledge that it is only fair-play that we are asking. I hope that my hon. friend will consider the suggestions that have been given, and will agree to correct his amendment where it is at fault.

Mr. CARVELL. Possibly there may be a grievance in the west that requires amendment, or requires something in the way of amendment. I am afraid that if this Bill were to pass as it has been drafted, the people in eastern Canada, where the railways are fenced, would be in a worse position than they are at the present time. It seems to me that the law as laid down by the Act of 1910 is almost ideal, so far as ordinary conditions are concerned all over Canada. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the conditions of farming in the west to know whether there are large portions of land that are not fenced, according to section 254 of the Railway Act. But in all eastern Canada I am satisfied that the railways do fence, practically in every case, according to the provisions of the Railway Act. Now the underlying principle of the amendment of 1910 is that the farmer can get paid unless the railway company proves that he is negligent, or guilty of wilful omission in leaving the cattle at large. If we adopt the principle laid down in this Bill we are entirely reversing that, and we are saying that the company is not negligent if it can prove that it has complied with all the requirements of the law. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle so forcibly a railway company might say: We have provided fences four feet six inches high——

Mr. MEIGHEN. Let me draw my hon. friend's attention to this point: The Act as pointed out by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, makes the duty of the company absolute to prevent cattle getting on the track. Their fences must be such, and their cattle guards must be such. If it is the case that they do not prevent them from getting on how can they get on except through the negligence or omission of the company?

Mr. CARVELL. I cannot understand that because they do get on and under the law, I do not care what the company may say, if the animals do get on the company is liable, unless they can prove an act of negligence on the part of the owner.

Mr. BENNETT (Calgary). That is prima facie evidence against the company.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, and in my practice I find that it works admirably. I have not had any difficulty in compelling the company to pay in every case where animals have been killed on the track. I am afraid that if the proposed Bill became law I would not be in the same position. I have no doubt whatever that if the animals got on the track the company would say: Our fences were all right, and our cattle guards are of the most approved pattern, it is not our fault, we have done everything we ought to do, and therefore, you have no right against us. My hon. friend, I presume, has had some experience with railway companies. Railway companies keep their fences and cattle

guards in order through the agency of their workmen and officials, and you will never find a section man admitting that his fence or cattle guard is at fault if he can help it. Just as sure as a case goes to court under this Bill, you will find that it will not only be the wish, but almost the life of the section man or official, to say: Our cattle guards and fences are in perfect condition, which raises at once a question of fact and if the judge or jury decides that, as a matter of fact, the cattle guard or fence was in proper condition, the farmer loses. The hon. gentleman desires to provide for a condition of affairs in the west, but, in so far as affairs in the east are concerned, I am satisfied that it would be a misfortune to the farmers if this Bill were made law and I think, that unless I can get some light upon it, I would be almost compelled to vote against the second reading.

Mr. MEIGHEN. My hon. friend says that he has always succeeded in making the company pay. Can he tell the House of a case where the company has been made to pay in which they had not violated this Act, in which they lived up to the provisions of this Act, and if so, would he give us the particulars?

Mr. CARVELL. I may say that I have not been compelled to sue the company since this Act was passed, but I have already collected a number of claims. I have collected half a dozen claims from the Canadian Pacific railway since this Act became law, and all I have been compelled to do, has been to prove that the cattle were on the railway track and were killed.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then, if you did not have any cases yourself, could you give us the particulars of a case in which cattle were killed where the company lived up to the Act?

Mr. CARVELL. Not long ago I had a case where five sheep got on the railway track. I do not know by what agency, but the fence was torn down and the sheep got on the track. They paid. It may have been some outsider who broke the fence down.

Mr. MEIGHEN. They were in default.

Mr. CARVELL. No.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Yes, they must maintain a fence that will keep out the sheep.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend is begging the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is the Act.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend wants to get at the right side of this question let him direct his attention not to section 294 but to section 254. It would appear that there is a great deal of misconception on the part of the legal profession and railway companies as to what is meant by subsection 4 of section 254, with regard to fencing the line. When must the railway company fence? I think that the railway company should be compelled to fence every mile of its road and that it should take the same precaution through wilderness land as through cultivated land. I think that if my hon. friend would direct his attention to this section and make it obligatory upon railway companies to fence their track in every place and under every condition and leave section 294 as it is he would meet the difficulty. He would not be creating a condition of affairs which would be beneficial to the people of the west and against the interest of the people of the east, but he would be creating a condition which would benefit everybody and it would not be sectional legislation. Unless I can get some further light I am afraid I will be compelled to vote against the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. THOMAS MACNUTT (Saltcoats). Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to approach this question from the standpoint of the lawyer. I will have to leave that to the many eminent lawyers who are here and who can take care of that end of it, but I may make a few remarks and produce some little evidence in the shape of letters from some settlers that the present system in the west is no protection whatever to the farmer. Under the Saskatchewan law it is not illegal for cattle to be at large. I have never heard that it was; in fact, they are encouraged to be at large. The farmers there have accepted a law called the fence law. They recognize that it is better for their cattle to be out on the vacant land getting the grass, they are willing to protect their crops and to do that they are required under law to erect what is called a legal fence and to maintain gates. They are willing to do that; otherwise they cannot collect for any damage which may be inflicted upon their crops. I think that the railway companies should be obliged to protect their property in the same way not only for the benefit of the farmers but in the interest of the travelling public because many wrecks have been occasioned by animals getting on the track. Under the present law they have to fence their railway, but I think it would be far better if there were no fence at all because the cattle get on the track with the present style of cattle guards. The cattle get over these guards and are entrapped. The fences are very good generally and the cattle guards are very poor. They get in between these fences, a train comes along, the animals are frightened and they run backwards and forwards and cannot get out. If there were no fences at all they would get out on the prairie again. Without better cattle

guards it would be better to have no fences. It is claimed that the best kind of cattle guards invented are used in the west, but I have heard to-night that there are cattle guards along the Intercolonial railway that do protect the track and keep stock from getting on it. I know that one railway company in the west just use planks set on edge at an angle and the cattle can run over them. I want to show what some of the settlers say about this question. It is generally understood that under the present law the animals must break through the railway fences and get on the track from the owner's property or there is no recourse for the owner. I have never heard of a case yet in the west where the farmers have got any compensation, unless the guards had been removed. With the permission of the House I will read the following letters showing how cattle do get on the track in that country:

Melville, January 15, 1912.

Thos. MacNutt, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—W. G. Gudnason, of Yarbo, had a 2-year old mare killed about 15 months ago. She got on the right of way at the crossing and had galloped nearly a mile ahead of the train before being killed. He had a claim made through a lawyer but was advised that he had no chance for action. Value $225. I had a colt killed on March 16, 1911. This colt had gone down the track with other horses. In this case the guards had been removed for the winter, and as the trails were heavy any stock running on the prairie would take to the track on account of there being no obstruction whatever. I have not been able to get any settlement so far for this animal. Value $90.

H. Frechette, of Yarbo, had a calf killed in the yard at Yarbo, near the loading platform. Dan. Stack has had several head of young stock killed. Howard Spence, of Zeneta, had at least three cows killed; Sam. Mitchell, of Atwater, had four or five horses and Jack Bradley, of Atwater, had horses killed to the value of about $1,000. None of these claims have been settled, the company taking the stand that they were not legally liable and that their guards were approved by the Railway Commission. In connection with these guards, I wrote to the claims agent and offered to bet him $100 that I would drive a team across these guards at 10 miles an hour and the offer is still open. On Atwater section, from April till November, there was about $1,400 worth of stock killed. I have seen cattle and horses cross these guards without any hesitation, and one occasion after being chased off the right of way ahead of a train they immediately recrossed the guards after the train had passed. To my mind the present guards seem to offer an incentive for stock to go on to the track. I have several times heard railway employees discuss these guards and they are of opinion that they are of no use for the purpose for which they are intended.

With best wishes, I am,
Yours faithfully,
J. J. SULLIVAN.

Yarbo, Sask., Jan. 16, 1912.

Mr. Thomas MacNutt,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—I am one of the many who have had stock killed by the railway company through defective cattle guards. The particulars in my case are as follows:—

I had some of my horses running on vacant Canadian Pacific railway land (we have no herd law here), and one of them (a fine Clyde bred filly, 2 years old, worth then $225, would have been worth easily $300 now), got in on the track over the guards from the public crossing. I traced her tracks from where she was killed back to the guards, a distance of a little over half a mile. This was on the 10th of June, 1910. I put in a claim but got nothing. I inclose the final letter from the railway company. The railway company put up a good fence, but the guards are of no earthly use for the purpose for which they are intended. I have seen cattle walking over the guards and they have no more trouble to walk on them than on a plank floor. I have several times driven other people's cattle out when I have seen them in on the track.

The law is very unjust to the farmer and they lose thousands of dollars every year, all through defective guards. I think the law should be amended so that the railway company would have to pay for all the stock killed, then they might put in a guard which would keep the stock out. Hoping that the Railway Act will be amended.

I am, yours truly,
W. G. GUDNASON.

Winnipeg, March 27, 1911.

W. G. Gudnason, Esq.,
Yarbo, Sask.

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 18th instant to Mr. Chamberlin has been forwarded to me for reply.

I would be glad to meet your wishes in this matter, respecting the settlement of the claim, but inasmuch as there are no legal grounds of liability on the part of this company, I think you should understand that we cannot consistently accede to your wishes. If all claims preferred against a railway company were settled irrespective of legal liability, it would be a serious matter for the shareholders.

After having given repeated consideration to your claim, I must again respectfully beg to decline the same.

Yours truly,
D'ARCY TATE,
Solicitor.

Esterhazy, Sask., 19th Jan., 1912.

Dear Sir,—I may say that I have had two horses (valued at $600) killed on the track of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, about one mile east of Zeneta, and the so-called cattle guards as used by the Grand Trunk Pacific are utterly useless, as both horses and cattle walk over them as if there was no obstruction at all. As no doubt you are aware, several other farmers have had either horses or cattle killed in this district on the track of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the loss to the farmers in the district from Yarbo to Atwater would amount to about $3,000. One mare was

killed on October 16, 1911, and two others September 4, 1911.

Yours faithfully,
MISS NARA STACK.
MR. DELL STACK.

Atwater, Jan. 22, 1912.

Mr. MacNutt.

Dear Sir,—I thought I would write you about my horses that were killed on the Grand Trunk railway last fall; one was killed in September and 3 in October, 3 fillies and one gelding, 2 rising 3 years and 2 rising 2 years; the four were valued at seven hundred dollars. I don't think that I could buy 4 colts as good for that money; also they were all killed on the right of way. They went in over the guards. Horses don't mind the guards one bit; the guards is no good. That is the reason that there are so many killed. There has been a lot of horses killed between Atwater and Yarbo. Mr. Mitchell had 2 killed and Mr. Spense at Zeneta had 2 or 3 killed, and Mr. Stack at Yarbo had two killed, and every one of them killed on right of way. They had gone in over the guards; that is proof enough that the guards are no good.

I hope you will be able to do something in the matter.

Yours truly,
J. BRADLEY.

Zeneta, Sask., Jan. 20, 1912.

Dear Sir,—I am writing you about the amount of stock the Grand Trunk Pacific railway has killed for me in about one year, which the appraisers valued at $700. In August, 1910, I had one cow killed. The cattle were walking down the yard and were caught by a freight train just leaving Zeneta and were found just across the public crossing on the company's land.

Now there is one whole section of the company's road that is unprotected by any kind of a guard at Zeneta. The cattle and horses go up and down this track for nearly one mile and a half (1½ miles) just as they please. And then on September 4, 1911, I had two horses killed outright and one had a leg broken, all of them mares, one was with foal. About one mile from Zeneta these horses had walked over the guard that is laid down on the public crossing and were killed about midway between the crossings. It was plain to see where the horses had run in front of the train for some distance before they were killed. The train could have been stopped easily in both cases, but they never stop but jam into any stock that is in front of them. Now about the guards. They are no good to keep horses or cattle from off the track. I have seen them walk over the guards just as though there were a few loose poles in their way. I have written the company about the stock, but as yet have received no satisfaction at all.

Is there no way to make the company pay for the stock where the guards are no good? The road is practically unprotected from stock going on when they please.

Please let me hear from you in regard to this matter.

Yours truly,
H. E. SPENCE,
Zeneta, Sask.

Spy Hill, January 26, 1912.

Dear Sir,—Yours to hand and noted. There has been killed on the Grand Trunk Pacific in the Spy Hill district, 22 head of cattle and, I think, about 6 horses. There are no cattle guards now at any of the crossings as they were taken up in December early; when in they are no use as horses and cattle walk across them as if there were none.

Trusting to hear from you on this matter and also on all matters affecting the farmers and our province.

Yours truly,
JOHN A. BROWN.

Atwater, Jan. 17, 1912.

I beg to inform you that a two-year old mare, being worth at least $175, was killed for me on the railway track of the Grand Trunk railway, on section 5-21-2, west of the first crossing some time in the latter part of August, 1911.

The mare crossed the cattle guards on above mentioned crossing. I did not think it worth while sending in a claim to the railway company as I understand the guards are what the law requires.

I would think the government of Canada ought to have big enough eyes to see that the present cattle guards on the Grand Trunk railway are entirely worthless. That is if they ever seen them, and if they have not, it certainly is time they have a sample sent down to Ottawa, so every member of the parliament that has a horse can put it outside their stable door and give it a trial. As my farm is only a few rods from the track, it is almost impossible to keep the stock off the track.

Hoping you will do all in your power to remedy the present situation with regard to the cattle guards on above mentioned road.

I remain,
Yours very respectfully,
K. GRIMSRUZ.
Atwater, Sask.

I have read these letters from some farmers that I know personally, as evidence that a great many cattle are killed. I think the Bill would be satisfactory except for the rider. I do not wish to say one word reflecting on the Railway Commission, which everybody in the west highly appreciates; but it seems to me that the official who passed the present cattle guards did not act on very good judgment. The Bill reads:

Such fences, gates and cattle guards shall be suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway lands.

If it stopped there, it would be all right; but it goes on to say:

And the style, construction, material and dimensions of such cattle guards shall, before the 1st day of April, 1912, be submitted to the board and receive its approval.

There is no reason to expect that the Railway Commission would alter its judgment very much, so that we would be very much as we are at the present time. With that rider in the Bill, I think it is utterly use-

less, and, therefore, I cannot support it. I think, however, that something should be done in this matter. If the railway companies are not able to protect their tracks properly, I think they should pay for the damage, and there is no doubt they are able to do so. The Intercolonial railway does so, and the railways in the west should do so too. I have known people who could not put in their crops because they lost their horses on the railway tracks. It may be said that they should not let them run at large; but that does not relieve the railway company of responsibility. I have heard of a few cases in which the railway company made some allowance to the settler, but without prejudice. This is a very important matter, but I do not think this Bill would give any relief.

Mr. TURRIFF. I hope that what has been said to-night will convince the right hon. the Prime Minister that some action is necessary this session, and I am sure that other members of the House, like myself, who have Bills before the House to amend the Railway Act, would be very pleased to waive their rights to have those Bills considered until a consolidated Bill is introduced next session, so as to allow the Bill of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) to receive the consideration of the government at this session. We have heard to-night of the tremendous loss of money to settlers in these cases. I know of a case in my own constituency in which four horses which were being watered by the owner at his well ran on the railway track and were all killed, and he has never been able to collect one cent from the railway company. The loss practically put him out of business, the horses could not be replaced for $1,000. I think the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) is trying to get up something that will improve the Act, but after the explanations made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson), I am sure the House will see that if we leave clause 1 as proposed by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), we shall not accomplish his object. If it is provided that the railway company may get the endorsation or approval of the Railway Commission for its cattle guards, it will still manage to escape all liability. What we want to do now is to make the railway company liable for any animals killed on the tracks. If that is done the railway companies will very soon find means of preventing horses and cattle from getting on their tracks. In looking over subsection 4 of section 294 of the Act, it seems to me that it would be made all right if the following words were omitted from it:

> Unless the company establishes that such animal got at large through the negligence or wilful act or omission of the owner or his agent, or of the custodian of such animal or his agent.

If these lines were omitted, responsibility would be placed on the railway companies for every animal that is killed, except the ordinary exceptions such as the farmer leaving his gate open purposely, and there would not be one animal killed where there are ten killed to-day. The railway company should pay the loss, simply because in that case it is the general public that would be paying. If you make the railway company responsible, it will take the necessary means to prevent cattle getting on the track, and there would be one killed in the future where ten or twenty have been killed in the past.

I hope that the right hon. the First Minister, will see his way clear to make an exception in the case of the Bill of my hon. friend from Portage La Prairie. I am satisfied that if the hon. members for Portage La Prairie, Calgary, Edmonton and Qu'Appelle, were to get together for an hour, they could bring in a Bill that would be satisfactory to every one, and would go through the House with very little discussion.

Mr. WARNOCK. As I have some practical experience in this matter, I should like to say a few words concerning it. That some amendment should be made to the Railway Act which would give the farmers compensation for horses and cattle killed by railway trains is certainly of great urgency and importance to our western country. 75 per cent of the horses and cattle killed by railways, have been killed after they gained access to the right of way across cattle guards. A number of years ago, when Alberta was much more of a ranching country than it is now, an arrangement was made with the Canadian Pacific railway by which that company agreed to pay for all cattle—they did not include horses—killed or injured by their trains, without any necessity on the part of the owners to take action against the company. But as soon as the Canadian Pacific railway had fenced in its right of way, that arrangement was withdrawn, and more cattle are being killed in southern Alberta by the railway trains to-day than before the right of way was protected When the right of way was open, Alberta was a great ranching country and cattle were free to roam over the prairie, and the accidents were far less in number. But since the putting up of cattle guards, the cattle frequently stray across these guards. Then, especially at night, they are dazed by the glare of the locomotive headlights, and unable to get off the track before they are struck. Whereas before the railway

tracks were fenced in, the cattle were in no danger of finding themselves enclosed within the cattle guards, and had a greater stretch of clear space in which to escape. Within the last two years, a farmer in my constituency has lost eight fine horses, killed by the Crowsnest Pass railway, and received no compensation. The Canadian Pacific railway repudiated all liability, and under the law a conviction was almost impossible. There is one thing certain, and that is that the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners of a cattle guard put up by the company will not make it any the more efficient. If the company were compelled to pay the value of all stock killed which had crossed its cattle guards and gained access to the right of way, we should probably find much less loss in that connection than we do at present.

Mr. BORDEN. I have listened with much attention to this debate. An hon. gentleman opposite remarked that I ought to be convinced of the very urgent necessity of an amendment to the Railway Act. While I am inclined to agree with him, I am equally convinced that there is a great divergence of opinion as to how it ought to be amended. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) has submitted his proposal with that cogency and clearness which characterize all his utterances in this House. He points out that while the statute at present imputes negligence to the railway company, it also enables the company to discharge itself by proving one of many possible remote or indirect causes of the accident He proposes to change the law so that the company, in order to escape liability, must prove that it has not been guilty of any negligence or omission. It has been stated that the law as amended in 1910 worked satisfactorily in some parts of the country and unsatisfactorily in others. I do not know what may be the result of the change proposed, nor have I had any opportunity of giving close consideration to the amendment proposed by the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) last session. I remember being present when that amendment was debated with very great vehemence, with the result that in the end it was dropped in order that the remaining sections of the Bill might pass. So far as the Bill before the House is concerned, if the hon. gentlemen who have been debating it to-night would only get together and come to a conclusion as to what the amendment should be, I should be glad to consider it. It might be well to permit the Bill to go to a small committee in order that that committee might report to the House, but at the moment it seems to me it would be better that the debate should be adjourned. I am not at all convinced that if we did form a committee, the varying opinions put forward to-night would be reconciled. It is possible that they might be, and in that case it would be practicable to put this Bill on the government orders and endeavour to have some amendment to the Railway Act which could be reasonably satisfactory to all concerned. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT—PIRACY OF LOGS.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 9) to amend the Criminal Code.—Mr. Stevens.

On section 1,

Mr. STEVENS. There have been some slight amendments in the Bill as at first introduced.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Do I understand that it is intended to drop lines 17 to 19, which describe certain particular kinds of lumber at least in eastern Canada that a man could take without being liable.

Mr. DOHERTY. The effect of the Bill is that shingle bolts are added to the list of the varieties of lumber and the waters of the coast are added to the lakes and rivers now included. The Act applies to the case of timber marked with an owner's mark. The only amendment in that regard is that the mark that constitutes a prima facie case against the person retaining the timber, is a mark under the Canada Timber Act, or a mark under the British Columbia Timber Act.

Mr. STEVENS. The law clerk has asked me to have this formal clause added:

This Act shall come into force sixty days after it has been assented to by the Governor General.

Mr. CARVELL. I have no objection to this Bill in that it does not go far enough. It provides for any log which is marked with a mark duly registered under the provisions of the Timber Marking Act, or of the statutes of the province of British Columbia. Now in New Brunswick, in practically all of our large rivers, we have what are called log driving companies incorporated by the legislature, to whom is entrusted the driving of logs coming down the river, and the different owners of logs register with the driving company the marks which they claim. Now the mark itself does not give them the prima facie title in the property which the Timber Marking Act does; but it is a fact that this law shows that the log is the property of the company, or of the person claiming the mark. It seems to me that this section might be extended to cover any mark which is well known as the property of the owner.

Mr. DOHERTY. The law as it now stands attaches this privilege of constituting prima facie evidence of ownership exclusively to the marks that are registered under the Canada Timber Marking Act.

Mr. CARVELL. Then why add British Columbia?

Mr. DOHERTY. Because there is a law in British Columbia which provides for that registration, and which is more generally used there. Now we are extending it to make it apply to brands registered under the legislation of the province, and if there be similar legislation in another province then it would be an analogous case. I understand the hon. gentleman to suggest that we should extend that to apply to the mark of every private company. I think this is a provision which is relieving an owner who comes to claim his property of the burden of proving that which, in common law, falls upon him, and makes the particular designation mark prima facie evidence of his ownership. He would have to begin by proving registration of that mark, he would have to prove that that mark was his mark, which would be proving ownership. The purpose of the registration as it stood without this amendment was to attach to the registered mark, registered under the Dominion law, the privilege of making prima facie case against the man in possession of the log that he knew that mark, and, therefore, knew that he was getting somebody else's property. I think there may be a similar effect making a prima facie case of knowledge on the part of a man if he is in possession of a log bearing a mark which is registered under a law in force in the province. I think we may fairly expect a man to know the registered marks that are registered under a law of his province. But it might not be equally fair to throw upon everybody the knowledge of what is the mark of a driving company.

Mr. CARVELL. I appreciate the argument of the Minister of Justice. The fault I have to find with the section is that it either goes too far or not far enough. It creates a special law by the legislation of British Columbia, it creates a special right in some way in the legislation of British Columbia which does not apply to the legislation of other provinces.

Mr. DOHERTY. If the hon. gentleman will say that New Brunswick has a timber marking registration Act under which the registration of marks is provided for in a manner to be made public, I would say that we ought to include it. But I do not know of such an Act in New Brunswick, or in any of the other provinces. The hon. member who is promoting this Bill, does know of the existence of such an Act in British Columbia, and the logs there are habitually marked by that mark which is registered and made public under that law.

Mr. CARVELL. There is no law in New Brunswick providing for the registration of timber marks, but there is a law providing that the owners of lumber should register their marks with the driving companies, and then they get certain rights in the property. It amounts to the same thing in the end. It seems to me like sectional legislation, which applies to one province and not to all.

Mr. McCREA. The Minister of Justice has been talking about the law of British Columbia, and the law of New Brunswick. But there is another part of the country, the province of Quebec, where a great quantity of pulpwood is cut and exported, and which is not marked at all. For instance, there is a concern who practically run all their logs on the river, and only a very small percentage are marked with a registered stamp. What will happen to the mill owner if the log is not marked at all ?

Mr. DOHERTY. Merely that these gentlemen will remain under the common law, and they will have to prove that these are their logs. This Bill only goes so far as to say that a registered mark will be prima facie evidence of ownership. It is attaching a privilege to the existence of a registered mark. I think it would be an extreme measure to say that any man who is found in possession of a log should be presumed to know that it belongs to somebody else, and would have to say where he got it. A man placed in that position might have had a log that did not have that mark upon it, and inasmuch as it is an unmarked log it would be just as hard to prove that it was his log, as for the man who claimed it to prove that it was his.

Mr. McCREA. I have had some experience, and I know that there is a general impression amongst the public that if a man finds a log without a mark he has a right to take it.

Mr. DOHERTY. There is nothing in this Act justifying that.

Mr. McCREA. It may probably lead to some trouble in some places.

Mr. DOHERTY. I think my hon. friend would find it very hard if I walked into his establishment, and he happened to have a large quantity of logs on hand, and I said: Those logs are all mine unless you prove that they are yours. My hon. friend suggests that it would be a good law that would entitle me to walk into his place and say: You prove that all those logs are yours or else I will prosecute you for steal-

ing them. I do not think we could go as far as that.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DOHERTY moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I ask what business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. DOHERTY. First the Grain Bill, then other Bills except Nos. 78, 88, 95 and 97; then Supply, beginning with Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 6, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE GRAIN ACT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 32) respecting grain.—Mr. Foster (N. Toronto).

On section 101,—disputes as to grading.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is twenty-four hours long enough delay in which to allow an appeal from the grading of the inspector?

Mr. OLIVER. I think so. This grading must always take place at the inspection point, and it is absolutely necessary that there should be no delay there. Every one is supposed to be doing business there on the jump in order that the cars may get forward.

On section 102—grain survey board.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved that in subsection 2 the word 'its' be substituted for 'his,' the subsection would then read:

The grain survey board shall be governed in the performance of its duties by such general regulations as are made by the board.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TURRIFF. I notice that eight of the twelve commissioners on this grain survey board are to be appointed from the province of Manitoba. That was all right at one time when Manitoba was raising practically the great bulk of our wheat, but now the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta are raising a great deal more wheat, and I do not know that this preference given to Manitoba is right. I have not heard of any complaints and am not prepared to say that it is not right.

Mr. DOHERTY.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Where is the inspection made?

Mr. TURRIFF. In Winnipeg.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think that the probable reason for this provision is that it is difficult to get together so many from a distance. The members of the board of trade are in the city of Winnipeg and at the point of inspection.

Mr. BORDEN. Section 102 will stand.

Mr. TURRIFF. After the explanation given by my hon. friend from Souris, (Mr. Schaffner), I am not anxious that the section should stand.

Mr. BORDEN. Carried. It can be returned to afterwards if desired.

Section 104.—offices in Winnipeg.

Mr. OLIVER. While that clause is under consideration, I should like to place on record the suggestion that it will be desirable, if not now, at any rate, in the near future, to provide for a survey board at Calgary to deal with grain going west to the Pacific ports. I do not know that it is absolutely necessary at this time, but I desire to make mention of the possibility.

Mr. BORDEN. I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), desires that it be taken into consideration?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

On section 105—grades of grain.

White clipped oats—The grades Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 white clipped oats shall correspond in all respects with the grades of Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 white oats, except that the former shall weigh not less than 38, 36 and 34 pounds to the bushel respectively.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). There seems to be an error there; four grades of oats are given but only three weights.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is the same way in the old Bill. Yet it may have been an omission.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Let that stand for the present.

Mr. TURRIFF. Reverting to the question of the weight of a bushel of oats, our weight for a standard bushel is 34 pounds, while the American bushel is 32 pounds. There is no argument in the fact that 32 pounds is too light for a measured bushel. Lots of oats in the west will weigh 45 pounds and 46 pounds to the measured bushel, but 34 pounds is what we would give in selling a bushel. As we are now selling a very considerable portion of our oat crop in the United States, it might be an advantage if our standard bushel of oats, like our standard bushel of other grains, was made the same as theirs. I would suggest that a standard bushel of

oats be made 32 pounds instead of 34 pounds.

Mr. BLAIN. I would object to making any change in the weight of oats. It is a well understood thing in Ontario as well as in the other provinces, that 34 pounds is a bushel of oats and, therefore, I do not think it would be wise to adopt an American standard in preference to the standard that is so well understood in every part of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The matter of standards of these different grains is entirely technical. The representatives of the farmers, the Grain Growers' Association, of the millers, and others, have all had the Bill and have been interviewed in connection with it, and the conclusion has been not to materially disturb these grades in either weights or definitions. I would not care to assent to such a change without a general consensus of opinion.

On section 105,—grades of grain,—barley.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). There is no standard weight for No. 1 barley, while for all others there is. Then with peas no weight is given. This seems to be copied from the old Act.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There was none in the old Act. It seems that the grade of barley is imponderable; there is no weight in the present Act, there is no weight in Bill 'Q' and there is no weight in this one. I imagine we ought not to be daring enough to put a weight in.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite disagree with the minister; I think we should be daring enough to do what is right.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will let the provision with reference to barley stand.

On section 105—peas,

Mr. OLIVER. Before we pass from this part of the section, section 58 gives the standard weight of the different grains and it sets down peas as 60 lbs. to the bushel.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is provided for there.

Mr. OLIVER. The western producer is not seriously interested in this provision, but the eastern producer is, and as the eastern representatives do not probably have the Bill before them, I take the opportunity of drawing the minister's attention to the fact that under the Act as it stands peas of all grades would have the same weight, and the weight would be 60 lbs. to the bushel. I think also that the weights should be put right into the section defining the grade as in other cases.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The weight of barley is given as 48 lbs. to the bushel.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, the standard weight, but I think that in all cases, for the convenience of people who desire to use the Act, and inasmuch as there is a difference between grades, the weight of each grade should be stated in the section which defines the grade.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, that is right.

Mr. OLIVER. I would think that as subsection 1 of the barley division stands, the whole division relating to peas should stand for consideration in the interest of the eastern producer.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The definition of the grading of peas never appears to have had the weight put in at all. The general weight governing that is fixed at 58 lbs.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not an expert in peas, but I would think that No. 3 grade should not properly have the full weight of No. 1 grade. The interests of the trade would require a scaling down of the weight, but, I am not able to speak authoritatively upon it.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will look into it.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the division relating to peas had better stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 105 stands.

On section 107—grades in western inspection division,

Mr. OLIVER. The last words of the first paragraph of section 107 refer to 'the last preceding section.' That is section 106, but they should refer to section 105.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Section 105 and section 106.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the first paragraph of section 107 by inserting the word 'two' between the words 'last' and 'preceding,' and substituting the word 'sections' for the word 'section.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). In reference to section 107, there is, as far as I have understood, a pretty unanimous opinion that a change should be made in the denomination of these grades, that instead of having the word 'Manitoba' in the grades, the reading should be changed to 'Canada hard.' 'Manitoba hard wheat' was the denomination, I suppose, which was given when Manitoba was the grain

grower of the west, but Manitoba is no longer the only grain grower of the west. Saskatchewan and Alberta, notably the former, are increasing by leaps and bounds in their production of grain. The idea, then, that I wish to present to the House is that the time has come when 'Manitoba' as a denomination for hard wheat should give way to a broader name, and the name that is suggested is the word 'Canada.' There is no reason that I can see on general principles why hard wheat raised anywhere in Canada should not be hard wheat and should not get the grade, or that the name of a section should prevail rather than the name of a whole country. The grade of the wheat essentially will be exactly the same. It will be simply a change of name, and it would seem as though it would give greater prominence to the country, that is to the whole country, Canada, and give greater backing to the grade itself by having the denomination of the whole country than to confine it to a section which is now far outstripped by the adjoining sections and by the whole of Canada in the production of this grade.

The only objection which could be urged against it—and I inquired particularly of dealers and millers—was this: That when you give a distinctive name to a grade it becomes known by that name on the market, and sometimes it is known as a grade even after all the significance in the name itself has passed away. Those interested in the production and milling of grain, who have conferred with me, are of the opinion that that would not militate against the market currency of the wheat in this case. If there was any chance that it would, it could be cured in the first years of its currency by putting in brackets in our certificates after the word 'Canada,' the word 'Manitoba,' to show that 'Canada Hard Wheat' took the place of the former name, and was identical with the Manitoba Hard Wheat, and also by regulating that it should not come into effect until the first of September, 1912. With these safeguards it is generally agreed that no ill consequence would follow, and it is an idea which all seem to catch that it would be a good thing to give the general name of the country to the wheat

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not think it would be right for me to let that word 'Manitoba' be dropped without a kick. Even the kind hearted Minister of Trade and Commerce feels there will be a difficulty in dropping the name, and he is quite willing that the word 'Manitoba' should be placed in brackets. Well, I don't like that either. Manitoba has been the pioneer province in wheat growing in this country, and it is Manitoba that has produced the high grade of wheat which has earned for itself a reputation in all the markets of the world, so that in my opinion the word 'Manitoba' should stand out boldly. I do not think it is fair to drop the word 'Manitoba,' even in view of the softening down proposition with which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has connected his proposal.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a very good kick.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I thought it my duty to make that kick anyway.

Mr. OLIVER. At the same time it is unfair that the province of Manitoba should have the credit of the enormous quantity of hard wheat that is grown in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Aside from that, I think the argument placed before the committee by the Minister of Trade and Commerce is certainly very good. There is, however, a difficulty that properly arises in carrying the theory a step further, as I would like to see it carried if it can be done. I find that there are five definitions given to grain; there is 'Manitoba' for spring wheat, 'Alberta' for fall or winter wheat, 'Canadian Western' for oats, 'Northwestern Manitoba' for flax, and I think there is 'Manitoba' for barley. I would like very much to see some definition adopted that would apply to all of the different classes of grain that are raised in western Canada, and for the same reason, in regard at any rate to oats, and I believe to barley, as in the case of wheat, namely, that the quality raised in the west is superior to that raised in the remainder of the country. I am afraid that the word 'Canada,' if applied to all these other grains, would not be suitable. In the case of wheat the definition is made accurate and satisfactory by using the words 'Canada Hard Wheat', if the definition is restricted to wheat, but if you carry the word 'Canada' into oats and barley it does not apply as well. I would respectfully suggest that if it would be possible to secure a short and satisfactory word that would be distinctive, and that could be applied to all the different classes of grain raised in the prairie west as compared with the grain raised in the rest of the country it would be desirable to make the change. For my own part, I would think that if the word 'Northern' were used to distinguish all the different classes of grain raised in the prairie west it would perhaps be as good a general definition as could be given. Some people are delicate about the use of the word 'Northern' but, as a matter of fact, nine-tenths of our wheat to-day is sold as 'Northern' and the word 'Northern' has a more generally accepted significance in regard to our wheat to-day than has either the word 'Manitoba' or the word 'Hard.' I would suggest, with

all deference, merely for the consideration of the committee, that if we use the words 'Northern Hard' to apply to wheat and the word 'Northern' to apply to the barley, oats and flax, grown on the western prairies, they would constitute a satisfactory and sufficient distinguishment from the grain raised in other parts of Canada, and there would be notice to everyone dealing in the grain as to the kind of grain it was, and as to the part of the country it came from.

Mr. STAPLES. Like the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) I am jealous of the word 'Manitoba'. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has claimed for the province of Alberta the credit of growing the best 'Alberta Red Winter Wheat', but I can tell the hon. gentleman that we can produce Red Winter Wheat in the province of Manitoba just as successfully as they do in the province of Alberta.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. STAPLES. Therefore, if you are going to drop the word 'Manitoba' from 'Spring Wheat', I think you will have to drop the name 'Alberta' in order to compensate for the loss we are having in the 'Alberta Fall Wheat'.

Mr. OLIVER. That was my suggestion.

Mr. STAPLES. The name 'Manitoba' has become famous throughout the world, and while I do not like to see it dropped I think perhaps it could be worked out on the lines I have suggested. There is, of course, the danger of there being some commercial loss by dropping the name 'Manitoba', but if there is due notice given in the manner the minister has stated, probably the loss may be minimized. Section 105 of the Act provides for the eastern grades, and section 107 for the western division. Now, if you call the eastern grades 1, 2 and 3 spring wheat there might be some conflict in that. I suppose the term 'Spring' is used instead of the term 'Hard', and there are two divisions to be considered there.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the necessity of giving a distinctive name to the grain raised in the western division if it is to have credit for its special character.

Mr. STAPLES. Why not call it Western No. 1 hard instead of Northern?

Mr. ROBB. As an easterner I am prepared to support the Manitoba members in their defence of the word 'Manitoba.' It seems to me that if we make this change we shall be doing something that will disturb trade conditions in regard to both wheat and flour. We have built up in this country and on the Liverpool market a reputation for Manitoba wheat and Manitoba flour that is worth a great deal to every grower of and every dealer in western wheat. On the Liverpool market Manitoba wheat is generally quoted a little higher, for instance, than Duluth wheat; and in the United States hard wheat belt people do not confine themselves to a general term such as we propose to introduce. For instance, hard wheat is generally spoken of as Duluth wheat, while hard wheat flour is spoken of as Minnesota flour. These are trade marks which they have built up. In the same way we have built up the trade mark of Manitoba flour and Manitoba wheat on the Liverpool market, and I think the minister should hesitate before introducing any legislation that will disturb these conditions.

Sir EDMUND OSLER. In the exportation of flour and wheat the brand or trade mark is often much more valuable in sentiment than it is in reality, and it might be rather risky to make a change.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think the change could be fairly made with the safeguards surrounding it which the Minister of Trade and Commerce suggests. There is no doubt that the name 'Manitoba' having been used for a number of years, some little inconvenience would be caused in changing it. When the name was adopted, the great bulk of western wheat was grown in Manitoba; but at present there is a great deal more wheat grown in Saskatchewan than in Manitoba, and in the future there will be many times more. Take the case of flax. All our flax is sold under the names 'No. 1 Northwestern Manitoba,' and 'No. 1 Manitoba Flaxseed,' although Saskatchewan grows 90 per cent of all the flax grown in the whole Dominion; and naturally the people of Saskatchewan who produce this flax do not want it to be called by the name of another province. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Edmonton strikes me as a very good one. I think we should cut out the names Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta altogether, and use instead one name that would be fairly distinctive of the whole western country, surrounding the change with the precautions suggested by the minister. If this is done, I do not think any loss will be suffered by the producer, the miller or the exporter.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want to dictate at all, not being an expert. I just gave the House my own views as gathered from consideration of the subject. The Act we have had up to the present time is called the Manitoba Grain Act. We are calling this one the Canada Grain Act, because it embraces all parts of our country. The fact that Manitoba flour and Manitoba No. 1 hard wheat have a prece-

dence in the English market is not because the name is 'Manitoba,' but because of the hardness and the quality of the wheat. If it had happened to be called 'Saskatchewan Hard,' it would have had the same precedence, although it might have aroused some prejudice in the minds of those who had to use the term because of its largeness and the difficulty of spelling it. However, if we restricted all our Canadian wheat to the name Manitoba on the markets of London, Liverpool, Berlin and Hamburg, the idea of Canada's productive power would be restricted, whereas the word 'Canada,' would lend itself to the idea of extension and expansion. The buyer, the newspaper reader, and everybody else would say, why, this is Canadian wheat, so that the quality of the wheat would be immediately transferred to the country itself, which would be a great gain. Now that Manitoba is about to pass from the chrysalis stage of a postage-stamp province to one with large national boundaries, it will be able to appreciate the idea of largeness, and I think it would be a graceful act on the part of my two friends here to kick a little, but not to kick too hard, against the extension of the name. As a representative of the small province of Ontario, which also grows wheat, I have a little bit of an objection to having all the wheat of that province and of Canada generally, described by the name of one section. However, with the two restrictions of having the change coming into force in September, 1912, and indicating by a hyphen what the name was under the old nomenclature, I do not see how there would be any loss; and that is the expression of opinion of the Dominion Millers' Association, which had its committees here, and the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, as well as those who raised the wheat. I would, therefore, move that the word 'Canada' be substituted for the word 'Manitoba,' in the 17th line.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does eastern Canada grow hard wheat?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not know what its possibilities may be when we get up to the Hudson Bay territory.

Mr. STAPLES. As we have been letting other sections of the Bill stand, I do not think it would be any harm to let this section stand, and we may be able to get even a better name than the one the Minister has suggested. When the proposal goes out to the public generally, I think he will find considerable opposition to it, and it is fair that before we enact legislation the public should have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon friend would rather have the section stand for a little more cogitation, I have no objection.

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

Section allowed to stand.

On section 110,—standard samples United States grain.

Mr. OLIVER. The question of naming the winter wheat might be discussed. If the minister has any suggestions with regard to a title for that class of wheat, which will bring it into some sort of conformity with the proposition regarding spring wheat, it would be satisfactory to the commission to hear his suggestions.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I suggested that these items should stand so that my hon. friends might think them over. I am quite willing to take into consideration the suggestion made a little while ago to see whether any further change in the name could be proposed, which the committee would think advisable.

Mr. STAPLES. I suppose the same suggestion would apply with equal force to Alberta winter wheat as to Manitoba?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Except that there is not so much of it raised.

Mr. STAPLES. How would the word 'prairie' apply instead of 'Canada'.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It has been suggested that we should call it simply 'northern'. That however simply indicates climate and has no suggestion of nationality. You have northern wheat in Dakota and Russia. The same objection applies to the word 'prairie'. There are prairies in different parts of the world, so that the word is not distinctively Canadian. I should like to see a wheat which is really good and which we are sending out to the world's markets tagged with a distinctively Canadian name. To my mind 'Canada' is the most distinctive name we can apply. 'Canadian' is an adjective, and an adjective is not as strong as a substantive.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The question is whether we want to make any distinction between hard wheat grown in the west and hard wheat grown in eastern Canada.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We make that distinction by calling it hard.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You may have hard wheat grown at the North Pole.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Well, I would not like to repress any optimism which might be in the minds of the committee.

Mr. TURRIFF. I see that flax is not included in the eastern schedules at all. I would suggest, while leaving this section stand in the meantime, that instead of No. 1 Northwestern Manitoba flax you make No. 1 Canadian flax—either Canada or western Canada.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think that eastern Canada and western Canada would be good definitions.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would prefer No. 1 Canada.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why prefer that in the case of flax and not in the case of wheat? Flax is also grown in eastern Canada.

Mr. STAPLES. Is there any difference in quality between eastern and western flax?

Mr. TURRIFF. I have no idea whether western flax is any better or as good.

Mr. OLIVER. There has been a suggestion put forward with regard to No. 3 barley, described on page 29, which might be considered now. The definition reads:

No. 3 Manitoba barley shall include shrunken or otherwise slightly damaged barley, weighing not less than 45 pounds to the bushel.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I propose to amend that.

Mr. OLIVER. We might consider the amendment now.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I shall read the amendment, so that it may be under advisement. It is proposed that No. 3 barley shall be reasonably clean, reasonably free from all other grains, shall include weather stained, and slightly shrunken, but sound barley, free from frost and weighing not less than 44 pounds to the bushel.

The intention of having it free from frost is so that it may keep its malting properties perfectly good. A little frosting of the barley, I understand, destroys its malting properties. No. 4 barley should include all damaged barley, weighing less than 44 pounds to the bushel. This will appear in 'Hansard' and can be thought over.

On section 110.—standard samples.

Mr. NEELY. I notice subsection 3 reads:

The board may reject such standard samples if it deems them to have been unfairly or improperly chosen, and in such case it shall forthwith cause others to be chosen in their place by such means as it thinks proper.

I was not here when we discussed the powers of the Grain Survey Board, but if the Board of Grain Commissioners are to have the same authority with regard to the supervision of the selecting of samples or standards by the Survey Board of Canada wheat, I think there is an anomaly we ought to correct. As I understand it, the Board of Grain Commissioners, while supposed to be good business men understanding the conditions of the grain trade, are not necessarily grain experts in the selecting of the samples of grain and the establishing of standards.

The Grain Survey Board, I understand, is composed of men technically expert in collecting samples and establishing standards for commercial grades, and I think that the decision of such a board should not be subject to revision or supervision by the board of commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I understand that the standard samples for the United States product are to be selected here by the Grain Survey Board and the standard samples for our own grain are selected by the board of standards; and my hon. friend (Mr. Neely) asks why this should be under the survey board as being an exception. Is that it?

Mr. NEELY. In this case it is the Grain Survey Board. I quite understand that the standards board collects the samples for Canadian grain and establishes the standards for commercial grades. But where there is a dispute or question of selecting commercial grades, I do not think the board of commissioners ought to have supervision over the judgment of the Grain Survey Board or the Grain Standards Board.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They do that for the standards board. In fact, the standards board is appointed by the board of commissioners.

Mr. NEELY. All right as far as appointments are concerned.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not think there is much in the hon. gentleman's objection. In the first place, we have no right to assume that the commissioners will not be experienced men; they may be as good judges of samples as any one. But, in any case, they have expert advice, they have the chief inspector and other experts, and I suppose they will rely upon that expert advice. The board of any concern is not expected to have expert knowledge of all matters coming under its authority, but they realize that in questions of dispute they must depend upon expert help. The same applies in this case.

Mr. NEELY. Take the case of the establishment of grain standards by the Grain Standards Board. It appears that difficulty might arise from giving the Board of Commissioners revising power, if in any instance they exercised that power. Because, when the commercial grades are established, contracts are entered into on a basis of these grades; and if the board of commissioners are to have the power of revi-

sion of these grades, there might be great disturbance with reference to contracts.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). As a matter of fact, I think that hon. gentlemen will find that there will be little interference by the board of commissioners with the work of the experts.

On section 113, grading United States grain—appeals,

Mr. OLIVER. I am not very familiar with the operation of this provision. Perhaps the minister could tell us under what circumstances it becomes desirable or necessary for Canada to make an official inspection of United States grain in transit in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The reason this is necessary is that United States grain—wheat to some extent, but particularly corn—is liable to heat on the way, and deteriorate, so there has been a demand for an inspection at the port of Montreal. It is only in the east, I think, and at the port of Montreal that this inspection takes place.

On section 115, no grade; condemned; rejected; scoured grain,

Mr. OLIVER. It has been brought to my attention that there is a possibility under this clause, and the clause regarding hospital elevators that an abuse might arise unless an amendment is provided. This section, which really applies to grain treated because it has been damaged, provides that the grain so treated shall, under certain circumstances, not grade higher than No. 3, but under other circumstances it shall be given such grade as it may be entitled to after passing through treatment.

There is no prohibition, in the Act, so far as I am aware, of the placing of sound grain in these hospital elevators. If there is no such prohibition, and no prohibition of mixing of that grain with the treated grain, then sound grain could be mixed with treated grain, thus securing for the treated grain a grade to which it would not be properly entitled. A provision of this kind should be inserted in this section or in the section relating to hospital elevators, or in both.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I should think that the provisions against abuses should be made in the section relating to hospital elevators. We are here fixing the grades of grain. Of course, if necessary, we might return to this section.

Section 121—interpretation.

Mr. NEELY. This differs materially from the corresponding clause of Bill 'Q'. Bill 'Q' included in its definition sections 123 and 124, but this Bill does not include those sections. The effect is that the important feature of the Bill covered by section 123 is limited in its application by section 121, to the western inspection division only. In 'Q', the application is made throughout Canada. Why are these restrictions on the buying and selling of grain that are laid down in 123, applied to the western inspection division only, and not to those operating public elevators in the east?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This includes all that was included in Bill Q, with the single exception of section 123.

Mr. NEELY. And section 124.

Mr. TURRIFF. Perhaps the minister could give us the reasons for leaving out clause 123.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am going to ask the committee to skip 122 and 123 for the present. The committee will see that in passing over for the present 122 and 123 I am leaving out the questions which are moot points. We will come back to them afterwards, when a full explanation will be given.

Mr. NEELY. Would you allow 121 to stand as well?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). 121 will stand if you please.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will the minister give us good notice before he takes up these sections?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think he might have given us notice that he was going to allow section 123 to stand, because I came here at a good deal of personal inconvenience.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am very sorry, but my hon. friend will have the advantage of having two studies of it instead of one, and be all the better prepared.

Sections 121, 122, 123 allowed to stand.

On section 124—Hospital elevators,

Mr. NEELY. Here we have the trouble that was referred to by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver); at least, this is where there should be something adopted to prevent the grading out of grain which has merely passed through these hospital elevators but has not been treated —grain, which as a matter of fact, should not be admitted into these hospital elevators. Under this section there is absolutely nothing to prevent these hospital elevators taking in grain which does not require treatment, and, as my hon. friend from Edmonton has said, mixing it with other grain, thereby raising the grade of the treated grain and leading to more or

less fraud when that grain is shipped out again. I would suggest to the minister that after the word 'grain' in the third line of the third subsection, there should be inserted some such words as the following: 'Such as is mentioned in section 115 of this Act.' I think perhaps, that would cover the case.

Mr. OLIVER. That brings back my suggestion that there should be some provision in section 115 which this would refer back to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). As I understand it there is no objection to the first and second subsections.

Mr. NEELY. No.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The first makes provision that there shall be hospital elevators and the second that each shall take out a license and furnish a bond. In the first subsection, in the third line, the word 'point' should be 'points.' In subsection 3 I desire to add, after the words 'section 115' the words 'and section 99'. Section 99 reads:

> When grain shipped from any elevator is being systematically reduced in quantity below the general average quality of the grain of similar grades in the bins of the terminal elevators, the chief inspector shall instruct inspecting officers that no such grain shall be allowed to pass inspection except on a lower grade.
>
> 2. The inspector shall at all times keep careful watch on grain received into terminal elevators, and, if they find any such grain as aforesaid being received, shall at once notify the chief inspector, who shall make an investigation forthwith and take action accordingly.

If my hon. friend will state his objection, we can discuss the matter.

Mr. OLIVER. My objection is that section 99 provides for the grading out at a lower grade, and that is what we expect will be done and what we don't want to be done. We want the grain which is not treated and which goes into the elevator at a certain grade to come out of the elevator as the same grade. I would respectfully suggest that a provision be made in section 115 to provide that the grain which has been treated shall not be mixed with grain that has not been treated, so as to absolutely prohibit the mixing of good grain with treated grain in these hospital elevators.

Mr. NEELY. The objection to section 124 and to the Bill generally, as applied to hospital elevators is, that there is absolutely no provision made to prevent the hospital elevators taking good grain and mixing it with defective grain, thus lowering the grade of the good grain and increasing the value of the mixed grain. I do not think the hospital elevators should be permitted to take in any grain other than is mentioned in section 116. I do not think the hospital elevators should be allowed to take in good grain at all, because if they have good grain in one end of the elevator and treated grain at the other end of the elevator, it would be pretty hard to prevent them mixing.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The Act provides that these hospital elevators shall be governed by such rules and restrictions as may be imposed by the board. Everything in connection with the operation of an hospital elevator has to be under the supervision of the board, and according to rules and regulations imposed by the board. And surely you will be safeguarded in that way. I do not know how you could in a statute profitably determine everything an hospital elevator should do. If you have a board in which you have faith—and we are going to have faith in this new board—and it makes regulations governing an hospital elevator, one would think that ought to be sufficient.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to urge that the possibilities are so great and so necessary to guard against, that they should be taken notice of in the Act and that it should not be a matter left to the discretion of the board. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Carrick) described graphically the pecuniary advantages resulting from mixing grain, and the pecuniary advantages resulting from the mixing of good grain with scoured grain are so great that I am not so sure but that it would be possible to persuade even a board such as we hope to have appointed to accede to the mixing. There is a great deal to be said on the subject of mixing. The House and the government, as I understand, have their minds made up on this question, and they propose to give effect to their view in legislation. Then it is for them to do so, and not throw the responsibility on the board. I think it is not difficult to make the provision, and I would strongly urge that it should be done in the Act and on the responsibility of the House.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want to be understood as saying that the Act ought to be silent and that everything ought to be left to the discretion of the board. I do not think that for a moment. I think the Act should go as far as an Act can go in expressing the intention of the legislation, and then discretionary power in things unforeseen, and that cannot be included in detail, should be left in the hands of the board. My view is that we should allow them to do their legitimate

work and not hamper them in doing it; but on the other hand we should not give them power to degrade the grades, and by their operations to go against what is the evident intention of the Act. If there are any other suggestions to be made on either side of the House, I would like them to be made, and I will take them into consideration.

Mr. ROBB. Will the minister tell the committee what regulations are in force now for checking up the elevators and keeping up the standard grades that go in and come out?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I suppose my hon. friend is as well versed in the operations of the elevators as I am. The modus operandi is in short this. When the inspected and graded grain goes to the elevator, it is under the supervision of officers of the government from the time the door of the car is opened until the grain is elevated and weighed and disposed of in the appropriate bins. It is under the supervision of these same officers whilst it is in the elevator, and it is taken out again under their supervision. In fact, they are on watch and guard from the time the grain is weighed into the elevator until it is weighed out of the elevator into the car or vessel. If their eyes are about them and they are thoroughly honest, they can, I think, see that matters are pretty fairly carried on rightly and honestly. That modus operandi has been absolutely efficient, I think, in preventing many abuses. The fact that it has not issued in a perfect result is the foundation for the demand for elevators at terminals which shall be not only under the supervision of government officers of another entity, but shall be absolutely operated by officers who are not employed by any corporation, and who consequently have no incentive for allowing or committing wrongdoing.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to have some information as to what classes of wheat are to be sent to the hospital. The word 'hospital,' indicates that the wheat is sick, to some degree at least. Wheat that is not sick to any great extent, but is mixed with oats, should not go to the hospital. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Robb), who I understand is a miller, whether wheat that is smutty, if put into a hospital to have that detect cured, would be as good for milling purposes after it comes out as wheat that does not contain smut. Does the scouring make it pretty good milling wheat?

Mr. ROBB. That depends on the extent of the injury before it goes in. Scouring will not make it right; but if the hospital were equipped with washing machinery, the wheat could be made pretty good for milling by being washed. I am inclined to side with the view of the minister that some latitude must be allowed to the hospital, because in some years it will have very little to do, while in other years it will be kept busy. It should not be restricted to doing only hospital work.

Mr. TURRIFF. I may point out that some years ago the owners of the hospital elevators were here, extremely anxious that this privilege which we are trying to guard against now should be granted, that is, that damaged wheat, when scoured and cleaned, should be inspected by the grain inspector and certified. That was refused; but under the present Act they are still able to mix scoured wheat with other wheat, and that is the main thing to guard against. It is all right to sell the scoured wheat for everybody then knows what he is buying, but it is not right that a miller should buy wheat, graded No. 2 Northern, which contains a considerable proportion of scoured wheat.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Scoured wheat cannot be graded higher than No. 3.

Mr. TURRIFF. It should not be mixed in at all.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If you look to section 115, you find it deals with those grades of wheat. There are the 'no' grade, the 'condemned' and 'rejected.' The no grade is composed of wheat that is slightly damp; the condemned is in a heated condition; and the rejected wheat takes in any grain that is unsound and unfit to be classed under the ordinary grades.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Having oats in it alone, does not make it sick.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is a very good thing to have machinery for the separation of mixed grains. They have special machinery at Port Arthur and Fort William, where the separation can be done much better than in the wheat elevators. That is the conclusion we all aim at. We want to give the hospital elevators as much liberty as possible to treat sick grain and make it commercially valuable. Outside of that, we do not want to give them any powers which will enable them to degrade the grain.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 123 is very important. If the minister has any amendment to offer to that section, it will be desirable to have it in the hands of members some little time before consideration in committee.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Any amendments will be printed and put on the table of the House.

On section 125—security by licensee,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to submit to the judgment of the committee a suggestion which has been made. It has been represented that large quantities of grain passed through these elevators and that the sum of $50,000 is too small in some cases, and that consequently the board ought to have the discretion of fixing a larger penalty. If that view be accepted, we might provide for a penal sum of not less than $10,000, and leave out all that comes after. That would fix the board to a minimum, but allow it to use its discretion in going above that minimum.

Mr. OLIVER. I would hardly think that would be advisable.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Another proposition is this, that the sum should not be less than $10,000, nor more than $50,000.

Mr. OLIVER. When we are taking the responsibility of interfering with private rights, as we are doing by compelling the giving of such a large bond for the transaction of ordinary business, I do not think we should throw more responsibility on the board than is absolutely necessary for administrative purposes. It would be advisable to give in the Act some indication of what parliament thinks would be an adequate bond, if there be any possible way of giving such an indication.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The difficulty is to fix the bond on any basis. I do not see what basis could be taken unless that of the capacity.

Mr. OLIVER. It strikes me that that would probably be a fair basis.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will let the section stand

On section 126 subsection 6—Public Elevators in Eastern Inspection Division, record to be kept.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask for information, and perhaps expose my ignorance in doing so. This subsection provides for weighing and keeping a record of the weight. The word 'overage' is used. Suppose a certain lot of grain is billed at 10,000 bushels, and it is found to weigh 10,100 bushels, does the whole shipment go forward just the same or does only 10,000 bushels go forward?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The warehousemen of the Eastern elevators weigh in grain that comes from, let us say Fort William, and under the section, they must keep an account of the grade, the billed weight and the actual weight as weighed in by them. He compares his weight with that weighed out at Fort William. If it weighs less, the vesselman who carries it is responsible for the shortage, and if it turns out to be more, the vesselman gets the overage.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That does not occur very often.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). A shortage is not infrequent.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes, but not an overage.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Does the answer satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver)?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that is exactly what I was asking. It is the actual amount of the grain billed that goes forward.

On section 126, subsection 7—preservation of identity of grain.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That has always been the law has it not? They break the law, but this has always been the law?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, this is the present Grain Act.

On section 126, subsection 10—Allowance for screenings.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I notice that subsection 3 of section 115 provides that:

> Any grain that is unsound, musty, dirty, smutty, sprouty, or from any other cause is unfit to be classed under any of the recognized grades shall be classed as 'rejected.'

In discussing this, I notice that instead of using the word 'dirty' the expression 'mixed grain' has been used by the hon. member of Trade and Commerce. Under subsection ten of section 126 which we are now discussing it is provided that the owner shall be paid or an allowance made to him in screenings. Now, I take it that the screenings of grain treated in an hospital elevator are a very important feature of the treatment. I would like to know if provision is made for looking after these screenings, as certainly they are a most dangerous commodity.

We know that in hospitals care is taken to prevent the spread of diseases. Also in packing houses officers are appointed to detect diseased animals and those condemned are sent to the fertilizer tank. These screenings taken from the grain at the elevators are often shipped out and sold for feed. I would ask the minister if any provision is made to safeguard the public against the danger from weed seeds thus distributed.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, there is the supervision of the government officers in the first place and then there is the provision that a certain charge is made for the screenings, half a cent a

bushel and all over 5 per cent of the screenings are returned to the owner. If it is not 5 per cent there is no charge for the cleaning. What is under 5 per cent is kept by the cleaner himself so that the value of the screenings inures to the owner and not to the warehouse man.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then the owner is at liberty to dispose of the screenings in any way he sees fit.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) I think so.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. During recent years a great quantity of these screenings has been purchased through the feed stores in Ontario and as a consequence weed seeds have been spread to an alarming extent. We have to-day in Ontario noxious weeds that were practically unknown six or seven years ago. Some safeguard should be inserted in this Bill to have the commissioners take charge of this dirty grain so that the weed seeds would be destroyed, perhaps burned, because they are a dangerous menace to the country.

Mr. TURRIFF. It would not be reasonable to destroy all the screenings. For instance in the crop of 1910 there was a great deal of broken and thin, lean wheat. The wheat was very dry that year and was broken in the thresher. I have known as much as 100 or 120 bushels of screenings to be taken from a car and in some cases that was nearly all such wheat as I have described, which was perfectly good for feed and some of it for milling. It was arranged that the inspectors would give a certificate to the owner for the amount of his screenings defining them as No. 1 or No. 2, No. 1 being screenings of over 50 per cent of wheat. It would not be fair to have such screenings destroyed.

Mr. ROBB. The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) is right in bringing this to the attention of the minister. Our friend from the west (Mr. Turriff) has pointed out that in the crop of 1910, a fairly good crop, about 2 per cent was seeds. That would be about 2,000,000 bushels. I understand that these seeds are sold to a firm in Fort William at $7.50 a ton, and resold to people who feed sheep, a good many of them going to the United States. Some of them come to eastern Canada, and from leaky cars they are distributed along the railway tracks, they get into streams and in that way the foul seeds are scattered through the country. Some farmers risk feeding them on their farms, but the best farmers have them ground first. Legislation should be introduced to ensure the grinding of these seeds before they are distributed on the eastern farms. I understand in the west they have stringent legislation to compel the grinding of these seeds before they are fed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Even when they are ground some very dangerous seeds are so small that they are not destroyed by the crusher or grinder. If 50 per cent of the screenings are good wheat the other 50 per cent may be composed of the most dangerous and objectionable weed seeds. I would think that the hospital elevator or the elevator where the wheat is cleaned would be the proper place to take charge of these seeds, and I contend that all wheat should be cleaned, that it should not be allowed to come to our Ontario mills uncleaned, for even in that way these weed seeds have been spread to such an alarming extent as to call for some heroic remedy. I believe that millions of dollars are being lost annually in this province through the spread of noxious weeds. We may as well look this matter squarely in the face and provide some remedy. and the proper place to begin is at the elevator.

Mr. TURRIFF. Of course it might be worth considering whether all screenings taken from all the elevators should be sent to the hospital for grinding in order to destroy their germinating power.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They tell me that grinding does not destroy the germ.

Mr. TURRIFF. I know that in many cases putting it through an ordinary grain crusher will not destroy the germinating power of the seeds. In the western provinces the local legislatures have provided that the country elevators shall not sell these screenings or even give them back to the farmer until they have been ground in order to prevent the germinating of the seeds. But, it has been found also that many small seeds will go through the ordinary crusher and will germinate just as if they had not been put through the crusher. As the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), says, the matter is one of very considerable importance.

Mr. NESBITT. I wish to endorse what the hon. member for South Oxford has said about the seeds. I think that elevators, hospitals or otherwise, should destroy foul seeds. As the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) says, there is a good deal of wheat in the screenings. We quite recognize that there is a good deal of wheat and broken wheat is as good feed as anything else. But the foul seed is what my hon. friend from South Oxford has been talking about, and that should be destroyed. I think a Bill was introduced by the Inland Revenue Department last year to regulate the grinding of these seeds. I believe the screenings can be ground fine

enough to keep the foul seeds from getting into the land.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We think our foul seeds come from Ontario.

Mr. NESBITT. As a matter of fact, the foul seeds from the west are very much worse than they are from Ontario. Ontario farms are very much cleaner than the farms in Manitoba, as far as my eyesight goes. I believe that we have got from the west a great many foul seeds in the last few years that we never had before in Ontario, and I quite agree with the hon. member for South Oxford that all foul seeds should be extracted from these screenings at the elevators, and destroyed, and that they should not be allowed to go out broadcast. There are a great many farmers, for instance tenant farmers, who would buy these seeds, and feed them regardless of whether they went on the land or not. They should not be allowed to do that. The farmers of Ontario who are endeavouring to get rid of foul seeds have great difficulty in doing so, and I believe the government should do everything they possibly can, whether through this or some other act, to keep any person from selling foul seeds through the country for feeding or any other purpose. They are not much good for feed. The broken grain is just as good as whole grain for feed.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), about the importance of this question which has been raised, and I very distinctly remember the Bill my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has just mentioned. I think it went through the House last year or the year before. I believe we called it the Seeds Act.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, the Seeds Act. It was under the Agriculture Department.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Yes. It had reference to screenings coming from the west to the east, or going from the east to the west. There should be some provision made whereby the germinating qualities of these seeds will be entirely destroyed. As an hon. member pointed out a few moments ago, the feeding value of screenings is quite an important matter. I agree with that, and I also agree with the hon. member for South Oxford that the ordinary milling process does not destroy the more dangerous foul seeds. Some of them are so very, very fine that they slip through. I remember well, a few years ago, getting on my farm through feed that had been imported from the west, one of the most dangerous weeds. Of course, it is not merely the importation of feed that is ground in the west that creates the difficulty, but, as the minister then pointed out, many Ontario millers bought these screenings, shipped them through to Ontario, mixed them with other coarse grain, ground them up and sold them to the farmers. I do not know that it would be wise to suggest that a clause should be put in this Act, but I think it would be well if the minister would take it up in connection with the Seeds Act under the Department of Agriculture, and see that the difficulty is overcome, and that the germinating qualities of all foul seeds in all screenings are entirely destroyed before the screenings are allowed on the market.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That comes under the Department of Agriculture, but I will call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) to the discussion that we have had here. I think that the provinces have jurisdiction over the seeds and weeds of that kind in their own territories, and that they have legislation more or less stringent in regard to the matter. There are difficulties about introducing legislation into this Act which will remedy this greivance. In the first place, it is not quite economical to destroy these screenings. I am told that there were about a million bushels of screenings last year from the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and that their value would be about $300,000. Well, that is a good deal of stuff to destroy. A part of these screenings are pure wheat, and in all cases where the wheat is broken it is given back absolutely to the owner.

Mr. NESBITT. There should be no difficulty in separating broken wheat from the foul seeds.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, the broken wheat can be separated.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is very difficult.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). But there is a valuable residue outside of the broken wheat. I am informed that only about two per cent of these comes to Ontario, but two per cent might be very mischievous as it dribbles out, and is a very insidious thing and it is said that grinding does not destroy the germinating power of these seeds. A lot of this stuff is sent to the United States where it is fed to sheep, hogs and cattle, and thereby gets on the farms in the most favourable condition for germination and is widely spread. It is a thing that it is very difficult to follow. Bad seeds, like bad habits, are hard to eradicate, as my right hon. friend knows.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have had some experience of that lately.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that perhaps there is a misunderstanding. Where grain is

chopped, or when it goes through what is known as the chopping process, no doubt the small seeds will grow, but I think it is inconceivable that grain which is absolutely ground into flour would have any germinating qualities.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is if it is ground in a mill?

Mr. OLIVER. The difference is between chopping and grinding. Chopping would not destroy very small seeds, but, actual grinding would, beyond any question, destroy the small seeds.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is just that difference between my hon. friend who is a House of Commons expert and a chemical expert. I believe this material has been ground up in the finest way then submitted to an analyst, and it has been found that the germinating powers of the small seeds were really intact. It is a mystery, but all life is a mystery.

On section 126,

Mr. OLIVER. The expression 'domestic grain' occurs in several places in this Act; what is to be understood by 'domestic grain?'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is better defined by a negative; it means 'not wild.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have seen a good deal of domestic wild oats.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They grow in every garden.

On section 132,

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of the first part of the section is that the warehouseman having certain responsibilities placed upon him cannot by any process relieve himself from this responsibility, and then there is an exception stating that he can do so with the consent of the parties. Under what circumstances would it be reasonable to consider that such an exception should arise?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The inspector tells me that so far as he is concerned, he does not know that any such has arisen and he does not know how any such could arise. We will allow that clause to stand.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 72). to incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr Blain.

Mr. OLIVER.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 68), respecting Queen's College at Kingston, and to change its name to 'Queen's University at Kingston.'—Mr. Nickle.

Bill (No. 69), to incorporate Queen's Theological College.—Mr. Nickle.

THE GRAIN ACT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 32), respecting Grain.—Mr. Foster (North Toronto).

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

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am not going to ask the committee to pass this clause to-night, but I want to say a word or two with reference to it, so that the committee may think the matter over, and I will come back to it again. It involves the payment of storage at the terminal especially during the winter season. It provides that upon the return of the terminal warehouse receipt, by the holder properly endorsed, and the tender of all proper charges upon the grain represented thereby, the grain is to be immediately deliverable to the holder of such receipt, and shall be delivered within twenty-four hours after demand has been made, and cars or vessels therefor have been furnished for that purpose, and shall not be subject to any further storage. The rest of the clause goes on to say that if the cars or vessels are not furnished, a second period of storage shall be entered upon after twenty-four hours, and storage shall continue to be paid even though the cars and the vessels are not ready for carrying out the grain. Now people who have cargoes stored complain that in a case such as the present, where the terminals are full, and where a single track of the Canadian Pacific railway makes it impossible to carry out any very large quantity of grain where more is coming in than goes out, although they want their grain removed and surrender their receipts in order to get delivery into the cars, the cars are not forthcoming and they claim that it is a great hardship to have to pay full storage in the meantime. They say the railways should make their arrangements to carry out this grain when we want it carried out.

If they do not do that, they should not be paid storage. So the battle rages between the two contending factions. I have had a good many representations made to me on both sides of the subject and have not made up my mind as to what changes, if any, will be made to section 123. I would like the committee to think the matter over. In the course of a day or two I shall be prepared to make some amendment or carry the clause as it is.

Mr. OLIVER. On its face the clause appears to apply to all terminal elevators, whereas terminal elevators that are not approached by a railway company cannot be held responsible for non-production of cars.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There are three distinct terminal elevators in connection with the three railways, but only one of these railways has a line going east.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 139.—maximum rates.

Mr. OLIVER. How does that section compare with Bill 'Q'?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is the same in principle. The Governor in Council takes in the old Bill the place of the board in this.

On section 147,

All duly authorized inspectors of grain shall, at all times during ordinary business hours, be at full liberty to examine all grain stored in any terminal elevator.

2. All proper facilities shall be extended to such inspectors by the warehouseman, his agents and servants, for an examination, and all parts of the terminal elevators shall be open to examination and inspection by any authorized inspector of grain.

Mr. OLIVER. Is there such a person as the 'agent' of the warehouseman?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, his agent or servant.

Mr. OLIVER. I take it that the warehouseman is held responsible for the weighing. He may have officials under him, but he cannot have an agent to act in his place.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). By the word 'agent' I suppose, is meant some one doing the work under the warehouseman The wording is the same as in the existing law.

Mr. OLIVER. No doubt; but I want to know if the word is properly used there. If it contemplates an official to act in the place of the warehouseman, I should think that is not the intention.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is not Make it 'employee.'

Amendment agreed to. Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 150,—warehousemen respon sible for neglect.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). An amendment is proposed to this section. I will read it so that it can be printed and notice thus given of it. The purpose is to provide for a license what is called a 'manufacturing license.'

On application by the owner or owners of elevators which are part of plants engaged in the manufacture of grain products in the western division that they do not wish to ngage in the storage business and that the said elevators will only be used for the storage of grain owned by the said applicants and sed in the processes of their manufacture, the board shall have the power to exempt such elevators from that part of the Act which relates to the storage of grain for the public. The license issued shall be a special license for such class of elevators and the bond required, if any shall be at the discretion of the board.

Any owner or owners who violate the conditions under which such license is issued shall be liable to a fine under this Act.

Mr. OLIVER. Referring to section 148 relating to contracts, etc., contrary to the direction of owner, there is a declaration that the operator of a terminal elevator shall not 'switch' grain. What is the penalty in case he does switch grain? And does the penalty under this Act in anyway relieve him from the effect under the criminal law, or is he liable under the criminal law?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I shall make a note of this section opposite section 236 which deals with offences and penalties and when we come to that section we can see if a penalty is provided or required, and we can also look up the criminal law.

On section 153—elevator licenses.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). In clauses (b) and (c) of section 2, the terms 'owning or operating such elevator' and 'owning and operating such elevator' are used. I understand that this is a personal license to the person operating the elevator, but under this it would be necessary to show who are the owners as well as the person operating.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would move to strike out the word 'and' in section (c) which would make it uniform.

Mr. OLIVER. The mischief is in the first line of the second subsection where it speaks of the owner or lessee. The person we desire to deal with is the person operating the elevator.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Suppose a man is hired to operate the elevator, he is only the servant of the owner.

Mr. OLIVER. The owner would be the operator. It is not a question of who owns, but of who is responsible for the operation.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That holds both of them.

On section 156: rules and regulations for control of country elevators and receipt, storage, etc., of grain.

Mr. OLIVER. Does this section apply to elevators owned and operated by the provincial government of Manitoba?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, I should think not.

Mr. OLIVER. Then there is a system of farmers' elevators in the province of Saskatchewan. Would they come under this control?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I should think not where they are operated by the government.

Mr. OLIVER. They are not operated by the government.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Then they are under a system of co-operation.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They are really farmers' elevators and they get a government bonus or advance?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They would come under this Act.

Mr. McKENZIE. I see that subsection 2 of section 156 gives power to the government to make rules and regulations which have the binding force of law. It is customary in cases of this kind for a provision to be made laying these rules before parliament. Is there any provision that these rules shall be laid before parliament?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is no provision that I see in the section, but there is no reason why they should not be laid before parliament. I do not know that it is necessary to enact it because if they are called for—and they will be called for— they will be laid before the House.

Mr. McKENZIE. In an Act such as this, it is always provided that they shall be laid before parliament within twenty days after the next sitting thereof, or within a certain time after the adoption of the rules because they have the force of law.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have taken a note of that.

On section 157: duties of warehousemen.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). There is a matter to which I wish to call the attention of the committee in connection with section 157. Perhaps the subject to which I refer would refer to all the provisions in respect to country elevators, but I will speak now particularly of clause (b) of section 157, which says that:

> The person operating any such country elevator shall,
>
> (b) Upon the request of any person delivering grain for storage or shipment, receive such grain without discrimination as to persons, during reasonable and proper business hours.

There is a class of grain business growing up in the west, and which has been growing up during the last two or three years, which did not exist some few years ago, when the Manitoba Grain Act was passed. I refer to the business of supplying pure seed to the farmers of western Canada. There are some elevators owned by persons in Saskatchewan who do nothing but supply pure seed. It is a question in my mind whether such elevators should be brought under the provisions with respect to the ordinary country elevator or not, but it might be worth while for the committee to consider whether or not such elevators, that deal in nothing but pure seed, and are not in the business of receiving grain for storage purposes, should be forced to receive grain for storage purposes from any person who may deliver it at any time. I would like to have the opinion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce with respect to this.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Does the hon. member refer to any particular warehouses or elevators of that kind? If so, to which and are they warehouses or elevators?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). There are two elevators in Saskatchewan, one in Regina, which do nothing but deal in pure seed and supply it to the farmers.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is an elevator at Regina?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). It is an elevator.

Mr FOSTER (North Toronto). What about its capacity?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I do not know, but I should say about 60,000 bushels.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). And there is another in Saskatchewan?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Another at Tessier.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I received telegrams to-day or Saturday from, I imagine, the same people who are running both of these elevators——

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The same people.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They brought the question to me and asked me to look into it. I am now looking into it. I think that every effort to secure and distribute good seed is praiseworthy and, whilst it must be guarded to see that it does not contravene the purposes of the Act, all proper freedom and encouragement should be given to such.

On section 158.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to draw special attention to a somewhat remarkable feature of this section, in subsection 2, which provides that under certain conditions the elevator owner can forward grain to terminals, without an order of the owner of the grain. It is a very remarkable provision. It is no doubt necessary, and in the condition of the country as it was some time ago it did not create any serious grievance, because then all grain practically was going through terminals. But now, there has sprung up throughout the west a considerable amount of local milling demand. The section does not recognize that interior demand to the degree it should be recognized and to the degree that the interests both of the interior millers and the producers require that it should be recognized. In considering this matter, there have been two suggestions made, one that the grain should not be shipped under the conditions provided in subsection 2 unless and until the owner of the grain has been notified of the intention to do it. That would certainly be the most satisfactory manner of dealing with the matter, provided it was always convenient to give the owner of the grain notice and provided the conditions were not such that if it were required that the owner must get notice, the object to be achieved, of allowing the grain to be forwarded quickly would not be lost. The other suggestion is that the elevator operator should not be allowed to forward the farmer's grain without the farmer's order for a certain period after the grain has been placed in the elevator, unless the farmer after placing his grain in the elevator waives that condition.

That would be a workable provision, although not theoretically as satisfactory as the provision for giving notice. The idea is this. The farmer has a carload or two carloads of grain which he puts into the elevator, and he has an opportunity to sell to an interior buyer or mill. In order to sell that particular grain he would have a certain period after the grain was put into the elevator to make his arrangements for its delivery to the interior buyer. If he were not able to make the arrangement within a specified time, his grain would go forward in the same way as anybody else's.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is that not dealt with in clause 164?

Mr. OLIVER. It is, but it seemed to several of the members in going carefully over the Act that it would be well to deal with it first in subsection 4 and afterwards in section 164. It is a very drastic provision as it stands, and while measureably satisfactory and just under former conditions, the conditions have so changed that it is liable to be used as a measure of serious injustice.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). By section 164 I propose that the owner or his local representative shall be given twenty-four hours' notice. The matter is surrounded with a good deal of difficulty. If the farmer lives 10 or 20 or 30 miles out, it does not help him to send him notice by a registered letter. Before the letter reaches him the grain is gone. He may not be in town more than once a week or once in two weeks. Therefore it is proposed that he shall have a representative or agent in a town, to whom the warehouseman or elevator man would give twenty-four hours' notice, and then the agent could communicate with his principal if that were necessary. I would hesitate to make a provision that would prevent the quick relief of the elevator. I would not like to fix a period of any considerable length within which the elevator man would be debarred from clearing his elevator and giving access to persons waiting with grain.

Mr. OLIVER. One suggestion is to provide that the grain should not be forwarded within 48 hours after it is placed in the elevator. That is not an unreasonable delay, and it would give the farmer that much time to decide where and how he would find local sale if he could. That is one suggestion. The other suggestion is in line with what my hon. friend has stated. It is a question which would be more in the interest of the farmers. To a farmer at a distance, the twenty-four hours' notice from the post office is of absolutely no value to him.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Or forty-eight hours.

Mr. OLIVER. That would be a good deal better.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). By mail?

Mr. OLIVER. It would be no use by mail, but if the farmer had some business man in the town who would act for him, forty-eight hours would be of some value. That would be an improvement on the present condition.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am loth to make it a single hour longer than necessary. Another twenty-four hours might mean delay in getting the cars away. Whatever applies to one of these clauses must apply to the others.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). What appears to me as the best way of overcoming the difficulty would be to adopt the following amendment:

That subsection 4 of section 159 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—Notwithstanding anything in this section, the owner of such grain, upon payment of all lawful charges as set out in subsection 2 hereof, may, at any time within 48 hours after the delivery of such grain at such country elevator or at any time before such grain is shipped to a terminal elevator require it to be shipped to any other terminal than as hereinbefore provided, or to any railway station on the line of railway upon which the receiving country elevator is situated, or any line connecting therewith, unless the owner of such grain waives in writing his rights under this section.

Then I would suggest to amend section 164 by adding after the word 'may' in the first line. The following words:

Subject to the provisions of subsection 4 of section 159 of this Act.

I think that might be a simple way of overcoming the difficulty.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend will hand me his amendment, I shall consider it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Subsection 3 of section 159 deals with the case of a country elevator on the line of railway formerly known as the Northern Pacific and Manitoba railway, or any line of railway operated therewith. I think that should be made to read 'any line of railway' and not 'any of line railway operated therewith,' because there are other railways besides the one mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I shall make a note of it.

Subsections 2 and 4 of section 159 stand.

On section 160—delivery of grain on return of receipt.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to see another subclause added which would provide that the railway companies should see that the cars called for were promptly supplied.

Mr. TURRIFF. And promptly taken out when they are loaded.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The first thing is to get them.

Section 169,

Nothing in this part shall be construed as permitting the owner or operator of any country elevator to allot special bins to any buyer beyond the time allowed by the provisions of this part, or for purposes other than as stated in the provisions of this part as to flat warehouses, or shall require the owner of a flat warehouse to insure grain while in his warehouse.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that the words 'country elevator' there should really be 'flat warehouse.' It will be seen that the section reads in contradiction of itself when you use the word 'country elevator.'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Going back to section 151, it will be seen that all the sections from that on past the one with which we are now dealing are under the heading 'country elevators.' Later on we come to the heading 'flat warehouses.'

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). But under section 184 relating to application for cars, a time limit is fixed in the case of flat warehouses; but I do not see any time limit so far as country elevators are concerned.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is a time limit in the case of special bins: 'shall be shipped within 24 hours after such demand has been made and the cars furnished.'

On section 173,—investigations of complaints.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think that both parties should be notified, that there should be an addition to subsection 3. According to the provisions of that subsection the person complained against must be notified, but there is no provision for notifying the complainant of the date and place of the hearing, so that the hearing might be held without his knowledge. If the words were added 'and shall notify the complainant as to the date and place', I think it would ensure the complainant receiving the necessary notice.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The complainant would generally be on the lookout, would he not?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). He might or he might not.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Suppose we make it read that the board shall notify both parties, and furnish them with a copy of the complaint?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). All right.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I move that the words, 'the owner of the country elevator' be struck out, and the words 'both parties' be substituted in lieu thereof, and that the word 'him' be struck out and the word 'them' be substituted in lieu thereof.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 186,

Mr. OLIVER. This section would seem to defeat to some extent the advantage of flat warehouses. There seems to be no reason why the owner of a flat warehouse should not buy and sell grain when the owner of a country elevator is allowed to do so.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The flat warehouse is a special convenience to the farmer for his own purposes. If you allow the flat warehouseman to buy and store grain then the farmer's privilege is curtailed. I think that section was meant for that purpose and it would be well to leave it there.

Mr. OLIVER. The wording of this section is intended apparently to prevent the provision from being useful.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not see how.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no difference whatever between the principle of a country elevator and of a flat warehouse. The only difference is that the capital invested in the flat warehouse is smaller and it affords a cheaper means of storage than the country elevator, but otherwise they are on all fours, and there is no reason why the restriction made applicable to one should not be made applicable to the other.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That clause was put there for the particular benefit of the farmers.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). The farmer might be unable to ship his own warehouse at all because he would not have a complete car to ship out, and if this restriction were stricken from the Bill he could buy enough wheat to fill that car up.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The farmer is not a buyer of wheat as a rule.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). It is not usual for him to buy, but there are cases in which he might find it advantageous to himself and his neighbours to buy.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Do you not run the risk, if you carry out that suggestion, of turning all the flat warehousemen into speculators in grain? The flat warehouse was meant to give the farmer a cheaper place in which to store his grain than in the elevators, and it gave him the privilege of storing his own grain instead of paying the elevator man for it. It is a place established for that particular purpose. I would not like to run the risk of making every owner of a warehouse a speculator in grain, interested in having as wide a spread as he could and taking advantage of the small farmer, which the other elevator companies are said to do. Let us keep one oasis for the farmer.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not like to keep that kind of oasis; it is a very dry well. What we want to give is as much competition as possible in the buying of grain. A man who has storage can buy grain, while the man who has not storage is at a disadvantage. We want storage, but we want buying as well, and we want competition in buying; and inasmuch as this provision cuts down the competition in buying, we think it is not advisable.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the distinction between elevators and warehouses? I do not think there is much. I agree with the minister that a warehouse is a cheap place for storing grain.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Warehouses are not often built in the locality which I know. They are sometimes, and I think it better that this restriction should be removed.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will consider it; but in the meantime let it pass.

Section agreed to.

On section 189—loading platforms.

Mr. STAPLES. There is no question that loading platforms are great conveniences in the west, though they are not much used in the older parts of Manitoba. The platforms which the railways construct are not such as to afford the facilities which the farmers require. The kind constructed by the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway is one from which it is possible to load practically only one car; it is too short and narrow. If the platform were built wide enough to enable the farmer to drive his wagon upon it and back out again after unloading, so that he could load three or four, or even five cars at once, the farmers would use it a great deal more than they do. There is no doubt that the farmer who loads his grain into a car and sees it sold and shipped gets the best satisfaction; and there is much more satisfaction with that method of handling grain than with elevators. If it is possible to compel the railway companies to build the platforms longer and wider, this should be done. The Great Northern railway has a system of platforms constructed of earth, which are much better than the board platforms. In my town a big farmer who came from the United States went so far as to construct an earth platform himself. I ask the minister to take this matter into his serious consideration.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Section 193 gives the board power to order platforms of such dimensions as it sees fit.

Section agreed to.

On section 191—location and dimensions.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. My experience in regard to platforms has been, not that they

are too short, but that there should be two or three instead of one.

Mr. STAPLES. The Bill gives the board power to order the railway company to build additional platforms, but I think it should also specify their width. The platform should be sufficiently long and wide to enable the farmer to back his wagon up to the door and make it more convenient for him to load his grain into the car. There is no way by which a farmer can save eighteen dollars better than by utilizing the loading platform. Under the Manitoba legislation, all elevators are compelled to charge one and three-quarter cents per bushel. On 1,500 bushels, that runs into a considerable sum of money. You can load into a car from a platform almost as quickly as into an elevator.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). What my hon. friend asks for is really provided here. In section 191, the platform has to be approved by the board and must be at least 18 feet wide, 54 feet long, and of such height as the board decides. Under section 193 the board may at any time, between the 15th of April and the 15th of October in any year, order the company to enlarge any platform at any station or siding. That is what my hon. friend wants. There is another consideration which has to be taken into account, and that is whether loading platforms are the most economical way of handling grain. The older we grow in the west, the more the elevator system will be resorted to and the less the loading platform. I have a report which was made to the Board of Railway Commissioners by one of their officers. He reports that the average time for loading a car from a platform is often more than two days, so that if you had all loading platforms, there would be a pretty slow transportation of grain. In the meantime this gives very broad authority to the board to order loading platforms of the kind most useful to the people at these stations.

Mr. CRUISE. This section gives power to enlarge the platform in length but not in width. It fixes the limit at 18 feet wide.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is the minimum.

Mr. OLIVER. What should be the minimum?

Mr. CRUISE. About 24 feet to give a man a chance to back up his wagon to the car. I cannot understand how a farmer could take two days to unload into the car.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They usually unload in one day.

Mr. OLIVER. If it is a fact that the unloading platform should be 24 feet wide in order to be of full value, would it not be advisable to say so specifically in the Act. We should also provide sufficient length, as suggested by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples). I have heard some complaints that the platforms in many cases were not big enough.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I shall take a note of that, and we can come back to this section if necessary, but in the meantime we might as well pass it.

Sections 195 and 196 stand.

On section 206:

The board may in its discretion during a car shortage direct the railways to make an equitable distribution of empty grain cars to all stations in proportion to the amount of grain available for shipment from such stations.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think the word 'stations' should be changed. As this section stands, only persons loading at stations have any rights; those who load at a siding are left unprovided for.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I assumed 'station' to be a general term. It is provided that a man can order his car to a siding or loading platform.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). There are sidings at the stations. But, as the minister says, provision is made in the Act for ordering cars to points where there are no stations. Provision is made in the Act, under which, even if the loading platform will not supply the requirements, cars may be placed on a siding to be loaded from the ground. We want the rights of all protected, and not the rights of those only who load at stations.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Make it 'stations or sidings.'

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). That would answer the purpose. Add the words 'or sidings' after the word 'stations' in third line.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 223,—time for loading cars.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I think the time from which this 24 hours will be reckoned is hardly right. It is reckoned from the time at which the car is placed at the disposal of the farmer, whereas, the 24 hours should be reckoned from the time notice is given to him, as provided by section 201. Section 201 provides that:

The railway agent shall post up daily in a conspicuous place a written notice signed by him, giving the date of application and name of each applicant to whom he has on that day awarded cars for the loading of grain, and the car numbers so awarded respectively.

The station agent might be very prompt in doing this or he might not. Sometimes he might be delayed quite innocently, and the farmer is obliged under this Act to have his car loaded within 24 hours from the time the car is placed on the siding for him, while the time he has actually, may be very much less. The general practice is for the farmer to make some provision for some one to notify him after the notice is posted up in the station, and that is the first notice he has of the fact that the car is at his disposal. I think the time should not start until after that date, and I would therefore suggest the insertion of the words 'or after the notice provided for in section 201 of this Act has been posted as therein required, wherever is the later.'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want to waste any time, but I will note my hon. friend's point. I took it at first that 'placed at the shipper's disposal' would be after he was notified of it, but I do not think that is quite a correct reading of the clause. That may pass if you like and we will go back to it if it is necessary to do so.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). It had better stand.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). All right.

Section 223 allowed to stand.

On section 224,—daily statement for nearest station agent.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the purpose of this requirement, and is there any further use made by the government of the information that is given to the station agent?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is for statistical purposes entirely.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a report to the station agent. Does the government get the advantage of that report?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is primarily, I suppose, for the knowledge of the railway company as to the stock in the elevators, but all these reports can be got by the government if they wish them.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not for the immediate information of the government?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The immediate purpose of it is statistical information for the railway companies and for the public. A report of the stocks on hand every night is made next morning on the exchanges.

On section 246,—fees for expenses of administration.

Mr. OLIVER. In my judgment the first part of this section is objectionable in making a declaration that seems to be inappropriate and uncalled for. While we are quite agreed that the grain trade shall carry the burden of its administration, that is one thing; but to declare by legislative enactment that the fees shall be fixed so that the result of those fees shall bear all the burden of the administration is another thing, and I would object very strongly to it. In regard to the second part of the section, giving authority to the board with the approval of the Governor in Council to fix fees, I think the proper legislation would be in each instance to lay down the principle which should govern the board in fixing the fees. I do not think a general authority such as this is good legislation. The fees to be levied under this Act are a tax upon business and upon the people, and it is an elementary principle that taxes should not be levied except on the responsibility of parliament. I think we should not place in the hands of this board of commissioners the right to tax the people except according to well-defined principles and within well-defined limits.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will note the objection of my hon. friend. It is, I think, a good thing to have a full and free understanding of the matter. From the very start the basis of this whole legislation has been understood, and freely and willingly the grain men have agreed to pay all the expenses of the administration of the Act, and I think it is just as well to have that on the face of the legislation itself, so that there will be no difference of opinion afterwards. I do not think this is objected to in any way.

Mr. OLIVER. I am practically giving notice of an amendment which I will move on the third reading. I had considerable discussion during former sessions with the representatives of the grain interests, and my understanding was that their willingness that the grain trade should assume the burden of administration was expressed in connection with the government operation of terminal elevators, and not in regard to the ordinary administration of the Grain Act.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). When they called for this legislation they also expressed their willingness that the trade should do in this case what it had been doing before, that is, bear the expense of ordinary administration by means of fees.

Section agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. May I call the minister's attention to section 48 to which a subsection was added in committee? On further consideration it would appear to me that the addition of that subsection is not in accordance with the best administration, and I would like on some future occasion to have an opportunity of discussing that amendment again.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will go back to it; but will my hon. friend state briefly what he objects to in it?

Mr. OLIVER. The Grain Standards Board is a committee of experts on grain. Every preparation is made for their arriving at a just conclusion in regard to the standards. It is a very elaborate preparation. It takes time and trouble and some expense to gather samples from the different areas where the grain has been damaged. It is proposed by the amendment that their conclusions shall be revised by the board of commissioners, who are not experts, and who have not had the opportunities to arrive at a just conclusion such as the members of the Grain Standards Board have had. I am very willing to place responsibility upon the board of commissioners, but in the case of a decision by experts it seems to me that under these circumstances it should stand without revision.

Progress reported.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 96) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I think there must be some error in connection with this proposed amendment. When it was moved, I asked for a copy and the hon. minister said I would find it in 'Hansard.' But the amendment, as it appears in 'Hansard,' does not convey the idea which was in our minds at the time. The amendment reads in 'Hansard':

That after the word 'collapse' in the third line, there be inserted all places where grain is damp and liable 'to become damp, or for the purpose of distributing seed grain to any point in the western division.'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It should read: 'damp and liable to become damaged,' are the words in the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. The liability to damage would not be a sufficient reason for giving the warehouse commissioner the extraordinary authority proposed. Such authority should not be given, unless the conditions were such as might be expressed in these words:

All places where the grain is damp and is liable to be destroyed by reason of that condition.

There must be the existence of the condition which, under ordinary circumstances, is going to produce destructive results, rather than the double proposition that where the grain is damp or where it is liable to damage.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is not the word 'or,' which is used. If it were I would take the same objection. The word 'and' is used where the grain is damp and liable to become damaged. It is the one condition which threatens destruction.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I withdraw my objection to the Bill, because it is only to go into effect in connection with the existing Act, but I give notice that when he proposes to introduce the like amendment into the Act before us we may give it further consideration.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I am not sure whether I am justified in objecting at this stage, but I understood, when the matter was before the committee before, that ample opportunity would be given to discuss this question. Do I understand it may be discussed on the third reading of the Grain Bill?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If it forms a part of the Grain Act, but this goes into the existing Act and becomes repealed when the Bill we are discussing comes out. My hon. friend would not be allowed, under the rules of the House, at this late hour, to raise any further objection.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. A provision with regard to the distribution of cars was allowed to stand. I take it for granted there will be an amendment to that. Is it understood that any amendment to that section will be laid on the table some time before being submitted for consideration?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That clause was allowed to stand as an indication that it is still being considered. If an amendment be desirable, it will be laid on the table as my hon. friend requests.

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

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). First questions and then government orders—very likely numbers 14, 17, and perhaps 18, and then Supply. The Supply will be Public Works.

THE CARRIAGE OF GRAIN TO DULUTH AND MINNEAPOLIS.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) to a Washington despatch with reference to the carrying of grain to Duluth and Minneapolis, and

would ask him if there has been any change in the situation since the statement my hon. friend made on January 23rd last?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There has been no change except for the better. I am not quite sure from memory just how far my statement went, but the condition at present is that wheat and oats for export are, and have been for some time, carried to Duluth and Minneapolis at the same rates as to Fort William and Port Arthur, that applications were made to place wheat and oats for consumption in the United States on the same tariff rates, that these were not allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States to take place earlier than the thirty days' notice required by that commission. That, however, has now been issued, and speaking generally, wheat and oats for export, and barley, wheat, oats and flax for consumption in the United States are either being carried at present at an equal or slightly higher rate to Duluth and Minneapolis than obtains in Port Arthur and Fort William, but by the latter part of February will be carried at the same rates as to Fort William and Port Arthur. The reason that all kinds of grain and for both purposes, have not been carried sooner is that the commission in the United States objected to doing the latter within the thirty days' notice necessary for the application to be made before the tariff goes into effect. That thirty days' notice is required in order to give full knowledge and advertisement to the interests that may be affected in the country itself.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 7, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

PROVINCIAL BOUNDARIES.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina) :

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to the following resolution unanimously passed by the legislature of Saskatchewan on March 16, 1911?

That whereas the government of Canada has under consideration the advisability of extending the boundaries of the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba so as to include the hinterland lying adjacent to the north of these provinces;

And whereas the several areas proposed to be included in the said provinces are at present the property of Canada and any action by the parliament of Canada to transfer the ownership of the property to the provinces referred to will have the effect of altering the terms and conditions upon which such provinces entered confederation;

And whereas the extension of the boundaries of the said provinces northward will bring within their respective borders areas very similar to the territory comprising the northern part of the province of Saskatchewan;

And whereas under the terms of the Saskatchewan Act, the Alberta Act and the Manitoba Act, the compensation payable to the provinces in lieu of lands is based upon the principle that the Federal Government should retain control of the agricultural lands, of western Canada for colonization and immigration purposes;

And whereas the said northern part of the province of Saskatchewan is not required by the government of Canada for the purposes of carrying out its colonization and immigration policy;

And whereas in addition to the agricultural lands there are certain natural resources within Saskatchewan which are purely of local concern and which are not required by the federal authorities for the carrying out of its colonization policy;

Therefore it is resolved that in the opinion of this House the government of Saskatchewan should proceed with negotiations with the federal authorities for the purpose of having transferred to the province all that part of the hinterland of Saskatchewan, together with all natural resources of purely local concern contained within the province, not required for colonization and immigration purposes.

2. Is it not a fact that in the statement of policy of the Dominion Conservative party, promulgated by Mr. Borden in 1907 and known as the Halifax platform, the following appears as paragraph fifteen:

'The restoration of the public lands to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan upon fair terms.'

3. Is it not a fact that during the Dominion election of 1911, the platform of the same party as published in western Canada contained the following paragraph two:

'The granting of their natural resources to the prairie provinces.'

4. Is it the intention of the government to give effect to the policy of the Conservative party as thus declared in their platform?

5. If so, will measures be submitted to parliament for this purpose during the present session?

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. The government has no definite information on the subject but believes that the fact was as stated.
4. Yes.
5. The terms alluded to in the second question have not yet been settled. Their

determination will require negotiation and inquiry which will be undertaken and carried on with such expedition as may be practicable. It will be impossible, however, to undertake or conclude them during the present session.

WHARF AT L'ASSOMPTION, QUEBEC.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Does the Department of Public Works intend to continue the works commenced on the construction of a wharf at L'Assomption and to use the money placed in the estimates of 1911-12 for that purpose?
2. If so, when will the work be continued?
3. If not, for what reasons and at whose request was it stopped?

Mr. MONK:

1, 2 and 3. As work cannot be proceeded with during the winter it is impossible to make any further use of the amount in the current year's estimates. The question of providing an additional amount in next year's estimates will have careful consideration should there be further supplementaries this session.

ST. GABRIEL DE BRANDON—DISMISSAL OF POSTMISTRESS.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has Mrs. Paul Farly been dismissed as postmistress of St. Gabriel de Brandon, county of Berthier, and at what date?
2. What are the reasons and at whose suggestion?
3. If she is dismissed, who has been appointed to succeed her and at whose request?
4. Was there an inquiry? If so, by whom?
5. Were there complaints against her? If so, by whom made and of what nature?
6. Did the Postmaster General receive any requests or letters asking that a change be made and giving the reasons therefor?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes, on the 22nd December, 1911.
2. Political partisanship. On recommendation of Mr. J. A. Barrette, M.P.
3. Mr. Telesphore Michaud, on recommendation of Mr. J. A. Barrette, M.P.
4. No inquiry was necessary.
5. Answered above.
6. None except what is above mentioned.

MANSEAU—DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER.

Mr. PACAUD:

1. Has Mr. Kirouac, postmaster at Manseau, in the county of Nicolet, been removed?
2. If so, at whose request and what were the reasons for his removal?
3. Who has been appointed to replace him, and on whose recommendation?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. On recommendation of Mr. P. E. Lamarche, M.P., for political partisanship.
3. Mr. J. A. Neven, on recommendation of Mr. P. E. Lamarche, M.P.

QUESTION RULED OUT.

On question No. 8—Mr. Bellemare.

Mr. SPEAKER. This question, in my judgment, is not in conformity with the rules of the House with regard to questions put by ministers. Such a question should contain no statement of fact beyond what is absolutely necessary to make the question intelligible, and should not contain any reflection upon a member of the House. I think this question contravenes the rules in both these particulars. It will therefore stand for amendment.

PICTOU, N.S., CARRYING MAILS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Were tenders called for carrying mails from the post office to the railway station at Pictou, N.S., on January 6, 1912?
2. If so, who were the tenderers and what was the amount of each tender?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Tenders were received for this service on 5th of January, 1912.
2. Peter F. Foley, 25 cents per trip; D. W. English, 35 cents per trip; Alex. Sarson, 40 cents per trip; John A. Brennan, 60 cents per trip.
3. Peter F. Foley.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY, LATE STRIKE OF TRAINMEN.

*Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What were the conditions under which the late strike of the trainmen of the Grand Trunk Railway was called off?
2. Was the late government in any way connected with the making of those conditions? If so, how and who represented the government?
3. Is the government aware that the Grand Trunk officials have not carried out the agreement made between the trainmen and the late government and the railway company?
4. Is the government aware that His Honour Judge Barron, of Stratford, Ont., was appointed by Chas. M. Hays, the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to investigate the individual cases of men who were not reinstated?
5. Was Judge Barron paid by the government for his services, or by the railway company or by Chas. M. Hays, and what remuneration did he receive?
6. Has the government been furnished with a copy of Judge Barron's report? If so, what recommendations concerning the matter did it make, and have those recommendations been carried out? If not, why not?
7. How many men affected by the late strike of the Grand Trunk railway have not been reinstated as per agreement, and what is the number at each point on the system?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. The terms of the settlement were as follows:

Montreal, July 31, 1910.

Re dispute between Grand Trunk Railway Company and its employees in train and yard service.

By way of settlement of the existing difficulties:—

1. The company will put back as soon as possible the men, other than those who have been or may be found guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct, the understanding being that there is to be no coercion or intimidation used towards the new men.

2. The company will put into effect from May 1, 1910, the rates named in schedule of rates dated July 18, 1910, those rates to be embodied in the present schedules now in effect on this line, it being understood that those rates shall in no instance effect a reduction in any existing rate.

3. The company will, on January 1, 1912, make effective in train and yard service on the Grand Trunk Railway the rates of pay and the rules contained in the schedule or agreement on that date in effect on the lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway east of Fort William.

The three above propositions shall apply also to the Central Vermont Railway Company, the said railway company to be substituted for the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the Rutland Railway Company to be substituted for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company wherever the same are used or understood in the above. (In the case of the Central Vermont, by the 'schedule of rates dated July 18, 1910' is meant the schedule issued by the management of that company since July 1.)

CHAS. M. HAYS,
President.
Grand Trunk Railway System.
For the Order of Railway Conductors:
Robert Kelley.
N. Foy.
Ed. Z. Sinclair.
J. E. Mann.

Approved by
S. N. BERRY,
Vice-President.
For the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen:
John Maloney.
J. A. Conner.
W. E. Berry.
P. A. Hebert.

Approved by
JAMES MURDOCK,
Vice-President.
Attest:
A. B. GARRETSON,
President.
Order Railway Conductors.
W. G. LEE,
President.
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

1. With reference to the meaning to be attached to the words 'as soon as possible', occurring in the above agreement, the former Minister of Labour made the following statement to parliament on March 21, 1911: 'Mr. Wainwright came up to Ottawa on a train about the same time as the one on which I came and as vice-president of the Grand Trunk railway he gave me an assurance in the presence of two of my colleagues here that the president of the Grand Trunk Railway would consent to giving to these three words 'as soon as possible' the definite meaning of three months,' which was the time Sir Frederick Borden and myself said we thought would be sufficient.

2. (a) The former Minister of Labour stated to this House on March 21 last the connection of the government with the making of the terms of the agreement set forth above, namely: 'The agreement was not with the government, but was between the parties to the dispute, the Grand Trunk railway on the one hand and the organization involved in the dispute on the other. They were the parties to the dispute, and they were the parties to the settlement. The government helped to bring about an agreement—brought the parties together and, through its representatives, assisted the parties in trying to reach satisfactory terms. But the agreement was an agreement between the parties to the dispute, and the best evidence of that is that one party is now saying that the other is not carrying out its agreement.'

(b) The former Minister of Labour, on the same occasion, stated to the House that he and the then Minister of Militia and Defence went to Montreal to represent the government as above in the negotiations held between the parties.

3. The government is aware that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has failed to reinstate, as required by the agreement above indicated, a number of former employees concerned in the strike and recommended for reinstatement by Judge Barron.

4. Yes.

5. So far as concerns the original investigation made by Judge Barron, as above indicated, the government made no payment to Judge Barron, and the government is not aware of the conditions as to compensation, whether from the Grand Trunk Railway Company or from Mr. Hays, under which Judge Barron conducted the inquiry. In August, 1911, however, the then Minister of Labour directed Judge Barron to proceed to Montreal to make some further efforts in connection with the reinstatement of certain of the employees, and Judge Barron received from the government as compensation for services then rendered the sum of $125, with $25 allowance for expenses, as per account rendered, the services then rendered being understood to have been of a conciliatory nature.

6. The government has not been furnished with a copy of the report made, as above indicated, for Mr. Hays, and is not aware of its nature. The government has, however, received what purports to be a copy of a statement made by Judge Barron to Mr. Hays, under date of August 18, 1911, and apart from the report proper. The statement thus received contains recommendations for reinstatement which have not been carried out. The government is not able to state why the recommendations have not been carried out.

7. The official representatives of the trade organizations concerned, representing the men concerned, have informed the government in a communication under date of December 6, 1911, that the total number of men not reinstated as per agreement then stood at 77 at various points over the line, as follows, namely: Brockville, 3; Stratford, 7; Palmerston, 7; Hamilton, 6; Montreal, 1; Sarnia, 2; Portland, Me., 1; Island Pond, Vt., 3; Toronto, 10; Allandale, 5; East Toronto, 1; Belleville, 1; Niagara Falls, 7; Bridgeburg, 1; London, Ont., 7; Detroit, Mich., 9; Windsor, 6.

MAIL CARRIER—ST. PAUL L'ERMITE AND DE REPENTIGNY.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What is the name of the person at present in charge of the carrying of His Majesty's mails between the post office of St. Paul l'Ermite and that of de Repentigny?
2. Has the contract of that person been annulled? If so, at whose request and for what reason?
3. Who has been recommended to take charge of that contract for the future, and what is to be his salary?
4. Who recommended the new contractor?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Joseph Larose.
2. The contract will, in the public interest, terminate on or about the 21st of April next, as provided for by one of its clauses.
3. Albert Juneau, at $102 per annum, the same rate as paid to the other contractor.
4. Mr. Joseph Morin, K.C.

MAIL CARRIER—ST. PAUL L'ERMITE AND CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What is the name of the person at present in charge of the carrying of His Majesty's mails between the railway station of the Canadian Northern and the post office at St. Paul l'Ermite?
2. Has the contract of that person been annulled? If so, at whose request and for what reasons?
3. Who has been recommended to take charge of that contract for the future, by whom was he recommended, and what is his salary?

Mr. CROTHERS.

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Camille Seguin.
2. The contract will, in the public interest, terminate on or about the 21st of April next, as provided for by one of its clauses.
3. Albert Juneau, who is to be paid $150 per annum, the same as the other contractor receives. He was recommended by Mr. Joseph Morin, K.C.

MR. HECTOR CHAUVIN, K.C., DISMISSALS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What are the names, residences and salaries of the Public Works officials, suspended or not, against whom Mr. Hector Chauvin, K.C., of Ottawa, special commissioner, has been instructed by the Minister of Public Works to investigate certain charges of political partisanship?
2. Has any recommendation for the dismissal of above officials been made by any member of parliament? If so, whom?
3. Who has laid the charge of political partisanship against each of the above public works officials

Mr. MONK:

1. All workmen employed in the shops at Ottawa:

Elevator men, paid at the rate of $60 a month—J. Bureau, J. Whelan, J. B. Rioux, N. Proulx, W. Connelly, — Charron, N. McCarthy, P. Blondeau, Wm. McEwan.

Electricians—B. J. Nolan, $60 a month, James Gleeson, $75 a month.

Engineers and firemen, $55 a month—S. Lurette, A. Bastien, W. Lurette, — Newington.

Watchmen, $60 a month—F. Moyneur, S. Chapman, J. Simms, R. Cornwall, John Whitton.

Roads and bridges—C. Leblanc, $85 a month.

Mechanical staff—F. Desmarais, $60 a month; W. Daly, $60 a month; F. Kennedy, $55 a month; D. Lang, $60 a month.

Carpenters, $2.50 a day—A. Caron, C. Hebert, J. Grusson, H. Theberge, T. Shea, Jas. S. Oakley, —. Bradshaw, W. L. St. Pierre, D. Sullivan.

Gardeners, $48 a month—E. Gagne, J. Chartrand, A. Bergevin.

Clerks of Works—Wm. Slack, $100 a month. G. Gibson, $2.50 a day. R. Henault, $65 a month.

Painters, $2.40 a day—C. Wall, J. Randall, A. Beaulieu, J. Boileau, J. H. Charlebois, D. Proulx, F. Lamb.

Roofers—A. Spenard, $86.66 a month. A. Monette, $2.25 a day. T. W. French, $2.25 a day.

Masons and bricklayers, $3.50 a day—C. Merrifield, C. Monette, A. Auborne, J. O'Donald, E. St. George, J. McGuire, W. Drake. J. Baxter, $90 a month.

Plasterers—J. Foley, $3.50 a day.

Shipyard, B. Gorman, —. Trudel.

Labourers, $1.75 a day—E. Gorman, F. Berthiaume, H. O'Neill, J. Duhamel, J. Carriere, J. O'Connor, Percy McGrath. W. A. G. Bedard, $90 a month.

Upholsterer—Alfred Trudel, $2.80 a day.

The following were dismissed, and have asked for an investigation: Michael Flannigan, $60 a month. J. Cleary, $60 a month. Jos. Piché, $60 a month. Alb. Dunn, $55 a month. Ferd. Cossette, $2.50 a day. Edmond Gariepy, $70 a month. Thos. Chapman, $60 a month. A. St. Denis, $60 a month. Omer Sabourin, $55 a month. Janv. Trepannier, $60 a month. E. Sauriol, $90 a month.

Carters, $4.50 a day—Oct. Latremouille, F. Landry, Harold Green.

The department does not keep the residence address of its employees.

2 and 3. (a) Yes. (b) By Messrs. Chabot and Fripp.

POSTMISTRESS OF SAYABEC.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. In regard to the postmistress of Sayabec station county Rimouski, was there a petition sent to the Postmaster General praying for the dismissal of the postmistress and for the appointment of Miss Boulay in his stead?

2. If so, how many people signed the petition?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. No.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH MARCONI COMPANY.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General been called to the following despatch published in the press of Canada:—

WIRELESS TO ALL DOMINIONS.

Marconi Company makes Arrangements with Government.

New York, February 1.—The London correspondent of the New York 'Times' cables that he has the best authority for announcing that negotiations which have been going on between the British government and the Marconi Company for over a year, rumours of which resulted in wireless shares recently rising from 14s., are now completed.

In fact the arrangements arrived at between representatives of the British post office and the Marconi Company only required certain formal signatures, which in the case of ordinary business would have been forthcoming yesterday, but in the present instance are delayed by the red-tapism of the government departments.

Under the new scheme the Marconi Company will be in a position to make enormous developments. While it is as yet impossible to give details, it can be said that the contract creates a system of wireless communication between all the British dominions throughout the world.

2. Has there been any communication on the above subject between the Postmaster General and the British government?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2. No.

I.C.R.—FENCE POLES AT STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIERE.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Is the government aware that the cedar fence poles of the Intercolonial railway at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière are said to have been taken and carried off?

2. If the allegations are true, who carried the said poles away, and at whose place were they found?

3. How many of them were there?

4. Was captain or policeman W. Moore, of Lévis, instructed to make inquiries and to verify the facts in this connection?

5. Has he made a report on the subject? If so, what are the contents of that report?

6. Were those poles put back on the ground of the railway? If so, how many of them were put back?

7. Did the head sectionman on the Ste. Anne section of the Intercolonial railway inform the government or the Railway Department on this subject, and what information did he give?

8. What was decided about the person who took them?

9. Is the government aware if there are any more of such poles on the property of that person?

10. Does the government purpose proceeding against that person?

11. Was this same person in the employ of the government as overseer of works on the wharf or otherwise at Ste. Anne and elsewhere?

12. Is that person still in the government employ?

13. Is he not employed at the experimental farm at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. Poles were carried away by a farmer named George Beaulieu, on whose property they were found.

3. 350 poles.

4. Trackmaster Lavery sent word to Inspector Moore, who went to this man and had him return the poles.

5. No.

6. Yes, they were all returned.

7. No.

8. No action was taken.

9. Answered by No. 6.

10. The matter will be considered.

11, 12 and 13. Not to the knowledge of the Department of Railways and Canals.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MARITIME LAW.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the government been invited to participate in the International Conference on Maritime Law, to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in September, 1912?

2. If so, has the government decided to be represented at such conference, and by whom?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.
2. Answered by reply to No. 1.

POSTMASTER AS TOWN COUNCILLOR.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is it against the rules of the Post Office Department for a postmaster to become a municipal or town councillor?
2. If so, what is the regulation in regard to it?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. There is no special rule.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY BRIDGE AT MORRIS.

Mr. MOLLOY:

Have any representations been received by the Railway Department objecting to the establishment of traffic facilities in connection with the proposed Canadian Northern railway bridge across the Red river at the town of Morris, Manitoba? If so, when and by whom?

Mr. COCHRANE. The department has no knowledge of any representations being made, objecting to the establishment of traffic facilities in connection with the proposed Canadian Northern railway bridge across the Red River at the town of Morris, Manitoba.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

—For a copy of all documents, papers, petitions, letters, &c., relating to the dismissal of Louis Girard, postmaster at Ste. Angèle de Mérici, county of Rimouski, and relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska).

—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, charges, complaints, reports and other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department, relating to the proposed dismissal of James McGrath, postmaster at Aspen, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Sinclair.

—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, charges, complaints or other documents in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to the proposed dismissal of Patrick Conway, lightkeeper at White Head Island, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Sinclair.

—For a return showing for each department of the government the names, post office addresses, offices, employment, and salaries of all persons employed either in the inside or outside service thereof, and of such persons not in the civil service, employed by the government in any department, on the tenth day of October, 1911, who have been removed from office or employment by dismissal; specifying in each case the manner of and grounds of such dismissals and the length of notice given to the persons removed, and also indicating in each case whether an inquiry was or was not held prior to such dismissal.—Mr. Eyte.

—For a copy of all letters papers, charges, affidavits and other documents relating to a charge against W. W. Gray, coal inspector of the I. C. R. at Westville, N.S., and of all evidence, documents, reports, or other papers connected with the investigation of said charge by H. P. Duchemin.—Mr. Macdonald.

—For a copy of all charges, letters, and other documents relating to complaints against John Connolly, of New Glasgow, coal inspector, for partisanship, the evidence taken in the investigation before H. P. Duchemin, and all other papers in connection therewith.—Mr. Macdonald.

—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, charges, complaints, reports and other documents relating to the dismissal of W. H. Harris, postmaster, at White Head, N.S., and relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Sinclair.

POSTMASTER AT ST. ANACLET.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska) moved:

For a copy of all documents, papers petitions, recommendations, &c., relating to the request that was made to the Post Office Department for the dismissal of the postmaster of St. Anaclet, county of Rimouski.

Mr. PELLETIER. There has been no dismissal.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). I know there has been no dismissal, but I would like to know the circumstances relating to the request.

Mr. PELLETIER. I suppose the hon. gentleman would like to know why there has been no dismissal.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNTIES ON STEEL AND IRON.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. KYTE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) based upon an item that has been going the rounds of the ministerial press. I quote from the Montreal 'Gazette':

Ottawa, Feb. 2.—The government has decided in favour of granting substantial bonuses for the encouragement of iron making in Canada.

Your correspondent can state this to-night authoritatively. The great smelting industries at Sydney and the Soo were established largely by means of bonus aids. The last of these expired in June. There were the bounties in steel rods. There had previously been bounties on billets and other forms of iron and steel which had expired and which Finance Minister Fielding failed to renew.

The government has decided that the state of the industries and the prosperity of the country warrant a restoration of this bounty aid. Therefore it has been practically decided to give a bounty of a dollar a ton on pig iron produced from foreign ore and a dollar and a half a ton on pig iron pro-

duced from domestic ore. These bounties will likely run until the Tariff Commission is appointed and has looked into the question of aid for steel works. It is likely that then the bounties will be dropped and the steel industry aided by means of tariff protection for which they have always expressed a preference

I desire to ask the government if it has been decided to renew the bounties, and if any information to that effect has been given out by the government?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). In answer I may say, what I think my hon. friend must know, that it is not the custom to make any announcement in a matter of that kind except in the budget speech.

Mr. KYTE. Are we to understand that this statement is not authoritative?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend will have to use his own judgment.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to refresh the memory of the right hon. leader of the government (Mr. Borden) as to the return regarding the appointment of commissioners under the Boundary Waters Treaty. My right hon. friend thought he had the return and, if so, I would like to know if he is prepared to produce it?

Mr. BORDEN. It cannot be produced until assent is obtained for bringing down certain documents. That has been asked for but has not yet been obtained.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When is it likely to be obtained?

Mr. BORDEN. I could not say—as soon as possible. We are asking for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That means right away?

Mr. BORDEN. I think so—with the least possible delay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In reference to Bill (No. 95) respecting the National Transcontinental railway, I have understood from my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that he would bring down the factum of each party in the case before the courts.

Mr. BORDEN. It was so intended.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I understood that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had received everything he required. I had instructed my assistant deputy to procure the factum if possible and I will bear that in mind, make further inquiry and bring it down if it is available.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is available.

PEACE MEMORIAL MONUMENT.

Mr. GERMAN. I would like to call the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) to an article which I saw in a newspaper yesterday stating that he had been interviewed by some prominent gentlemen in reference to the building of a peace memorial monument in Queen's Park, Toronto, to commemorate a hundred years of peace between the British and United States governments. The right hon. gentleman is aware that there is considerable earnest feeling—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. German) would be going beyond the rules in entering upon a discussion and not simply asking a question.

Mr. GERMAN. I only intend to mention what will lead up intelligently to the question which I purpose asking. The Prime Minister is aware of the feeling existing in Canada and the United States that there should be some International Peace Memorial Monument erected and I desire to know from the Prime Minister if he has considered the question and if any action will be taken by the government in reference to it in the near future.

Mr. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman inquiring as to a peace memorial or as to the memorial mentioned by the delegation?

Mr. GERMAN. The peace memorial which is being suggested to be erected by the governments of the United States and Canada.

Mr. BORDEN. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. German) that the subject to which he has alluded has been brought to the attention of the government on more than one occasion in an informal way. I understand that an association has been formed in the United States for the purpose of assisting in the celebration of the anniversary of peace between the two countries in a way that would be worthy of the very great event that it would commemorate. I also understand that an association has been formed by some prominent men in the mother country and I think that perhaps more than one association may have been formed in Canada although I am not aware that they have organized in any very effective way up to the present time. As far as the government of the United States are concerned, I am not aware that they have taken any action in the matter, nor have I received any information that the government of the United Kingdom have taken any action up to the present time. The government of this country would be prepared to take any part in the celebration of the peace anniversary that might be decided upon after the necessary conference with the

government of the United Kingdom and the government of the United States. We have not received any intimation with regard to the matter from the mother country or the government of the United States. For that reason the matter has not come, except in the informal and unofficial way to which I have alluded, to the attention of the government. I do not think I can give my hon. friend any further information on the subject at the present time.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Part 4 of the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce—Mr. Foster (Toronto).

APPOINTMENT OF A TARIFF COMMISSION.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 88 to provide for the appointment of a Tariff Commission. He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill to create a Tariff Commission, I am sure I need not say that it is not the intention of the government to delegate or attempt to delegate its powers and functions with regard to the making of tariffs to any outside body. Under our parliamentary system, the duty of originating Bills for the raising of revenue devolves upon the government, and the responsibility for such Bills must remain with the government. Under this proposed Act creating a Tariff Commission, the duty and responsibility with respect to the tariff shall remain precisely as it is at present, precisely as it has been in the past. In this respect there is no departure whatever from the former practice. The wish has often been expressed that the tariff could be taken out of politics and that a commission akin to the Railway Commission might deal with it; a commission having power not only to obtain information but to actually fix tariff rates. The idea underlying this wish is, of course, that the tariff and the fixing of tariff rates might be removed from the sphere of political influence, or the sphere of party favouritism, and that a commission should fix the rates of the tarff upon a basis that would be fair, and just, and equitable to all classes of the community, producers, and consumers alike. Now, apart from the question of governmental responsibility for national expenditure and for the raising of revenues, such a proposal could only be regarded as Utopian, and impractical, because there is probably no question in the whole realm of political science upon which men and parties and economists have more widely or more earnestly differed than as to the principle upon which tariff rates should be based and established. There are those who are free traders, and who believe in a tariff for revenue only, but they differ among themselves as to the particular commodities that should be taxed and as to the proportion of the tax that should be borne by the several classes of the community—I am not speaking particularly with regard to Canada now when I speak of free traders and those who believe in a tariff for revenue only. Then, there are those who are protectionists, and they differ among themselves as to the degree of protection that should be accorded and the extent of time and the period over which protection should extend. I think we may safely say—and I am sure it is not necessary to elaborate the point in a representative assembly of this kind—we may safely say that there is no matter in the realm of political science about which men and parties are more apt to differ than the question of the proper basis for, and the principle of establishing tariff rates. I think, therefore, we may assume in view of this and other considerations, that the tariff cannot be taken out of politics, that it is in reality the most vital and essential feature in politics, that it is, and probably always will be the chief topic of political discussion.

Now, in any modern society, the task of tariff making or of tariff revision, especially upon a comprehensive scale, is one of very great difficulty and complexity, involving, as an indispensable preliminary, a more or less exhaustive investigation into economic conditions. In other words, where the tariff is a tariff for revenue only, or partly for revenue and partly protective, its basis should be the ascertainment, as accurately as possible, of facts. Let me give a practical illustration. From day to day in my office, the tariff being in the Department of Finance, I have applications from business men, from manufacturers, from others throughout the community, with regard to the tariff. These applicants have, or fancy they have, some grievances; they either wish a higher degree of protection, or, some of them may complain, and they may justly complain, that the tariff unduly favours certain industries, that the rate of living has been unduly enhanced by reason thereof, and they ask that the matter be looked into. Now, right at the outset, and before that matter can be properly investigated, there comes up the question: what are the facts. In other words, the question of facts is an absolutely necessary preliminary to proper tariff investigation, and to proper and just tariff action. In Canada, with our vast extent of territory, with our great variety of resources, with our great industrial establishments, the task of tariff making is one of very great difficulty, a fact that has been recognized by previous governments whenever they have undertaken the task of tariff making

or tariff revision. They have tried to meet the situation by organizing committees or commissions—I prefer to call them committees, although they have been called by the ministers themselves commissions, they tried by this means to obtain the necessary facts and data upon which a tariff can only be justly and fairly and intelligently constructed. They have gone through the country, they have visited the principal places in Canada, and have there sought information. In 1893 a committee of the ministers of Sir John Thompson's Cabinet visited the principal centres of the Dominion for the purpose of obtaining information with a view to revise the tariff. In 1897, similarly, a committee of Cabinet ministers, three in number, visited the leading centres of the Dominion in quest of information. They gave hearings to parties who were desirous to be heard with regard to the tariff or who might have information useful to them in coming to a conclusion. In 1905 and 1906, similarly a committee of ministers visited various points of the Dominion, preparatory to the tariff legislation of 1907.

Now, Sir, I think that such committees would serve an extremely useful purpose. In the first place they would bring the ministers in touch with public opinion throughout the Dominion, the ministers would hear both sides, so to speak; they would hear the side of those in favour of an increase in the tariff or of maintaining the existing tariff, and they would hear, on the other hand, those who were opposed to such increase or such maintenance.

But I think it must be obvious to all that it would be absolutely impossible for such a committee of ministers visiting various parts of the Dominion to obtain anything like accurate statistical information, which I believe is indispensible to the making of a tariff upon a just and fair basis. It would be absolutely impossible for these ministers to obtain anything like accurate information with regard to the great variety of products and commodities mentioned in the tariff schedules. Our customs revenue for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1911, was over $73,000,000; our tariff Act embraces something like 740 different items; and these items in turn embrace thousands of commodities. One gets a fair idea from these figures of the great amount of information which would be necessary or desirable before anything like a comprehensive revision of the tariff could be attempted. I do not wish to overemphasize or to magnify the difficulty, because it is only fair to say that it is possible to become academic with regard to getting information; but there is no doubt that our tariff will be on a more just and equitable basis in proportion to the amount of accurate information which we have at hand at the time the tariff is created or is revised.

Other countries have been confronted with the same difficulty of obtaining facts as a preliminary to tariff action. Germany engaged some thirty experts for the purpose of obtaining information upon which her tariff might be based. Japan, preliminary to any tariff legislation, appoints a committee consisting of civil officials, members of parliament and leading business men, for the purpose of advising with regard to the items in the tariff schedules. The nearest approach to a permanent tariff commission, although it is not a tariff commission in the sense in which our Bill provides for one, is the Tariff Board of the United States. The Customs Tariff Act of the United States for the year 1909 contained maximum and minimum tariff provisions, and it left the administration of the tariff as to these maximum and minimum provisions in the hands of the President of the United States. The following provision was made in the Act:

> To secure information to assist the President in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this section, and officers of the government in the administration of the customs laws, the President is hereby authorized to employ persons as may be required.

Subsequently he appointed three persons, the number being afterwards increased to five, to organize the bureau, and they were known as the Tariff Board. As to the duties of the board there is no definition in any statute, but the president of the board has thus defined them:

> The duties of the board are the ascertainment of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad and the ascertainment of the prices at home and abroad and their relation to local conditions.

The President desired to have the board made permanent, but in the meantime public sentiment had arisen calling for the creation of a Tariff Commission. In the United States there were two distinct notions prevalent as to the scope of this commission. One was that the commission should have the powers which I mentioned at the opening of my speech—that it should be absolutely independent of Congress with the power to fix the tariff rates. The other was that the commission should be auxiliary to the government, for the purpose of obtaining information on which tariff rates might be founded. A Bill was introduced founded on the latter conception, though slightly different in form, and passed both Houses, but failed of final enactment. It is generally acknowledged that the Tariff Board of the United States has performed very important and valuable services. Among the different works which it has undertaken I might mention

the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States, the pulp and news print paper schedule, and the woollen schedule.

It may be assumed that accurate information and data are absolutely essential if we desire to be just and fair and equitable to all classes of the community in the revision of the tariff. We propose, therefore, to create a Tariff Commission with the duty of obtaining and collating information of which the government may avail itself in making its tariff law. As a result of that tariff organization, I would hope that in time—because it cannot be done hurriedly—we would have established a very valuable bureau of information relating to almost every commodity, or at least all the principal commodities, embraced in our tariff schedules. Under present conditions the Minister of Finance and his colleagues obtain that information in the best way they can. In the first place, the Minister of Finance has his own knowledge, such as it may be, and that of his colleagues, with regard to existing business conditions. Then he obtains a great deal of information from discussions in the House, and from members representing the different constituencies throughout the Dominion. He obtains further information from deputations and interviews, which for the most part are of a confidential nature, and in which he is asked to make tariff changes. He receives letters from time to time bearing on the question of the tariff. From all these sources he undoubtedly does receive a considerable amount of information. He has also in his department an accumulation of statistics. But the great lack, as I have indicated, is that we have not tabulated and accurate information on which we can rely, we do not know the facts as we should know them, in regard to the industries, the businesses, the callings and the occupations of the people. We have not the facts with regard to the cost and conditions of production that we should have before we can intelligently approach the question of tariff consideration and tariff modification. Now, I have no doubt that an expert staff could be organized that would materially assist the minister in obtaining that information, but no such staff could possibly act with the authority of an efficient Tariff Commission clothed with the most ample powers of investigation, for the purpose of obtaining the information of which I speak.

I desire to say as strongly as I can that the creation of a Tariff Commission does not in the slightest degree minimize ministerial or government responsibility for the tariff. The minister must still continue to keep in living touch with conditions to the best of his ability, because it is very much better that he should have first hand information—that he should supplement the information obtained from the Tariff Commission by his own knowledge and by such information as he may obtain in the way I have indicated. The government, after all, is responsible and must continue to be responsible for the tariff; but the minister should have, as a result of the work of the Tariff Commission, a constantly increasing body of information which would be of the greatest possible service to him and his colleagues in coming to just conclusions upon tariff matters. That has always been the great need, and it is to gain that knowledge, to obtain the information and data indispensable, that we propose to create this commission. I shall take up briefly some of the principal clauses of the Bill.

In the interpretation clauses, the expression 'goods' means:

> Products, wares and merchandise or movable effects of any kind, including, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, horses, cattle and other animals.

That clause is practically taken from the interpretation clauses of the Customs Act.

The commission is to consist of three members appointed by the Governor in Council. They are to give their entire time to the work of the commission and must reside in Ottawa or in its vicinity. The chairman will receive $7,500 per annum, and each of the other two commissioners $7,000 per annum. Each commissioner shall hold office for a period of five years from the date of his appointment, but may be removed by the Governor in Council at any time.

Now I come to the duties of the commission. These are set forth in the fourth section of the Bill. In respect of goods—and the word 'goods' is defined in the interpretation clauses—produced in or imported into Canada, the commission shall, under the direction of the minister, make inquiries as to raw material, production, transportation, labour and so forth. The intention is that the commission shall be directed by the minister to take up and investigate particular matters or schedules, and ascertain the facts connected with the production of any particular industry and deal with these facts separately as mentioned in the paragraphs of section 4. Once the minister has directed the attention of the commission to a particular schedule or article, such as cement or iron or any other commodity, the commissioners will investigate in such a manner as they deem proper. As directed by the minister, they will inquire into:

> The price and cost of raw materials in Canada and elsewhere and the cost of transportation thereof from the place of production to the place of use or consumption.

In other words, it is very desirable that we should know what the cost of raw material is laid down at the places of use or consumption in Canada. It is very desirable that we should know the advantage that Canada enjoys or the disadvantage she suffers with respect to raw materials used in connection with the manufacture of any particular commodity. The cost of transportation will of course include all charges incurred from the place of production to the principle place of use or consumption.

The commission shall also inquire into the cost of production in Canada and elsewhere.

Now the cost of production is not easily ascertained, but that is no reason why there should not be an attempt to ascertain it. The cost may vary according to locality and supply and demand, and it should be the duty of the commission to ascertain the cost of production at various times and points and in various industrial establishments in Canada and elsewhere, and try to reach a conclusion as to the cost of production in this country as compared with other countries. The word 'elsewhere' would seem to give great latitude to the commissior but there are two restraints on that provision being abused. When the matter came up in the United States House, the suggestion was thrown out that such a provision might be taken advantage of by the members of the commission to enable them to take trips abroad. But our tariff commission is not to go outside of Canada except with the consent of the minister, and of course parliament has the most immediate check on the expenditure of the commission in the appropriation parliament makes for the ensuing year.

The commission will also make inquiry, under the direction of the minister into:

The cost of transportation from the place of production to the place of use or consumption, whether in Canada or elsewhere.

The cost of transportation of course has a great deal to do with the cost of production, and when we find great variations in price in the east and the west within Canada, we ought to ascertain how much transportation figures in the difference.

Another subject of inquiry by this commission is:

The cost efficiency and conditions of labour in Canada and elsewhere.

It is very desirable that we should know the differences between the conditions in Canada and elsewhere and what effect those differences have on our competition with other parts of the world. The conditions as to wages, the cost of living, the efficiency of labour and generally all the elements that affect production, should be probed as thoroughly as possible. Another subject which the commission will have to take up is:

The prices received by producers, manufacturers, wholesale dealers, retailers and other distributors in Canada and elsewhere.

A comparison of prices ruling in various centres is very desirable when considering a tariff. Generally speaking, the commission should investigate all the conditions and factors that enter into the cost of production and the price to the consumer in Canada as compared with other countries.

Taking section 4 literally, it is a pretty large order, but if the powers of the commission are exercised with good sense and they pursue their investigations along that line, there will in time be a wealth of valuable information which cannot fail to be of use to the government in coming to a conclusion on tariff matters. What I mean is that the commission is to be directed to make certain inquiries and not that the government should wait until the commission has investigated all the matters mentioned in this fourth section of the Bill. If they did, tariff considerations would be indefinitely postponed. My own opinion is that the tariff, especially in prosperous times, should not be lightly changed, but we must recognize that conditions are changing in the country and a tariff must change with the changing conditions. It will be only changed however, when we have the information upon which changes should properly be made.

Subsection 2 of section 4 provides:

The commission shall make inquiry into any other matter upon which the minister desires information in relation to any goods which, if brought into Canada or produced in Canada, are subject to or exempt from duties of customs and shall report to the minister.

And subsection 3 provides:

The commission may be empowered by the Governor in Council to hold an inquiry, under section 12 of the customs tariff 1907, in the same manner as a judge of the Exchequer Court or any other judge herein referred to may be so empowered, and the said section shall include and apply to the commission as if it were therein expressly named.

In connection with that clause, I may say it was deemed advisable that the commission, which naturally becomes skilled in matters of that kind, should be empowered and authorized to hold investigations under the provisions of the Tariff and Customs Act. For the information of the House I shall read the section in question. Section 12 of the Customs Tariff Act:

Whenever the Governor in Council deems it to be in the public interest to inquire into any conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement alleged to exist among manufacturers

or dealers in any article of commerce to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers in such article at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may command or empower any judge of the Supreme Court, or of the Exchequer Court, of Canada, or of any superior court or county court in Canada, to hold inquiry in a summary way and report to the Governor in Council whether such conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement exists. The judge may compel the attendance of witnesses and examine them under oath and require the production of books and papers, and shall have such other necessary powers as are conferred upon him by the Governor in Council for the purpose of such inquiry.

If the judge reports that such conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement exists in respect of such article, the Governor in Council may admit the article free of duty, or so reduce the duty thereon as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in the article, if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article.

As I have said, that gives the commission power, at the instance of the Governor in Council, to make investigations where it is thought that there exists any combination for the purpose of unduly enhancing prices.

Subsection 4 provides:—

It shall also be the duty of the commission to inquire into any other matter or thing in relation to the trade or commerce of Canada which the Governor in Council sees fit to refer to the commission for inquiry and report.

That is, of course, a purposely wide clause to meet any condition that may require investigation at the instance of the government, inquiries to be made in a summary manner. As to the powers of the commission, they include the usual powers of a court to summon witnesses and to require them to give evidence on oath or affirmation, and orally or in writing, and to produce documents etc. In order that the commission may cover more ground and work more efficiently it is provided that one commissioner shall have power to hold inquiry under subsection 1 and 2 and two commissioners shall have power to conduct investigations under subsections 3 and 4. It is provided also:

For the purposes of any inquiry under this Act, the commissioners may obtain information, which in their judgment is authentic, otherwise than under the sanction of an oath or affirmation, and use and act upon such information.

In other words, wide latitude is given the commission to obtain information. They will obtain it in many ways—from reports of trade and statistical returns of other countries, from investigations carried on, so to speak, in the field in connection with the industries of the country, and by hearing those who may desire to be heard with regard to the questions, and, if necessary, by summoning witnesses and calling upon them to testify under oath. The sixth subsection of section 5, is an important one:—

Should evidence or information in its nature confidential, relating to the business or affairs of any person, firm or corporation, be given or elicited in the course of any inquiry, the evidence or information shall not be made public by the commission in such a manner as to be available for the use of any business competitor or rival of the person, firm or corporation, respectively, but this subsection shall not apply to an inquiry under subsection 3 of section 4 of this Act.

This does not relate to the inquiry into combinations for the purpose of enhancing prices to which I have referred. In that case, nothing confidential is to be obtained, but all is to be public. With regard to this subsection, if the commission carries out its duties as is proposed, there is no doubt that information will be obtained which will be of benefit to the commission, but of a confidential nature the publication of which would be most disadvantageous to, in fact, might greatly impair the credit of the firm that has given it. The experience of the United States Tariff Board is that they derive a great deal of information in that way, and they are decidedly of the opinion that where given confidentially, it should be safeguarded. No doubt, objection may be raised, but I think that if parties reasonably fear that their credit will be injured or that they will be in any way embarrassed or that any rival would obtain advantage from information given to the commission constituted under this Act that information should be held as confidential.

Subsection 7 reads:—

Inquiries under this Act shall, whenever practicable, be conducted at some suitable place in the city of Ottawa, but the commissioners may, in their discretion, conduct such inquiries, either in whole or in part, in any other place in Canada, and, with the consent of the minister, in any place outside of Canada.

I must apologize for taking up so much time in connection with the provisions of the Bill, as I understand that is not customary at this stage.

In bringing down this measure, I do not wish it to be inferred that the government has modified, in any way, its policy as to a reasonable and adequate protection for the industries of this country. Personally, I am not a believer in high protection, but I am a believer, an absolute believer, in reasonable and adequate protection for the development of the resources and the building up of the industries of this country. Next to the power to make laws for the peace and good order of the community, I do not believe there is any power exercised by the government of more import-

ance than the power of fixing tariff rates. Every man, woman and child in Canada, is interested in the tariff; from the miner of Cape Breton to the fruit grower of British Columbia, all are interested. And the problem that confronts us is this: How shall we arrange the tariff so as to provide the necessary revenue for the country, and also provide for the upbuilding of industry and the development of our resources, yet at the same time be just, fair and equitable to all classes of the community? That is the problem; and I say that in order to solve that problem it is necessary that we should obtain all the information possible. We cannot have too much information in order that we may try, at least, to accomplish this result. It is as an aid to the solution of the problem of obtaining that information upon which an equitable tariff can be based, a tariff fair to all while reasonably protecting the industries of the country and the labour dependent upon those industries, that this Bill has been brought down by the government.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). What ever criticism I might have to offer upon the Bill, the second reading of which has just been moved by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds), no one can take exception to the clear explanation which he has given the House, of the proposal and his own intentions in regard to the proposal. As to much of what he has said, I can agree with him, and to many parts of his address I take no exception.

But I must disagree with him on the method he has adopted in seeking to obtain information and facts, which I believe all members of this House will deem to be necessary to enable us to bestow proper consideration upon any of the tariff questions which from time to time arise in this House. I object to the form in which the government has brought down this measure, and as I proceed, I think I can point out to the satisfaction of the House that the form is objectionable, and if persisted in, as brought before us in the shape of the present Bill, its operation and ultimate result will not only be objectionable, but I think I may go so far as to say may be disastrous to the great body of the citizens of this country.

I believe that the Finance Minister recognizes that this Bill is in the nature of a new departure. It is a radical departure from anything which we have hitherto known in our parliamentary or constitutional practice. In order to justify so radical a departure, strong reasons, substantial reasons, I think should have been given to the House. Mere matters of expediency are not sufficient for the purpose. Our constitutional practice, our parliamentary practice in respect to tariffs, and in respect to the great question of national taxation, has not been the growth of a year, or of years, or of generations, but of centuries. It is the outcome of long centuries of ripe experience, and the rights which we in this parliament possess of dealing with matters of revenue and of taxation are rights not lightly to be interfered with, not lightly to be limited, and no government, I submit, is justified in raising any barrier between a government and the people who puts that government in power; and this Bill, in my opinion, raises at the outset such a barrier.

I think, too, that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance might at the outset have given the House some reason for bringing in this measure at the present session. What public demand has there been in Canada for such a measure? Has there been any demand? Has the question ever been discussed in this House or outside this House? Has it ever been discussed as a question of vital importance by the press of the country? I know, as every hon. member knows, that the question of the appointment of a tariff commission was raised by my right hon. friend, the leader of the government, in one or more than one of his many pre-election manifestos. But I know that I am quite within the mark when I say that the matter as a live issue was never discussed, either on the platform or in the press, and up till the present moment, so far as my knowledge goes, it has never been discussed in the parliament of Canada. Now what call or what demand has there been for such a measure? The Minister of Finance gave the House not a single instance of any demand, of any request, which had been made upon the government to formulate such a measure as that proposed in this Bill for the employment of a permanent tariff commission. We know that there is one important body in Canada that has called for it, and called loudly for it. We know that it has been a sort of an ideal of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association for a number of years back. We know that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association has year in and year out, in open session and in secret session, and at its banquets, announced its desire that a permanent tariff commission should be established in Canada. But apart from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, has any call come from any other section of the country? I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance: Have any agricultural societies in Canada asked for the establishment of a permanent tariff commission? Have any of the dairymen's associations, any of the live stock associations, swine breeders' or sheep breeders' associations any western association, the Grain Growers' Association, the Dominion Grange—

have any of these men asked for it? Have any of the great consuming classes asked for such a measure? Has any request come from Boards of Trade? If so, the Minister of Finance did not give the House any information. Has he received requests from the great industrial classes, the Trade and Labour Congress, the trades unions, any of those representative bodies of the great consuming classes, have they made any request to the government, direct or indirect, that a permanent tariff commission should be established in Canada? I venture to say that, with the single exception of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, there has never been a request or a suggestion from any of the great public bodies in Canada for a Bill such as the one which is now under consideration.

Now, on the face of the Bill, one might suppose on a superficial glance, that it is perhaps innocuous, perhaps to some extent harmless. But I venture the assertion that any one who will carefully read the Bill, any one who will observe what I believe to be its real intent and purpose, will see that it is one of very far reaching scope, and of very serious consequence to the people of his country. It does, Sir, seem to me a strange thing that the first important official act, the first act, at all events, of any consequence or any magnitude, performed by the Minister of Finance in this House since his appointment to that high position a few months ago, should be the introduction of a Bill to establish a permanent tariff commission in Canada, a Bill which, on his own statement, both in form and in substance, I think I am safe in saying, is practically borrowed from the highest protectionist country in the world, from the United States of America. It is a strange comment, a strange sequel, upon events which happened just about a year ago in Massey hall, Toronto, at a tremendous gathering called by so-called Liberals to protest against the proposed reciprocity agreement with the United States. The hon. the Minister of Finance was on the platform at that gathering, and they tell me he made the best speech that was made on that occasion, and I am sure he would. His theme was that the United States systems are bad, their laws are bad, their methods, their manners are such as should not be adopted in Canada; they would lower us, they would not ennoble us. And now, Sir, we see that the first act of consequence or of magnitude, of that same hon. gentleman occupying the high position of Minister of Finance of Canada, is to bring in a Bill, to find a model for which he has gone across to Washington. He has culled the 'Congressional Record' of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and he has brought here in concrete form what the high protectionist party in the United States deem a proper thing to safeguard high protection in that country.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, knows that he has perused that 'Congressional Record,' every page of it, dealing with this subject. I do not object to his doing so, but I say that his remarks are tainted with the arguments which were advanced by the high protectionist party in Congress for the passage of a similar measure. He will remember, as I do, that one member of the House of Representatives said: I support this Bill because it is the best way to sustain the glorious doctrine of protection. That is one of the reasons given in the House of Representatives and I, for one, have not a single doubt in my mind that the real object, purpose and intent of the present measure is to perpetuate and sustain, not the present system of protection, but a higher system of protection in the Dominion of Canada.

This Bill cannot be said to be original in any respect. There are only two or three countries, I believe, in the world—only two or three at all events, of which I know —which have adopted tariff commissions and it is a strange thing that the countries which have adopted this method of procedure, are the highest protected countries in the world. A tariff commission board seems to be a necessary adjunct to the high protective system, and I do not think I am going one jot beyond the truth when I say that this Bill is brought in here—almost the first important Bill of the first session of this parliament—as a quid pro quo for the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to redeem the promises made to them for their generous and lavish support during the election on the 21st day of September last.

Well, how will the Bill operate? Opinion may be divided upon that question and probably will. We have perhaps no plain statement of fact which you can lay before the House as to what will be the exact operation of the Bill and we cannot more than surmise what are the real intentions of the government in bringing it forward. But, straws show which way the wind blows, and we must gather these things from the material at hand. I think I am within the mark in saying that the operation of this Bill will not be such as was pictured in such a masterly way by the Minister of Finance, but that it will go much further. It is a matter which will enter much deeper into our fiscal system than the Minister of Finance would lead us to believe, if we can judge of its provisions and by the remarks which he has made to this House to-day. I believe I am right in saying that the only occasion

on which the question was ever mentioned in this House during the past ten or twelve years, was during the last session of the last parliament, about a year ago. The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) on that occasion, speaking in the debate on the question of reciprocity with the United States, did make a reference to the question of establishing a permanent tariff commission. It was not a lengthy reference, it was a brief reference and I give it now as being the only reference I can find in this House by the right hon. gentleman or by any one else to the matter. He said in that speech, at page 3311:—

I believe that we in Canada, in the future still more than in the past, should attempt to shape our tariff upon scientific consideration of known facts. I believe it would be well that we should have exact information as to these matters laid before parliament. I believe it would be well if we established a permanent tariff commission in Canada so that our tariff should not be made by rule of thumb.

And further, in column 3312, he says:

My idea of a tariff is one which would give the industries of this country a fair chance, and more than a fair chance perhaps, to stand up against competition of countries where, it may be, the standard of living among the labouring people is lower than in Canada, and lower than it ought to be any where. That I think is a reasonable proposition. A permanent tariff commission if established would be the most fitting authority to decide as to these points.

If that language correctly expresses what was the view and the opinion of my right hon. friend the leader of the government, when he spoke in this House one year ago, the intention of the tariff commission, and of this Bill which has been introduced, go much farther than the Minister of Finance would lead the House to believe. The right hon. leader of the government said last year that in his judgment a tariff commission would be the proper tribunal to decide these weighty matters, and he was then in favour of giving to the industries in Canada not only a fair chance, 'but more than a fair chance perhaps.' Why give to the industries of Canada more than a fair chance, let me ask my right hon. friend? Was that expression purposely used as a bait for the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and did the Canadian Manufacturers Association take the bait? Why give them more than a fair chance? Do they ask for more than a fair chance? I assume they do, but if that language correctly expresses the views of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, speaking in this House one year ago, and if this Bill is to establish a permanent tariff commission, and to give that commission power to decide these questions, as intimated by the right hon. gentleman last year, then the Bill is not so simple, and not so innocuous as the Minister of Finance would lead the House to believe in his statement. But, Sir, I am backed up in that view by a statement which appeared a day or two ago in the columns of the 'Toronto Mail.' This is about the first serious reference I ever saw in the newspapers of Canada to the question of a permanent tariff commission. It is contained in an editorial in the 'Mail and Empire' of February 1. It is only a passing reference, it is true, but, as I said, straws show which way the wind blows and there are one or two sentences here which indicate quite clearly that, notwithstanding the language used in the Bill, and the language used in addressing this House to-day by the Finance Minister, the real object and intent of the Bill go much farther than he would lead us to believe, and it will mean a general raising of the tariff of this country and the erection of a barrier between the people and the ministers who should be responsible to the people but who hereafter will try to shoulder that responsibility upon the board which they propose to create by this Bill. The Toronto 'Mail,' in discussing what the commission has to do, and referring to the material which the commissioners are to collect, says:

This material will not only be collected, but, which is scarcely less important, it will be organized, and something like a starting point for a scientific tariff will thus be fixed.

That so-called scientific tariff is to be organized from that starting point to be established by these permanent tariff commissioners. Further on, in the same article, it says:

The commission's work will establish a new landmark in the history of Canadian tariff legislation.

Is that not plain enough? Do the people not believe that the government's proposal means that the board of tariff commissioners shall, from time to time, make reports upon which this government will act, and that these reports, in the very nature of things, will be in the interest of higher duties or greater protection to the industries of Canada; or, in the words of the Prime Minister, will be designed to give the industries of Canada more than a fair chance? If they give them more than a fair chance somebody is going to suffer. It is at the expense of somebody else.

At whose expense is it to be? Certainly, at the expense of the great consuming masses of this country. I might mention one or two other matters which tend to lead me to the conclusion that we do not see the intention and the purpose of the government on the face of this Bill. It is only a few weeks since there appeared in the newspapers a letter from the right

hon. the Prime Minister addressed to Sir Sanford Fleming in regard to the cement merger. In that letter the right hon. gentleman said that the legal aspect of the question should be decided by the courts, and in that, I agree with him. But, he said, the question of the raising of the price by means of the merger is a matter for the Tariff Commission to deal with. It is only during the present session that I asked the Minister of Customs, on behalf of some of my constituents, whether a certain heavy triphammer could be imported from Chicago free of duty, the same not being mentioned in the Canadian Tariff and not being manufactured in Canada. I suppose my request could have been granted by order in council, but my request was refused courteously by the Minister of Customs and in his letter of refusal he said: this is another of these matters for the Tariff Commission to deal with. Now, when facts like that come to one's knowledge and when we know that the people who have established permanent Tariff Commissions throughout the world, are people who believe in the doctrine of protection to the hilt and the highest kind of protection; when we know that the only demand in Canada for a permanent Tariff Commission has been from the high protectionist party, the Canadian Manufacturers Association; when we know there has not been any earnest demand or suggestion for it from any other body of people in the Dominion, then, taking the statement of the Prime Minister, with the statement of the Minister of Customs to which I have referred and with the statement of the 'Toronto Mail and Empire', may we not reasonably conclude that the functions of this board are far greater than would appear on the surface, and that the proposal is in reality a radical departure from British and from Canadian parliamentary practice?

The Bill is largely an American model, nothing more or less than a cheap Yankee device of the Finance Minister, copied from the United States; a device notoriously invented by the high protectionist party in the United States. I challenge the Minister of Finance to contradict that statement. It cannot be contradicted because it is the absolute truth. In form and in substance we have in this Bill, an American article, a cheap Yankee device, which, as one man said in Congress, was intended to sustain the glorious doctrine of protection. Coming to the Bill itself, the third clause deals with the number of commissioners, the appointment of commissioners, etc. and I notice it is not set out in that clause that these commissioners shall be possessed of any special qualifications.

I heard the Minister of Finance state in the House a few days ago, and I think quite correctly, that he would appoint no man on account of his business or calling, and that he would not refuse to appoint any man on account of his business or calling. But as this Bill is to create a special board for a particular purpose, I think the commissioners to be appointed, if we go that length, should be men having some special training or qualifications. However, no qualification at all is mentioned in the Bill, and in that respect the government will have a free hand. Now, there is one qualification that a man must have if he is to sit on that board, and that is: he must not only be a consistent supporter of the Conservative party right up to and including the last election, but he must also be a High Protectionist before he will sit on that board. The members of that board will be appointed from the friends of the government, and possibly some of the members will be recruited from the Canadian Manufacturers Association. I do not know that these people have any special qualifications to perform this class of work, but I mention this particularly because this commission is a permanent body They are not to be such a commission as the Minister of Railways had to deal with the other day when he said they were only appointed during pleasure, and he removed them. This commission once appointed cannot be removed except for cause, which means by impeachment as you would remove a judge. Once appointed they are there and they are permanently there, and the words 'for cause' are put in just to assure them that they are safe even if in two or three years my hon. friend the leader of the opposition should again obtain power, so that he will not be able to dismiss them. The fact, therefore, is that we are going to have three permanent tariff commissioners a board just as permanently appointed as a Bench of Judges is appointed; and that the qualification is that they shall be loyal subjects and followers of the——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Of the King.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Of the right hon. gentleman who is now Prime Minister of Canada. They are to be Conservatives first, last, and all the time, and if they are, they have also got to be Protectionists and High Protectionists. We may make up our minds to it that we are going to have a board made up of individuals who rightly or wrongly hold opinions in favour of a highly protective system in this Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) a Protectionist himself?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I believe in a certain amount of protection; a tariff for revenue.

Mr. HENDERSON. Tariff for tariff, the old cry.

Mr. GUTHRIE. A tariff for revenue affords enough protection in my community and in my opinion it is sufficient. Let us reason the thing out a little further. I believe that there are men in Canada, and many of them, as stated by the Minister of Finance, whose opinions are fixed on the question of Protection and High Protection. With them it is not a matter of a mere change of opinion from day to day or from year to year; they have an absolute and honest conviction that high protection—some of them would have it as high as Haman's gallows—is the best system for Canada. I give these men credit for honestly holding these opinions. Then, there are a large number of people in this country, who believe as I believe, that if we adopt a tariff for revenue, we will have sufficient incidental protection—and some protection is necessary—for the industries of Canada. But there are also a large number of people who believe in free trade. Here we have three distinct classes of opinion on the fiscal policy of the country, and there may be more. I give these all credit for honesty of conviction, and I will ask the Prime Minister from which of these classes he proposes to appoint a permanent tariff board? I believe that if he appoints a board of high protectionists they will view the facts and conditions and circumstances which they are called upon to inquire into through one set of spectacles. I could name for him another set of commissioners who are just as clearly convinced that the best fiscal policy for this country is free trade, and who would from the same facts the same conditions, and the same surroundings, form a different conclusion altogether.

I put the matter more pointedly than that; I will put an extreme case. Take a tariff board composed of three men holding opinions such as those of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor); they would certainly be extreme protectionists. Take another board composed of three men such as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), whom I believe to be the ablest exponent of the doctrine of free trade either in this House or in this country. I believe these two boards would view the same facts, inquire into the same conditions, and come to almost opposite conclusions upon them. Where are you going to draw the line? This Bill in my humble judgment goes much too far in the power which it gives to the commissioners. The United States Bill was more fair than this, for that Bill provided that the tariff board should consist of five members three of whom should be Republicans. We do not recognize the party system in our legislation, and I think it is well that we do not; but this Bill gives the government power to appoint three gentlemen of high protectionist views, and we know, without going a step further, just what their view of the situation will be and what their report is likely to be. Now, the personnel and the functions of this commission are the all important things. I do not think the government should ask us to advance the Bill without giving us some information in this regard. I notice, in reading the 'Congressional Record' of the United States, that Senator La Follette said that it was absolutely essential to the consideration of the Bill that the names should be submitted; and I think it will appeal to the hon. members of this House that we ought to know something of the men whom the government intend to appoint in order that we may reach a conclusion as to their qualifications and as to whether they are men likely to perform properly the duties which this Bill proposes to assign to them. Passing on to the functions of the commission, I notice that by section 4 subsection 1 after full inquiry has been made the commissioners are required to report to the Minister of Finance. I believe it would be far more satisfactory if that were changed and the report of the commissioners were to be made directly to parliament. I see no reason whatever for limiting such a report or tying it up in the files of the Finance Department. If the information which this board obtains is of any practical value, then surely it ought to be submitted to this House in order that all hon. members would have an opportunity of perusing it. I take issue with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in regard to the application of subsection 3 of section 4, which provides that these commissioners may inquire into combines. The Bill does not in express terms repeal the provision of the Customs Act which provides that the Governor in Council may institute proceedings before the judges of this country to inquire into combines. That provision would probably continue to be in force; but to my mind it is nothing short of ridiculous to ask a board of hide-bound political commissioners to inquire into the combines and mergers dominated by their own political friends. That would be the position. Why, Sir, with a board of three Conservative commissioners of the high protectionist stripe there is not a merger or combine or trust in Canada, but would laugh in its sleeve when these gentlemen talked about having its affairs investigated. That provision in the Bill might well be removed, so that the power would remain where it now is, in the Customs Act, permitting the Governor in Council to empower the judges to make such an inquiry. I understand that the present Customs Act is not effective in this respect. I believe there is very much to be said in favour of the position taken by the hon. member

for South York (Mr. Maclean) in regard to federal enforcement of federal laws, and the Prime Minister could adopt a very much better course than that proposed in this clause, were he to propose an amendment to the Customs Tariff Act, giving some official of the government, be he lawyer or otherwise, power to initiate proceedings under that Act for a full inquiry before the judges into the mergers, trusts and combines. Subsection 4 of section 4 to my mind is very objectionable. It is very broad in its language. I believe that if this Bill is passed we should limit the commissioners to report facts and nothing but facts. We do not want their opinions, their conclusions or their results. We cannot have too much information; we all want the facts; but if that is the object of this Bill, this section as drawn goes much too far. Subsection 5 states that:

> Inquiries under this section shall be conducted in a summary manner, and the respective reports to be made pursuant to its provisions, accompanied by a copy of the evidence, if any, taken in connection with the inquiry, shall succinctly state the results thereof.

These are the words to which I take exception. Similar words were debated at great length in the United States Congress. This clause allows the commissioners succinctly to state results and to do so upon an investigation in which they have taken absolutely no evidence. I can imagine a permanent Tariff Commission appointed under this Bill who, from what they saw or heard from others, could form a conclusion and state succinctly a result to the Finance Minister without taking one particle of evidence, and the Bill does not compel them to take any. By subsection 5 of section 5 it is specifically provided:

> For the purposes of any inquiry under this Act the commissioners may obtain information, which in their judgment is authentic, otherwise than under the sanction of an oath or affirmation, and use and act upon such information.

That surely is a very broad power to give to any commission.

Two members of the board may walk down the street, meet one of the parties interested, and have a few words with him, or the board may have a letter from a political friend, stating his views, and the board then may, without taking one word of evidence, reach a conclusion favourable to these parties and lay it before the minister in their report. That proposal seems on its face absurd. I hope the right hon. the first minister will see fit to at least amend that particular clause so as to meet some of the objections to it.

Other provisions are equally objectionable, but what appeals to me as most objectionable is this. The Bill evidently was drafted to enable these commissioners to report opinions, surmises and conclusions of their own without regard to the actual facts. The intention of the government in framing this Bill, evidently was that these commissioners should lay before the minister, not accurate information or facts, but their own opinions and conclusions. If we are to judge by the language of the right hon. the first minister, it is his intention that the commission should have that express power. What then will be the result? The board may make inquiry in any way it sees fit. It may call in a few supporters of the government, it may call in interested protectionists, it may obtain their views in an offhand manner, and on views thus obtained, make its reports. What will the government do with these reports? I presume they will be published, and you may get from them most misleading information. I am not at variance with the right hon. the first minister in his desire for information; but the information which the government say they desire to obtain through the medium of this Bill, they can obtain in another way not objectionable. For some years back, I have been one of those who have found fault with the statistical information gathered by the Canadian government. A much better system might well be evolved and put in practice, instead of the present one which is neither accurate nor convenient. I believe that all the information which the Finance Minister, judging by his remarks, desires, he could obtain by the appointment of experts added to the departments of Trade and Commerce and Customs. There is no necessity for the appointment of a permanent Tariff Commission at all. You could appoint to the Customs and Trade and Commerce departments, expert technical men, who would get for you all the information which these commissioners are supposed to obtain. I believe that this would be a much less expensive way of arriving at more satisfactory results. These experts would be at work under the eyes of the minister and be responsible to him for their work, whereas the commission will be an irresponsible entity. By appointing these extra clerks, experts in tariff and statistical matters, you would secure reliable information—more accurate and reliable than what you would get from a tariff board, I care not by what government that tariff board be appointed. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White), could obtain all the evidence he desires much more accurately in the way I have mentioned than by this Tariff Commission. Let him amend the Customs Act, if necessary, to make this change. I believe that both sides of the House would support an amendment to that effect. We do not begrudge any expense to get necessary information, but we do not

want legislation which will be a most radical departure from a cardinal principle of our constitution. In his calmer moments I think the Minister of Finance will admit the force of what I say. Let him amend the Customs Act, as I have suggested, and he can have an inquiry into all the combines, trusts and mergers before a judge, and get all the information he can possibly desire.

Why thrust this measure on parliament and the country? Such a measure can have only one purpose. Is it not a delegation of authority? Is it not a delegation to another body of really the most important duty which we, as members of parliament, have to perform towards our country, and Sovereign? Our first duty is to vote the Supply for carrying on the government—the taxation necessary for the administration of public affairs. The right of the Commons to supremacy in matters of taxation, and the incidents of taxation, is one which was gained in the old country through centuries, not of peaceful argument and debate, but of struggle and turmoil, and up to the present no right has been more firmly settled in Great Britain and this country. But we are asked now to divest ourselves of that right. This proposal will establish a barrier between the Commons and the people. When this commission makes reports it will no doubt make them to suit some purpose of the government. Then when these reports are acted upon, and the people complain, the government will reply that they were obtained from experts. They will urge that the tariff was framed on the report of an independent Tariff Commission, and will disclaim responsibility. That will be the result of the establishment of a permanent tariff board; and that, in my view, is really the strongest objection to this measure. The proposal I make is that this Bill should stand. There is no urgency, no demand for it, save a demand from a number of Canadian manufacturers. Let this measure stand, let the press of this country have time to study and discuss it, let our farmers have time to become acquainted with its provisions. Let our Boards of Trade and municipal bodies, our chambers of commerce and labour unions—let them all have time to be seized with the full import of this new departure, and be in a position to give their views.

No injury is going to accrue to anybody, I presume, whether this measure is passed this session or whether it is passed next session. My hon. friend's own statement was that in times of prosperity changes in the tariff of Canada should not be lightly made; I appeal to him to approve his own doctrine of a year ago and let well enough alone. There is no lack of prosperity in Canada to-day; there is no crying need for such a measure as this. I appeal to any member of the government to say whether the country has had a fair chance to digest this measure? Has any hon. member ever discussed it with his constituents? Have they ever heard a discussion of it? I believe I attended as many meetings as any one in the late campaign, and I did not mention it, nor did I hear it mentioned. I have not seen it discussed in the newspapers. And never, in the twelve years during which I have been a member of this parliament, has the matter ever been broached here, except by one slight reference made in this chamber last year by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. Why, then, not let it stand? Let the people have a chance to consider it. It is a novel proposition, a radical departure in policy. If it only meant what one might gather from a superficial glance, I should not have been insistent on having the matter stand over. But I do appeal to my hon. friend the Finance Minister and the leader of the government, to give the people a chance to look into this Bill with more care than has yet been possible. My own opinion is that, while it may fall somewhat short of the ideal of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, it is a perfect 'lemon' for the farmers and workers of Canada. They will be fooled and hoodwinked by such a measure. They have a right, I believe, to look for better treatment at the hands of the right hon. Prime Minister. The farmers of Ontario stood by him pretty strongly on the 21st of September.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. But it was not on the doctrine of protection, which doctrine always brings such a cheer from hon. members opposite, but on the question of reciprocal trade relations with the United States. The bulk of the farmers of Ontario are not high protectionists. And this matter will vitally affect them when brought to its logical conclusion and put in full operation. Why not let them have a fair chance to digest the Bill, to consider it? Why hurry it through? It is not going to affect the government's determination on the question of the iron and steel bounties. Because I assume that that will be announced in the near future, even before the Tariff Commission is appointed. If the leader of the government would consent to my proposal, I think it would be in the interest of everybody. If he will not consent to it, then there is nothing left for me to do on behalf of this side but to move an amendment, seconded by Mr. Pardee:

That this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. BORDEN. There is not very much in the somewhat lengthy speech with which my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) has favoured the House which calls for any reply at this time. What we are discussing at this moment is the principle of the Bill and not the various clauses, consideration of which is proper in Committee of the Whole but is not proper at this stage. I should have supposed that an hon. member of the parliamentary experience of my hon. friend would have had that in regard and would have reserved his comments and suggestions with regard to the clauses until we were in committee. The speech of my hon. friend was full of gloom: he was very pessimistic. He made a very fervent appeal to us on behalf of the people of Canada, and at the conclusion of his remarks urged us not to hurry this measure. He is one of those who voted time after time during last session to drive the reciprocity pact through this parliament without any opportunity to send it to the people. That was a measure not simply concerned with the gathering of information for the use of the government and parliament, but calculated to affect not only the destiny of this country, but the destiny of the whole empire. Why did he not have the same tender regard for the people of Canada at that time which he exhibits so strikingly now? And I was shocked and surprised to find my hon. friend, who, in the early part of his speech castigated—or undertook to castigate—the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds) for endeavouring to get information as to the manner in which this question had been dealt with in the Congress of the United States, and who spoke in the most scornful way of 'Yankee devices', changed his tactics in the latter part of his speech and counselled the whole of us to follow the course of Mr. La-Follette and of the American Congress. Whom are we to believe—my hon. friend in the early part of his speech or my hon. friend in the latter part of his speech? I for one, have said, and am glad to say in this House, that there are many things in the example of the people of the United States and the course they have taken in public affairs from which we may learn something. No one, I hope, is so bigotted,—except my hon. friend, if he chooses to put himself in that category—as to imagine that in every respect we in Canada are the superiors of our neighbours to the south. I believe that in some respects they can learn from us, and I have been always ready to admit that we have been able and should be ready to learn from them.

But, after all, what is the proposition the Minister of Finance has submitted? He has submitted a proposal of the government by which the information, which has been gathered in the past in a desultory, ineffective and unscientific manner, shall, in future, be gathered in a scientific thorough and efficient manner, for the advantage of the government and the people. That is this Bill from beginning to end. But when an hon. member of the experience of the hon. member from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) tells us that there must be something behind the plain words of this Bill and that we are obliged to guide our consideration and our construction of it, by newspaper articles, I think every hon. member will realize that he was put to very great straits indeed to build up any sort of argument in opposition to this measure. Does he not know that, so far as the courts are concerned, it has been decided over and over again that even the language of those engaged in making the laws is not to be taken into consideration by the courts in constructing the statutes?

Surely he would not have us suppose that any comment or suggestion made by newspapers, or by one of us in this House, can have the slightest effect in modifying the clear language of this Bill. The plain and clear language of this Bill is simply this, that effective and systematic means shall be devised by which certain necessary information should be acquired for the government and for parliament by means of this Tariff Commission. My hon. friend has told us there has been nothing said in the country. My hon. friend in this House—I trust he will pardon me for saying so—has not been distinguished for accuracy, and I want to tell him that he is just as inaccurate in respect of this statement as in some others he has made to the House on previous occasions. I do not pretend to have carefully followed the course of discussion with regard to this matter, but I do know that at least three or four years ago a very important speech was made before the Toronto Board of Trade at which the establishment of such a commission was advocated by a very prominent man in Canada, and I know that since then it has been spoken of over and over again. When my hon. friend says that the first occasion on which I uttered anything with regard to it was a year ago in this House, he is again inaccurate, because it was not the first occasion. When he says there has been no discussion in this country with regard to it, I want to tell him that on at least forty or fifty platforms I debated that question, both in eastern and western Canada; and that in every case, when I pointed out to the people that what we proposed to do was to gather absolutely necessary information for the purpose of making a reasonable tariff that would do justice, so far as justice could be done, to all our industries and to all the people,

whether in eastern or western Canada, and I found the people, whether in eastern or western Canada, fully prepared to support the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party in that regard.

Now he says this is a radical departure, and that some barrier is to be created, and that this Tariff Commission is to bring in a tariff.

Mr. GUTHRIE. No.

Mr. BORDEN. I took down his words. I withdraw the meaning which I would have otherwise attributed to them, if he tells me that he did not intend to convey that meaning. But he certainly did, in the latter part of his speech, use words which conveyed that impression to my mind, because I took them down. He said:

The result of this would be a tariff brought in by an irresponsible Tariff Commission.

That is what he said, I do not know what he meant. If he did not mean that, I accept at once his disclaimer; it is my duty under the rules of parliament to do so. This Tariff Commission will bring in no tariff; the government of this country will bring in the tariff, in the future as in the past. To contrast the two methods, I myself remember what took place in this House in 1897, and more especially in 1907. When the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Trade and Commerce had jonrneyed around this country, had listened to speeches here and there, from this man, and that man, and the other man, in every city and every important town in Canada, they came back to parliament and brought down a tariff, and I ask what information was available to any man in this House from all the peregrinations and pilgrimages of these three gentle men? I asked that the result of their labours should be brought down, and they brought down, in typewritten form, not even printed and indexed, and piled up on the table of this House a mass of papers two or three feet in height, and I do not think any member of this House ever took the time, or pains, or trouble to pay the slightest attention to it, from beginning to end of the debate. My hon. friend may have been an exception, I do not know whether he was or not; I know that he is very industrious in such matters. Now, what we propose is to have a Tariff Commission of men who will be wisely selected for that purpose, and who will collect information in a systematic and effective manner, and put it in such a form that the government can avail themselves of it; information which will be available for the purpose of discussion in this parliament when any tariff changes are proposed. Surely there is no radical departure in all that. My hon. friend repeated over and over again that this is a radical departure, that this would create a barrier. Let us take his own illustration. He says the same result could be arrived at if the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Customs would add certain officers to their staffs and acquire information in that way. May I be permitted to inquire of the thoughtful members of this House who listened to my hon. friend, why the obtaining of information in the one way would create a barrier and would not create a barrier in the other way. Has a single hon. gentleman in this House been able to compass the argument of my hon. friend in that respect? I do not think he has been able to compass it himself; at all events, he will have an opportunity, I hope of telling us on some later occasion, just what he meant by that extraordinary argument and still more extraordinary suggestion. Then he is very much disturbed as to some of the provisions of this Bill, he was very much disturbed as to the provision that evidence not taken under oath may be used. Does he not remember that about ten days ago he and a number of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were very much disturbed because a commission was to be appointed who would take evidence on oath? At that time the great danger was that commissioners should be appointed to take evidence on oath, and now he is greatly disturbed because commissioners are to be appointed who may take evidence not under oath.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I did not take any exception as to the question of oath, it was the kind of evidence I objected to, it was to be too wide.

Mr. BORDEN. I thought my hon. friend was alluding to that clause in the Bill which says:—

For the purpose of any inquiry under this Act the commissioners may obtain information which in their judgment is authentic, otherwise than under the sanction of an oath or affirmation, and use and act upon such information.

I may have misunderstood my hon. friend, I am sorry if I did so. But I understood that the objection he raised to that section was that evidence not taken under the sanction of an oath, might be used by the commission. Was not that the objection which he raised?

Mr. GUTHRIE. What I meant to say, was that material which was really not evidence at all, might be used if the commissioners saw fit; letters, conversations, or anything of that kind. The objection was not to the lack of an oath.

Mr. BORDEN. Well, then I do not understand my hon. friend's objection at all.

I would not suppose that a commission of this kind would be bound by formal rules of evidence; at all events, I would hope that they would not make any attempt to restrict their inquiry by rules of that kind. Therefore it seems to me my hon. friend's objection falls to the ground.

Now, my hon. friend was very much concerned about the attitude of the government towards the Manufacturers' Association. I want to tell my hon. friend that he ought not to assume too much in these matters without due inquiry. So far as I am concerned, no man connected with the Manufacturers' Association of Canada ever spoke to me on this subject, except one, and he was absolutely opposed to the establishment of a permanent tariff commission. I want to tell my hon. friend, further, that no promise has ever been made by this government to the Manufacturers' Association; and further than that, the Manufacturers' Association have never approached the government for the purpose of obtaining any promise.

My hon. friend must not draw too much upon his own experience or the experience of his party friends in that regard. That is not the way in which the present administration propose to conduct the affairs of this country—by making promises of modifying the tariff in consideration of political support at elections. We have put all that behind us; the country put such methods behind it at the last election. My hon. friend finds fault with us for establishing this Tariff Commission, because he says that a commission of this character is only to be found in countries that have established a highly protective system. Again, I do not know that my hon. friend has been exceedingly accurate. It is perfectly true that a commission, or something of that kind, exists in France, and it may exist in Germany, although I am not sure of that. A Bill has been introduced into the Congress of the United States, but, if I understand the situation correctly, it has not yet been passed. It has not been passed for the reason that very grave objection, I believe, has been raised to it there. So, if my hon. friend regards the United States as a highly protectionist country, let me point out to him the simple fact that this Bill, up to the present time, has failed to pass the Congress of the United States. Further than that, I think that the object of the President of the United States in introducing that Bill, and in defending the establishment of a permanent Tariff Commission in that country was to cut down the system of protection in order that it might be brought within reasonable bounds. Surely my hon. friend is aware that at the last Imperial Conference held within a year his own leader stood up before that conference and moved for an Imperial Trade Commission to investigate conditions of trade in every one of the great Dominions which owe allegiance to His Majesty the King. I suppose the idea in making that proposal was to establish a means by which the necessary information as to trade conditions in every one of these Dominions, both within themselves and in relation to the people of the mother country, could be gathered in an effective way. If the proposal made on that occasion was a good one, why is it after all that my hon. friend finds any fault with the proposal of the present administration to do in an effective, systematic and thorough way that which in the past has been done in a very different manner?

I do not know that there is very much else in what my hon. friend has suggested to which attention need be given at the present time. As far as the provisions of the Customs Act are concerned, to which my hon. friend has alluded, the only thing that this Bill accomplishes, if it should pass into law, is this, that it establishes another tribunal to which may be referred the question as to whether or not a particular combine does or does not exist in this country. It does not take away any existing powers. It simply adds a new tribunal and in that regard surely it is a step in the right direction.

When my hon. friend suggested to us that we should have officers appointed for the purpose of enforcing Dominion legislation, I think he possibly made the most sensible suggestion that I noticed in his speech. But, I am bound to say that, although it has been spoken of in this parliament for the past six or seven years and advocated by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) and other hon members of the House, I do not think that suggestion, up to the present time, has received any sympathy or support from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat and I am glad to observe the newly awakened interest in the enforcement of Federal laws which has just been developed by my hon. friend. This is a matter to which we intend to give very serious consideration. It is impossible to deal with all these matters at once. As far as my views are concerned, I think there is a great deal in the suggestions which have been made for many years past by my hon. friend from South York and by other hon. members of this House in line with what has been suggested by my hon. friend from South Wellington.

My hon. friend has screwed his courage to the sticking point and has proposed an amendment. He has proposed an amendment that this Bill shall not be read now, but that it shall be read this day six months hence. We are glad to

welcome the challenge that my hon. friend has thrown out. He was very insinuating in his suggestion at first that we should have regard to the interests of the people and withdraw this Bill, but, at the end, he made manifest his true intention which was to challenge the policy of the government in this regard and to propose a continuance of the old method pursued in 1897 and in 1907 of conducting by useless and ineffective methods any investigations into the trade conditions of the country, the cost of production and all those matters that are so important to a proper consideration of this question. We believe that this information is necessary, that it ought to be obtained in a systematic and businesslike way and that it cannot be so obtained by the old methods. We propose now a method which takes away from parliament absolutely nothing of that power which is vested in parliament and of which parliament cannot divest itself. We propose to take away nothing of that, but we do propose to appoint a Tariff Commission which will give to the government and to parliament information respecting all matters that have been alluded to which information is vital, essential and necessary in order that a reasonable and just tariff may be made in the interest of the people of this country. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I do trust that the hon. members of this House will not regard with favour the proposal of my hon. friend to defer this legislation to another session. I trust that the amendment made be defeated and that this Bill may be passed. So far as the appointments are concerned, I can only say to my hon. friend from South Wellington that we do not know at the present time whom we shall appoint to that commission, but when we do make the appointments we believe they will be such as will commend themselves not only to the judgment of this House, but to the judgment of the country as well. I therefore, say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that the government cannot for one moment think of accepting the proposal of my hon. friend from South Wellington and that we desire to have this legislation passed and passed at this session. We do not desire to limit in any way the discussion upon the question but we believe that it is in the interest of parliament and of the people of the country that the Bill should become law at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BORDEN. It was so at the last election.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister complained that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), did not discuss the principles of the Bill before the House, but the right hon. gentleman himself did not come within many degrees of latitude and longitude of discussing any single principle involved in the Bill, and it would have been more illuminating to the House had he scolded less and argued more. He referred to the attitude of the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) upon the reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States in a scolding fashion, but what that had to do with the Bill we were discussing is more than I can understand. If the right hon. gentleman does himself understand the principles involved in the Bill, then he was most successful in neglecting to disclose his knowledge to the House. The hon. member from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), was distinctly right when he said that this measure was a mere copy of Yankee legislation which has not yet even received the approval of the American Congress. There is no originality in the Bill, and, apparently on the part of the ministers there is no attempt to understand what principle underlies it, if principle there be. The right hon. gentleman complained that the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) objected to the appointment of a Tariff Commission as provided for in this Bill, while, at the same time, he formally admitted the feasibility and propriety of the addition to the Civil Service of a certain staff in order to enable members of the government to prepare a tariff. Well, if the right hon. gentleman failed to understand the distinction between the two, he has failed to understand what the Bill involves. I am opposed to his Bill, because I believe it is a violation of constitutional practice in all British countries, because it directly or indirectly, and perhaps unconsciously, assumes to give to a Tariff Commission powers of legislation——

Some hon. MEMBERS. How?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I will tell you how later. I object to it because it tends to weaken the doctrine of ministerial responsibility as it obtains in all British countries; I object to it because the duties which, under the Bill, are assigned to a commission, refer to matters which in all British countries, are dealt with directly by the responsible advisers of the Crown. I object to the Bill, because the purpose sought to be attained by it can be better attained by less expensive and less objectionable methods; I object to it further, because it seeks in a manner—in a veiled manner, perhaps—to validate by a statute the doctrine of protection in this country. Recently the Minister of Finance stated in

the House that this measure was submitted in consequence of the popular demand. I deny that. It is true that the creation of a Tariff Commission has been suggested by the Manufacturers' Association, and by certain other individuals, and it is true that the Prime Minister, during the recent election campaign, did occasionally refer to the appointment of a permanent Tariff Commission, but not in a very serious manner, because I do not remember a single occasion upon which he devoted more than a few minutes to that particular matter. I submit that there is no evidence whatever of any demand by the people of this country for the appointment of such a commission. The establishment of this commission does not meet with the approval of the matured thought of this country, and from personal experience I know that it does not meet with favour from a great many who live within protectionist circles. I think it may be safely said that the government adopted this idea of a Tariff Commission merely as an expedient to escape a frank declaration of their policy upon trade and tariff matters during the past few months. It was, in the first instance, compounded as a sedative for the people of western Canada, who were demanding wider markets and reciprocal trade with the United States. It is an artificial expedient to escape ministerial responsibility, and its effect will be to further becloud an already difficult problem. When we read the declaration of the Prime Minister, in what is known as his Halifax platform, on the fiscal policy of the country, one would imagine that no other human agency than the government itself was necessary to frame a tariff that would suit all sections of the country, and all classes of people. I shall read the tariff plank from the Halifax platform, and it will then be seen that in some respects it might be properly catalogued as humorous, although it was delivered in the most solemn manner. I might also add that in some respects it is like the Divine peace, which 'passeth all understanding.' It reads:

'Fiscal policy which will promote the production within Canada of all useful articles and commodities that can be advantageously produced or manufactured from or by means of our natural resources, having due regard to the interests of the consumer, as well as to the just claims of our wage-earning population.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen opposite express approval of the declaration of their leader, but if they had faith in the ability of their leader to carry out their trade policy as thus announced, there would be no necessity for this tariff board. When one thinks of the difficulty in framing a tariff in this country that will suit the producer, the consumer, and the wage-earner and remembers that the Prime Minister stated, in announcing his tariff policy, that he and his party could accomplish this difficult task, it is strange that he and his party, having the open sesame to tariff-making on the universally harmonious plan, should seek the intervention of a Tariff Commission or any other body. In his Halifax platform the right hon. gentleman stated that it was his policy, in framing a tariff, to protect the producer, to protect the consumer and to protect the labourer as well, a task which passes the power of any man on earth. Was this declaration of policy on the part of the Prime Minister a wilful deception, or has the boastfulness which characterized hon. gentlemen opposite in the days when they were in opposition been tempered somewhat by the responsibilities of office? Now, the Bill before the House seeks to establish a Tariff Commission to which are assigned certain duties, which are directly or indirectly related to tariff-making. I do not propose to discuss the various clauses of the Bill, as they have already been fully and fairly dealt with by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I desire merely to discuss the principle involved in the Bill, namely, the appointment of a commission to assist in the matter of taxation by tariffs and tariffs for protection.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Before recess I was laying down the proposition that there was a principle involved in this Bill. I was submitting that the appointment of this Tariff Commission involved a departure from a well established principle in our constitution and in this respect differs from the appointment of any other commission. The right hon. the First Minister this afternoon argued that as parliament had appointed in the past many other commissions and no objection was raised, there should be no objection to the appointment of a Tariff Commission. If the right hon. gentleman is really of the opinion that this Tariff Commission differs in no essential from others, I can quite understand why he should treat the whole subject so cavalierly. But if there be a distinction between the proposed Tariff Commission and other commissions, I cannot understand the position taken by my right hon. friend. I would ask the government, why in this particular instance, it has departed from the customary practice of administering public affairs

through the civil service under responsible ministers. Why in the matter of taxation and revenue, interject between the people and the government, between the legislative and executive powers of this parliament, a new body to be called the Tariff Commission? If the Department of Finance is in need of additional expert aid for the transaction of the business of that department, no hon. member of this House will object to any money vote which will give that department the number of competent men required to carry on its business. That would be a much better method than the one proposed, because it would ensure permanency, for, of course, the appointments to the civil service are much more permanent than the appointments of commissioners. Why single out a number of gentlemen as members of this Tariff Commission and give each a salary almost equal to that of a minister, for the performance of duties which can be performed just as well and possibly better by clerks in the civil service? So far as I am concerned, I would willingly vote for the appointment of such extra officials in the Departments of Finance, Trade and Commerce and Customs as would give the minister in each of these departments an efficient staff upon which he could rely, especially in matters connected with the tariff. That has been my view for years, and while I may not have given public utterance to it, I have expressed it to some members of the late government, political friends of my own. If that were done, we would have a civil service staff working under the direction of the minister of the day, no matter to what political party he might belong. The framing of a tariff for Canada is a matter of policy which, under constitutional and parliamentary practice, rests with the government. No money or taxation measure —and the tariff is eminently such a measure—can originate with parliament or any member of it. The government may accept a suggestion from parliament or from any member of parliament, but in acting on that suggestion it does so solely on its own responsibility, because it is the government of the day which is primarily responsible in matters of taxation. Not even the Senate can interfere in such matters. The isolation of the government in this respect, its undivided responsibility, is well illustrated by the fact that when the Finance Minister brings down a tariff Bill the moment he submits to parliament the first item of that tariff, the whole Bill goes into effect from coast to coast. Therefore, the responsible minister in these matters—the Finance Minister —should not ask for the passage of a statute that will create a body to deal with the tariff and thus divide his responsibility. When he does so, he is violating the constitutional practice of this country. Again a Tariff Commission is entitled to no more consideration than parliament or any one member of parliament, yet should this Bill go into effect and this Tariff Commission be created, the members of that commission will, in the making of tariffs, have more to say than any member of parliament. In case it be argued that the distinction I make between assistance given to the Finance Minister by a Tariff Commission and that given to him by a staff in the civil service, is a very fine distinction, let me point out that to any one who keep in view the constitutional principle, and the constitutional practice of this country, the distinction will be obvious. In this connection it may not perhaps be amiss for me to give the view to be found in Bourinot's 'Parliamentary Procedure' regarding the imposition of taxation. These will be found on page 594:

> It is now a fixed principle of constitutional government that all propositions for the imposition of taxes should emanate from the minister. In the session of 1871 Mr. Speaker Cockburn recommended to the House the adoption of the British practice in this particular, and the Commons have ever since acquiesced in its wisdom. As a consequence no private member is now permitted to propose a Dominion tax upon the people; it must proceed from a minister of the Crown, or be in some other form declared to be necessary for the public service. A motion or a Bill of such a character should properly be introduced by a minister of the Crown.

Now, the Minister of Finance in proposing the appointment of a Tariff Commission, is dividing the responsibility which constitutional parliamentary practice has thrown on him in this respect.

Therefore, I venture to postulate the statement that no member of parliament originates a tariff or taxation Bill. He has the power to recommend changes, but, before it can become effective, it must be recognized by the ministry of the day, and, in the last analysis, by the Minister of Finance. The Tariff Commission to be appointed under this Bill will be given power to investigate facts and report. It is to be appointed, apparently, upon the assumption that taxation by tariffs with the feature of protection, is constitutional in this country. If the Bill means anything, it means that the principle of protection—and I am not arguing against it now—is constitutional in this country, or we seek to make it so by placing that principle in a statute. It is placed in such a position that if any of the members of the commission have views upon the tariff, they can practically compel recognition of them by parliament. And

this is only natural because the Bill by which it is proposed to appoint this commission practically places the members of the commission on a parity or at least in partnership with the Minister of Finance. And I say the commission in this respect is given a prominence which the constitution of this country never contemplated, and our parliamentary practice does not warrant. The members of the commission are given a rank above the members of parliament.

It has been urged, and it will be urged again, that because there was created in the United States a so called tariff board, that conditions are analogous in both countries, and hon. gentlemen opposite will urge, as I think the Minister of Finance did, that because the United States appointed a tariff board or commission, therefore, this parliament should appoint one. Let us review what has been done in the United States in this respect, and let us see if the methods of tariff making in Canada and the United States are analogous; let us inquire if, even though there were, in the United States a Tariff Commission or a tariff board, we should be warranted in appointing one in Canada. In the United States there is no such thing as a Tariff Commission, and there may never be —likely there never will be. Strictly speaking, there is no tariff board. In the United States tariff of 1909 there appeared for the first time the principle of a maximum and a minimum tariff, and section 2 of that Tariff Act places upon the President the authority to determine against which countries, if any, the maximum and the minimum tariffs should apply, and when the maximum tariff, if applied, shall be withdrawn. The same Tariff Bill provided by a money vote the means by which the President could secure such information as would be necessary to determine when he should apply the maximum tariff against any country, and when he should withdraw it. Now that is all there is in the nature of tariff board or tariff commission legislation in the United States; and, strictly speaking I say there is not even a tariff board in that country. There is only given the power under the annual Appropriation Act, to the president to employ the services of any persons whom he may select to assist him in determining when and against which countries he shall apply the maximum or the minimum tariff.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If that be so, how is it that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) accused the Minister of Finance of following 'cheap Yankee methods'?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I can see a very clear and obvious distinction. I can also quite understand and justify the statement that the hon. member for South Wellington made. I do not blame the Minister of Finance for denominating the body in the United States as a tariff board. It is so called even in Congress. But what I say is, that, strictly speaking, there is no tariff board constituted by Congress. Let me read a provision of the Tariff Bill of 1909. Section 2 thereof was the section which for the first time enabled the United States government to establish a maximum and a minimum tariff. It provides:

> To enable the president to secure information to assist him in the discharge of the duties imposed on him by section two of the Act and the officers of the government in administering the customs laws, including such investigations of the cost of production of commodities, covering cost of material, fabrication, and every other element of such cost of production, as are authorized by said Act, and including the employment of such persons as may be required for those purposes.

Again, in the Appropriation Acts for the year ending June, 1912, there was a vote of $225,000 to enable the President to secure information to assist him in discharging the duties imposed upon him by section 2 of the Tariff Bill of 1909, which I have just read. So it will be seen that the continuation of the United States Tariff Board so-called is only possible by the continuance of the vote wherewith to pay the same, in the Appropriation Bill. Under the constitution of the United States the President is authorized to recommend changes in the tariff. It is only natural, it seems to me, that he should require expert assistance in first deciding against which countries the maximum tariff might be levied and also in collecting for him such information as will enable him to send to Congress, whenever he sees fit, any recommendation as to the tariff. Now, tariff commission Bills, as I have said, have frequently been introduced in the American Congress, but so far, none have passed. What they have is an advisory body to the President upon tariff matters. Strictly speaking, that is what it is and nothing more.

But, I will proceed now to show that, even if they had a tariff commission in the United States, and I can conceive of there being reasons for the appointment of a Tariff Commission or board in the United States, that it does not follow that we should have one in Canada, because our conditions are absolutely different, and constitutionally, we are upon a different basis. Now, let us see who it is that originates and enacts Tariff Bills and taxation in the United States. Let us see if there is any analogy whatever between the United States and Canada in respect to tariff making and taxation. Under the Constitution of the United States, there is imposed upon Congress the obligation of making the tariff of that country and raising the revenues necessary for the public service. That

obligation primarily rests upon the House of Representatives. It is the duty of the president to approve all Tariff Bills and in addition he has the power to recommend tariff changes.

Under the constitution of that country the making of a tariff is placed upon Congress. In the House of Representatives there is a Ways and Means Committee which originates Tariff Bills. In the Senate there is a Finance Committee which passes on Tariff Bills, originating in the House of Representatives through the Ways and Means Committee. If they cannot agree, the same is ultimately referred to a committee of conference. Congress, therefore, is charged with the task of making tariffs, and the President and his executive are absolutely powerless to intervene. The only power of the President is that of approval, and the power of recommending changes.

Now, let us look at conditions in Canada. Here the executive, not parliament or any branch of it, must originate all tariff measures, and while in theory parliament passes the Bill, yet in practice parliament must accept the measure as presented by the government, or in other words, as presented to parliament by the Finance Minister. Thus we have under our system with respect to tariff matters individual ministerial responsibility. As compared with the United States the one is directly contrary to the other. Now, one can see some reasons for the appointment of a Tariff Commission in the United States, but I confess I fail to see any strong logical, cogent reason for the appointment of a similar body in this country. In the United States, as I have said, the Congressional committees make the tariff. They have not the aid of a civil service, there is no responsible minister. There the Senate is not analogous to our Senate; there the party system works out differently. The dominant party in one House of Congress as represented by the President may not be the dominant party in both Houses of Congress, or it may be dominant in one branch and not in the other, as we find it to-day, where the Democratic party is dominant in the House of Representatives, but in a minority, I think, in the Senate. I could conceive the value of a tariff commission, if the Canadian House of Commons and Senate were obliged under our constitution to frame Tariff Bills, which would be analogous to the position of affairs in the United States.

Now, let us proceed further with the practice of tariff making in the United States. The first Tariff Commission ever proposed in the United States was by Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, in the year 1908, when he introduced a Tariff Commission Bill. I think he was the first person to suggest the idea of a Tariff Commission, either in the United States or Canada; and the occasion of the suggestion was during a joint debate on the tariff between Senator Beveridge and Wm. Jennings Bryan, some time previous to 1908. In presenting this measure to the Senate, Senator Beveridge urged many reasons in support of it, to some of which I wish to refer. I wish also to show that the conditions which he urged upon Congress so strongly in support of his measure do not obtain in this country.

In introducing his Bill in the Senate he urged very strongly as a reason, that the Congressional Committees were unable to accomplish the task properly, owing to the length of time required and owing to their many other duties. For instance, he stated that the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives which framed the Dingley Bill were in session nearly four months; the Committee of Finance in the Senate took this Bill into consideration for six weeks. The Committee on Ways and Means that framed the McKinley Bill occupied nearly five months, while the Senate Finance Committee had it under consideration two months. The Wilson Tariff Bill of 1893 was under consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means for over four months, and in turn this Bill was under consideration by the Finance Committee of the Senate for about three months. Senator Beveridge urged as a reason for the constitution of a Tariff Commission the fact that it was unfair to impose such a serious task upon the Congressional Committees, and even went so far as to say that many prominent members of such committees, suffered irreparable injury to their health by reason of their attention to such duties. He also pointed out that many of the members of these two committees were members also of other important committees.

He also showed the divergent views of the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee of the Senate, as to what should be the tariff rate on certain commodities, and he showed they greatly differed, though finally adjusted in conference, which was doubtless by way of compromises. Sometimes the difference in rates upon any given item fixed by the committees of each House amounted to 150 per cent. They frequently differed in classifications, perhaps the most important part of a tariff and which customs officials should be better prepared to deal with than any Tariff Commission. Sometimes the House fixed specific duties, the Senate ad valorem duties. Sometimes the House and the Senate put articles on the free list, and the Conference Committee put heavy duties on these very articles. Sometimes the Conference Committee disregard-

ed the tariff rates of both the Senate and House and fixed different duties, and on a different basis; and sometimes the whole Tariff Bill as prepared by the House and Senate Committees was changed very much by the Conference Committee in a session of even a day or so.

It is clear, therefore, to everybody that the methods of preparing tariffs in the United States and in Canada are absolutely different; and while one might reach the conclusion that a Tariff Commission was essential in the United States, I fail to see how any person can reach that conclusion in Canada, at least arguing by way of analogy.

There is this to be remembered further that in the United States there is no minister responsible for the making of the tariff; it is made really by congressional committees and these congressional committees have not the advantage, or the possibility of the advantage, of the assistance of a trained civil service such as we have in this country, and such as they have in Great Britain. In Canada, it would be a simple matter to enlarge the service in the Customs, Trade and Commerce, and Finance Departments, gradually as time and circumstances demanded, and gather into these departments men just as competent as the men who will be appointed on the Tariff Commission, in the gathering of data of one kind or another, to assist the ministers from time to time in determining whether representations made for an increase of tariffs by producers, or representations for a diminution of tariffs by consumers, should be granted and to what degree. As many hon. gentlemen are aware the chairman of the United States tariff board so called, is Henry C. Emery, and I have in my hand an address which he delivered in December, 1910, before the Association of Commerce, at Chicago, which address, I presume, has been read by a great many members of the House, and which, at all events, is available to any person in the library. He deals with the methods of tariff making in Europe and the United States, and the European methods differ very little if anything in principle, from the methods obtaining in this country. I am going to ask the House to listen to me for a few moments, while I read a few excerpts from this address in which he points out the efforts at tariff making in European countries and which he uses as a justification for the appointment of a Tariff Commission in the United States. He makes the statement that there may be some criticism in the United States to the effect that their Tariff Commission operations are on altogether too elaborate a scale, and he says:

In no country of Europe, for example, has the method of investigation of industrial conditions as affected by the tariff included such extended examination of costs of production by trained experts in the government employ as is contemplated by the Tariff Board. Such special statistical work as has been done abroad in connection with tariff investigations has been rather in the way of an industrial census similar in character to the census of manufactures undertaken by our Census Bureau. Neither the government, nor any special board or commission co-operating with it, has employed a staff of accountants or industrial experts to examine the books of manufacturing concerns and make independent reports. The method has rather been in the nature of frequent and friendly conferences with all the parties interested, while the interests of the consumer have been represented by the government officials themselves. These conferences are on the whole of an informal nature. That is, there is no formal governmental body which holds appointed hearings, and there is no publication of the testimony given. The officials concerned confer informally with the different parties interested, sometimes at their offices and sometimes by means of personal visits at different manufacturing plants.

There are, however, important differences in the two methods. In the first place, the government officials in these two countries are not legislators concerned with many affairs, but are trained experts of permanent tenure, who devote themselves solely to this question and have years of experience behind them. Second, they are free both from the pressure of local business interests and from any political bias. They do not have to consider the effect of their conclusions either upon their own tenure of office or upon the success of any particular party. Third, the hearings are not crowded into the space of a few months, so that an overworked committee is not swamped with material which it can not fully comprehend. The work goes on, day in and day out, over a period of years, and is conducted continuously by the same men who have received and carefully considered every complaint regarding the tariff which has been made from any source during the whole time of its operation.

This is a justification of my argument that any assistance which the responsible minister of the day requires in tariff making should come from the civil service where we can expect permanency in the appointment and from whom we can expect a longer and more varied experience in all matters in connection with the tariff of this country. The following paragraph which I am going to read refers to Germany and I wish to emphasize the fact that there they have not, and have not had, a commission in the sense contemplated by this Bill and that whatever they have had in this direction as an aid to governments in tariff making, corresponds more largely to the practice obtaining in the past in this country when Tariff Commissions composed of ministers of the Crown made an itineracy of the country, and there and there heard representations from any person who wished to be heard. He said:

In some cases the expert government officials in the ministries have been materially assisted by certain official or semi-official bodies, but none of these have performed the services which have been expected of a tariff board or a tariff commission in this country. In Germany, for instance, there is a large committee which, in the preparation of the last tariff was very active at a certain stage of the proceedings, and this is sometimes referred to in this country as the German Tariff Commission. This body, however, which numbered thirty-six, was primarily an advisory body made up of the great leaders in the industrial world. Its members were men of large affairs working simply on a trifling allowance per diem and devoting most of their time to their own personal business. Their assistance to the government was undoubtedly great, but this assistance was due to their long experience as business men and their consequent competence for taking testimony, rather than from any special investigation which they undertook.

I submit to the House that the conditions which Mr. Emery speaks of in Germany can better be obtained by having civil service aids to the responsible minister rather than by the appointment of a tariff commission whose appoinment can only continue as long as the government appointing them lives. He goes on to say:

In the same way, in Australia, the government has received much assistance from a committee of the Associated Chambers of Commerce which has attempted to straighten out beforehand the conflicting demands of the producing interests and present to the government a scheme which was already supported by the business world. This body, however, represents primarily the producing interests, and is in no sense the determining factor in tariff making. In both of these countries the real responsibility for understanding the nature of the tariff and its workings is placed in the hands of the officials of the different ministries, as already described.

And that is the condition which, I say, I would like to see obtain in this country.

Mr. NICKLE. Has the hon. gentleman any objection to reading the next paragraph of Mr. Emery's address?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The next paragraph, requested to be read by the hon. gentleman is this, and I thank my hon. friend for having called my attention to it because I intended to read it.

The situation here, however, is very different from that in countries like Germany and Australia. Such investigations are necessarily a part of the work of a tariff board in this country. The chief reason for this may be roughly expressed in the phrase 'making up for lost time.'

They certainly have lost time in the United States in respect to tariff making, and, where tariffs are made by congressional political committees, unsatisfactory conditions must prevail.

If there were any board or group of government officials in existence who had devoted themselves solely to the question of the industrial effects of the tariff for a period of twenty years, as is the case in Germany and Australia, such investigation would probably not be necessary.

In Canada we have a civil service staff, not large it is true, some of whom have been devoting their attention since their appointment, to tariff matters, and I repeat the suggestion that there is a better alternative to be found in the appointment of sufficient civil service officials, as is the practice in Europe, and which Mr. Emery commends.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Emery does not say that; finish the quotation.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) reading:

Such officials would already be sufficiently familiar in a personal and practical way with the facts regarding costs and competition in the different industries to be able to report or advise.

Why should not the civil service in Canada do that? In the United States there is no such thing as a civil service so far as tariff making is concerned, and even the President of the United States, while having power to recommend changes in the tariff, is absolutely powerless to initiate any such change.

No such body exists in the United States, and the effort promptly to put the question of revision on a sound basis, therefore, involves a much more extensive labour of investigation than would otherwise be necessary.

Now, you have only to look at the tariff of the United States to see its obvious defects as to classification and rates. The Canadian tariff, as far as classification is concerned, is fairly suitable, although open to improvement, and while the protective principle obtains in this country, it can be safely said that neither party has gone protection mad, as in the case of the United States, and, therefore, in tariff revision, and tariff making, we are not in the same position as they are. I suggest to the Finance Minister, as I suggested three years ago to Mr. Fielding, when Minister of Finance, that there should be a branch of the civil service to assist the Minis- of Finance in tariff making. I say that would be better than the appointment of a Tariff Commission. The Departments of Finance, of Trade and Commerce, and of Customs, are closely connected with the matter of tariff making, and I would suggest, as an alternative to this Tariff Commission, the selection of

proper officials from these three departments, organizing them if you will, under the name of a tariff bureau, and adding to their duties, if you feel so disposed, the obtaining of trade statistics which is very much needed in this country. The advantage of this would be that the members of this staff or bureau would be members of the civil service; they would be permanently in office, they would be unknown to the public other than civil servants, and according to the true constitutional practice, the minister alone would be responsible to parliament. I suppose it is fair to assume that directly or indirectly protection obtains in the tariffs of this country. It has been said by some, and indeed by no less a person that the Prime Minister himself, that a tariff can be scientifically framed by a Tariff Commission, and that this Tariff Commission would take the tariff out of politics. But, I was pleased to hear the Minister of Finance say to-day that there was no such thing as taking the tariff out of politics, and that it was impossible to give a scientific tariff. It is beyond human ingenuity for a Tariff Commission, or for any other body, to draft a Tariff Bill covering whole ranges of industry, which will be free of all inequalities and anomalies. Such a thing as scientific tariff making, where the protective principle is present, is an absolute absurdity. I am surprised that any hon. member of this House, especially the right hon. the Prime Minister, should believe that such a thing as scientific tariff making is possible.

To determine with scientific accuracy what is raw product, is an impossibility in a tariff in which the protective feature obtains. In Canadian trade the manufactured product of one industry is the raw material of another. The man who weaves the yarn does not spin it; the tailor begins with cloth, but does not make it, the shoemaker begins with manufactured leather, but rarely, if ever, makes it; the foundryman who uses pig-iron does not make pig-iron; the automobile manufacturer uses a great variety of materials, but manufactures practically nothing among all the articles which when assembled constitute an automobile. When hon. gentlemen talk about a scientific tariff, they are attaching to the word 'scientific' an improper meaning, because science loves truth, and the word 'scientific' in this case is not a token of that which is true. In the last analysis protective tariffs are not determined with scientific accuracy; it is impossible that they can be. The question of tariffs, protective tariffs, is largely a case of might. Local considerations, and the weight of influence brought by sections of the country and by various classes of producers are always more apparent in tariff-making than the influence of scientific or economic truths. At the best tariff-making is but rough approximations. From the protective standpoint the test is the force of foreign competition in the domestic market; and when you once ascertain the selling price of a foreign article in the country of production and the price of the same article in the Canadian market, that is, cost, insurance and freight, you have substantially the crux of the whole question. These facts are obtainable without difficulty and without an expensive instrument like a formal commission. They can be obtained as readily by the Minister of Finance with an efficient civil service staff as by any tariff board. Again, everybody knows that there are so many conflicting and fluctuating conditions in trade that it is impossible to draw any conclusion from the facts obtained one year which would be helpful to a minister framing a tariff containing the principle of protection, the following year. In framing a revenue tariff you need no experts and no tariff commission. In one country in certain trades the hours of labour are longer than in others. In our country you will find one manufacturer so efficient that he can get along without a tariff, while perhaps right alongside of him is another producer so inefficient in his methods that no amount of protection could make an intelligent or profitable producer of him. Then you have changing transportation rates, changing transportation routes, wars and rumours of wars, monetary and business crises, changes of foreign tariffs, changes in rates of interest, the effect of climatic changes, all to consider; and all these conditions would in a short time render futile any investigation of facts produced at the cost of a great expenditure of time, of work and of money by any commission. After all, the reports of such a commission cannot be more than rough approximations, which could be obtained just as well by other methods. I have already said that the appointment of a tariff commission by parliament is a statutory and legal recognition of the protective theory, and whether we are free traders, revenue tariff men or protectionists, we should not enact any statute implying that that principle should obtain in our tariff; but that is the effect of the appointment of a tariff commission by statute. During the discussion of the Tariff Board Bill in the United States Congress, one member of the House of Representatives said that he supported the Bill because it contained the principles of the bulwark of protection, and I am sure that a great many of the hon. gentlemen opposite are going to support this Bill because they feel that the Tariff Commission will be the bulwark of protection in this

country. Another gentleman in the United States House of Representatives said that if he believed in only a revenue tariff he would not support the Tariff Board Bill. The present Prime Minister, during the last election campaign, strongly declared himself on several occasions in favour of protection, and followed with the statement that the late government had revised the tariff without ascertaining all the conditions surrounding the tariff, and that when his party came into power he would appoint a commission to revise the tariff along business lines. Now, I submit that these several statements of the Prime Minister taken together can only mean that the right hon. gentleman believed that the commission to be created would assist in giving the protective feature to the tariff of this country. They could mean nothing else. I do not imagine that he would complain that the late government had increased the tariff in any respect. I assume that if he was complaining of anything, it was of reductions in the tariff which he said were made without proper ascertainment of the facts. Now, I do not say that I object to a tariff, even a protective tariff. I am not arguing one way or the other; but I do say that if we are going to have a tariff with the protective feature in this country, let parliament say so.

Every member of parliament should at least have as much to say regarding that as the members of a Tariff Commission. The Minister of Finance this afternoon sought to buttress his argument in favour of the commission by saying that we received $74,000,000 of our revenue from customs. No doubt he wanted us to draw the conclusion that a Tariff Commismission was justifiable because so much of our revenue came from the tariff. Much of our customs revenue comes from imported articles, the duties on which are intended to protect, but protected items give the minimum of revenue, otherwise the duties would not be protective. Therefore, the commission will not have much to do with items bearing only revenue rates, and from the standpoint of revenue they will not have much to do with protected items, because these items are not great revenue producers. It is not intended that they should have much to do with the matter of revenue, but that their work would be devoted mainly to the making of tariffs containing the principle of protection. Protection would, therefore, be the main reason for the existence of this commission. I do not see how any other conclusion can be drawn. In all matters respecting tariff taxation, divergent views obtain, and if we are going to apply the protective theory, it ought to be applied solely on the responsibility of the government and the minister in charge of the Finance Department. If protection be then applied, we can take it as the expression of the wishes of the people through their responsible ministers. That tariff may have inaccuracies and inequalities, but these would be the fault of the system, and for them the government would be responsible. That method would be true to constitutional practice.

Again it may be urged that the appointment of a Tariff Commission cannot be distinguished from commissions already appointed. That was argued by the right hon. the First Minister this afternoon. In fact that was the only answer he gave to the speech of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). In the first place let me say that this parliament has never delegated to any commission the power of directing taxation. I know of no instance in the history of the country when that was done. We have appointed commissions to execute the will of parliament expressed regarding any undertaking, such as the National Transcontinental railway. Before the Transcontinental Commission was appointed, parliament had expressed its policy, and the commission was only appointed to carry out that policy. Reference was made this afternoon to the Railway Commission, but that is not analogous to the Tariff Commission. The Railway Commission is a court, appointed under the Railway Act. Parliament defined the jurisdiction and powers of that commission, and settled its duties and powers before making the appointment. We have appointed commissions in the past and no doubt will appoint others in the future, but it is not the practice in any British country to appoint a commission for the purpose of determining a policy or a principle. In that respect the Tariff Commission differs from any other we have ever had. I would refer hon. gentlemen to Todd, the well known authority on parliamentary procedure. On page 432 of Todds 'Parliamentary Procedure,' I find the following:

> Preliminary inquiries by a royal commission are of inestimable service to the working of parliamentary government. Besides peculiar facilities for ascertaining facts, they frequently bring to light a mass of information upon the subject in hand which could be obtained in no other way, and the report of an able and impartial commission is often of the highest value in the instruction and enlightenment of the public mind. The questions of pauperism and poor law administration, of crime and penal administration, of pestilence and sanitary legislation, and of the evils attendant on excessive manufacturing labour, are conspicuous instances of the effects of commissions of inquiry in reversing every main principle, and almost every assumed chief elementary fact, on which the general public, parliamentary committees,

and leading statesmen, were prepared to legislate.

Again on page 434 Todd says:

Since the establishment of ministerial responsibility, commissions have become a recognized part of our governmental machinery, and it is now freely admitted that when confined to matters of legitimate inquiry they serve a most useful and beneficial purpose.

To all of which I agree. Every one will agree with this. It is proven by the fact that in the past parliament has unanimously concurred in the appointment of commissions for several purposes. But there is a qualification. On pages 434, and 435, Todd says:

But it would be unconstitutional to refer to a royal commisson 'subjects which are connected with the elementary duties of the executive government and with its relations to parliament'; or, to investigate a grievance which arises out of a particular decision of parliament, on a given question; or, to appoint a commission with a view to evade the responsibility of ministers in any matter; or, to do the work of existing departments of state, which possess all needful facilities for obtaining information upon questions of detail, and which are directly responsible to parliament.

Then on page 435 I find the following:

A commission of inquiry should be limited in its operations to obtaining information, and suggesting the points to which it might be expedient that legislative or executive action should be directed. No commission should be invited to 'enter upon any question of policy,' lest it should trench upon the proper limits of ministerial responsibility, and upon ground which belongs to parliament.

I say it is a weakness of the Tariff Bill now before the House that it trenches upon the proper limit of ministerial responsibility and upon gounds which belong entirely to parliament.

There are one or two instances in the parliamentary experience of England to which I wish to refer very briefly. In 1865 Mr. Roebuck, a member of the British House of Commons, asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if it was the intention of the government to institute an inquiry into the English railway system with a view to future legislation should such legislation appear practicable and advantageous. I cannot give to the House in full the statement made by the Chancellor, but I will endeavour to give a few quotations in order to fortify the position I have taken:

It is not their intention to take any step which could under any circumstances at all compromise or commit either ourselves or parliament with reference to any legislation upon a matter of this vast importance. . . .

Therefore, I beg that it may be understood that it is not the intention of Her Majesty's

government to advise the appointment of any commission that shall enter upon any question of policy. We are of opinion that if we were to do so we should be, if not prejudging the opinion of parliament, in some degree by extraneous instruments trespassing upon ground which belongs to parliament. . . We, of course, have taken into our consideration the question whether it would be desirable that this inquiry should be conducted by a Royal Commission or by a committee of this House. If we were going to inquire into any matter of policy it would, undoubtedly, be far more useful to institute that inquiry by means of a committee of this House than by means of a commission.

Again, it was once moved in the English House of Commons that an address be presented to Her Majesty that she would be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission directing investigation of the causes which led to the late severe and protracted pressure in the money market. Speaking to that motion Sir Stafford Northcote expressed the principle in opposition to the appointment of a commission which I have urged in connection with the tariff commission. He said in referring to the member who had moved the resolution:

I am bound to ask the hon. member for Stockport what exactly are the functions which he thinks this Royal Commission of inquiry should undertake. Is it to be a commission which is to inquire into facts, or is it to be a commission which is to inquire into principles? I think he will see that there is very great difference between the two. If we are to investigate a number of facts, requiring a great amount of time to ascertain and bring together, undoubtedly a Royal Commission may be, and very often is, a very convenient instrument for the purpose; but if we are to discuss principles, and if we are to investigate the principles upon which our legislation is founded, I do not myself think that a Royal Commission ought to be considered a proper substitute either for the action of the government or for that of parliament. If you were to appoint a Royal Commission in this case, for the purpose of investigating all the principles of legislation which affect our currency and banking, the first question that would arise would be, how is that commission to be constituted? We know perfectly well that different opinions prevail, and are ably maintained by the different schools of opinion, on all the questions that bear upon this subject; and if a Royal Commission were to be appointed it would be necessary to place upon that commission men in whose skill and intelligence, and in whose experience also, the country would have confidence . . . We also know that when it should become our duty to make a selection of the gentlemen—few in number as they necessarily would be—to be placed in that important position, we could not select gentlemen who were merely known to be gentlemen of intelligence and experience, but we should have to select gentlemen whose views upon these questions were perfectly well known and

familiar to the world, and probably it would not be very difficult, as soon as they were named, and the object of the commission made public, to foresee what the general verdict of the commission would be upon some of the main principles which would have to be brought before it. If that were the case, at once the authority of a commission, and therefore the use of a commission as far as the investigation of principles is concerned, would be at an end. Those who were satisfied with the opinions of the gentlemen who might be the majority in the commission would, of course, anticipate the proceedings, and foresee that their opinions would be well brought forward, well argued, and very ably, no doubt, elaborated; while on the other hand, the minority, who would not be satisfied would say, 'Because you have constituted the commission on this or the other basis, you have failed to obtain a fair verdict. We dispute, and have always disputed, the doctrines of those gentlemen forming the majority of the commission, and we also dispute the conclusion at which they have arrived.' This being the case we should not be much forwarder when we got the report of the Royal Commission than we are at the present time. . . .

And again:

It is obvious, however, that when you come to investigate causes it is not sufficient merely to collect facts, but to collect them with a view to certain conclusions, and select them upon some kind of principles. When you investigate facts, the question of causes necessarily arises.

Now, I submit that the purpose and object of a Tariff Commission finds no analogy in our political history. We have never, so far as I can ascertain, appointed a commission to determine principles of trade, tariff and taxation, upon which, in all countries of the world and in all ages divergent views do and will obtain. Let us adhere to constitutional practice. It is no answer to say that the commission is granted no legislative power; it will unconsciously and indirectly legislate. I say that in one form or another the commission will legislate or cause parliament to legislate in the direction of the conclusions and upon the facts which they present to the ministers. They are given power to supply facts, to report conclusions upon the propriety and extent of a tariff which contains the protective features. I cannot see how hon. gentlemen opposite can deny that this is the object of the Tariff Commission. If this be not the object, I say the Tariff Commission has no duty to perform. They would not be asked to investigate facts and report upon them if free trade obtained in this country or if our tariff were based upon revenue needs. I say, this is a question of policy, and, therefore, let the people, through a responsible minister make the tariff; do not let a commission appointed by parliament make it. The manufacturers of pig iron, according to the press, are to receive a bounty pending a report from the Tariff Commission. I do not know whether that is true or not, nor am I saying whether I am for or against a bounty on pig iron, but even before the creation of the commission, according to this report we find the government absolving itself of its functions and delegating them to a commission yet to be appointed. That is clear and forcible evidence of the influence which the commission will exercise, and it is that influence to which I object. To-day, we find that the government cannot wait for the Tariff Commission; they are going to forestall the commission.

They are going to give advantage to a certain industry, which may be right or may be wrong, without waiting for this great power which we are seeking to create to-night. I suppose that to-morrow, or in the near future, we will hear the government saying to other interests which will appear before them asking for higher tariffs, that they cannot act until they hear from the Tariff Commission; and soon it will come that you cannot tell who in this country will be making tariffs, the government or the commission, it will be absolutely impossible to tell. They will be on a parity, or they will be in partnership. I am sure that this country would prefer that we remain true to the constitutional practice and parliamentary procedure of the past, and have no special body who will stand between the government and parliament in the making of tariffs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Bill because the creation of a Tariff Commission with power to investigate and report, must ultimately mean the assumption, partially or wholly, of the power of tariff making by such a commission, or at least we will find a division of responsibility between the commission and the government. I object to this Bill because it is a subversion of the well established principle of ministerial responsibility so long obtaining in this country, particularly in reference to the question of taxation and of revenue. I object to this Bill because it purports to lend and does lend parliamentary sanction to the economic doctrine of protection. I object to it because the proposed commission cannot accomplish what is expected of it in the direction of scientific tariff making. I object to it because the tariff commission cannot take the tariff out of politics, it will put it further into politics. I object to it because any merits which the Tariff Commission Bill possesses, and upon its face it does possess some, are obtainable by the ordinary methods now employed in the administration of the public service by

the civil service under ministerial responsibility. We may have protection in the tariff of this country to-day, we may have it in the future. I am not now arguing for or against the protective feature in our tariff; but I do say that if it is to be found in our tariff, it is better that a responsible minister and a responsible ministry place it there, and that subsequently, if the people of this country wish it to become law, it be affirmed by the parliament of this country.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal). We have listened, Mr. Speaker, for upwards of two hours to one of the best exemplifications I think I have ever seen since I entered this House, of the good old fable of the wolf and the lamb. After endeavouring to criticise everything that was not in the Bill, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has finally ended by saying that if all these things that he criticises were not there, he could still read into the Bill sinister intentions, and that these sinister intentions alone were reason enough why the Bill should be rejected. Now, I propose to take half an hour in dealing with what is in the Bill. In the first place, let me say that I think if there is anything that has been demonstrated beyond peradventure in the recent general elections, it is that the majority of the people of Canada to-day are still believers in the National Policy that has been in force for many years. The majority of the people to-day, within reasonable limits, are willing that there should be built up and established throughout Canada diversified industries that will give employment to our people; and they are willing, even at the risk of a slight increase of price to the consumer in some instances, that there should be a moderate protective tariff. Now, the tariff we have to-day is partially- protective and partially non-protective. Hitherto we have made our tariffs in a rough and ready sort of way, by rule of thumb, so to speak, and if one looks down the category of the various items he will see that it is very much like a wavy line. I was pleased to hear the admission from the junior member for Halifax, of the fact that his experience for the last few years has gone to prove that it was 'might' that made the tariff. That that admission should be made by one who was so close to the late government, certainly shows what has been their experience in connection therewith. I think if there is anything that this Bill proposes to do, it is to reduce at least to a minimum, the influence of 'might' in the making of tariffs. Now, if one glances at the tariff of to-day he will find it is like a wavy line swerving first to one side and then to the other. It shows all through the evidence of pressure on the part, let us say, of certain favoured producers, and then it shows the evidence of pressure in another direction on the part of certain clamorous consumers, who have made themselves felt out of proportion to their numbers. So as you look through the tariff you will find that it lacks uniformity, it is full of inconsistencies and excrescences, and what this Bill proposes is to reduce it to scientific basis.

Now, in Canada I think we have outgrown the stage of this rough method of making tariffs. We have to take this legacy that has come down to us, and we will not perhaps treat that legacy with the respect which the junior member for Halifax might wish that we should use. We intend to take that legacy and to apply new methods, new rules, in order to make the tariff apply with equal benefit to all the people of Canada. Now that Canada has reached her present size we must admit that she has outgrown the old rough-and-ready method of making tariffs, and I think we must be prepared to adopt a scientific process with our tariff, we in parliament must be prepared to apply all along the line, consistently and fearlessly, some definite policy that the majority of this House can stand for. What we ask by this commission is that they will collect for us the facts, not opinions, not theories, but facts, and on those facts we, in the exercise of our reason and judgment, will be able to base a tariff measure which we will not be unprepared to submit to the whole people of Canada.

Now I regard this Bill as a long step in advance. I consider that the government have acted fearlessly and courageously, they have shown initiative in bringing down this measure that the House is called upon to deal with. Furthermore, this Bill fulfils a repeated promise on the part of our chief, and a promise that many of us have made on the platforms of the country from one end to the other. I do not wonder that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) was somewhat surprised that this new government, within four or five months of its creation, should actually set to work to implement the promises that were given to the electorate. That is not the experience of the other side, I admit, but that is what this government is intending to do, and here is the first instalment of the fulfilment of those deliberate promises.

Mr. BUREAU. There are a few more to fulfil, however.

Mr. AMES. They will be fulfilled more rapidly than promises have been in the past 15 years. What is proposed by this legislation is primarily to create an impartial non-partisan commission, and that com-

mission should busy itself in a scientific manner in getting at established facts, then those facts will be submitted to parliament, and upon these facts legislation will be based.

To say that this measure violates constitutional practice is to indulge in one of those sophistries in which these hon. gentlemen often indulge when addressing this House. There is not one privilege that this House at the present time enjoys, not one privilege that the opposition has hitherto enjoyed, that would be infringed upon in the slightest degree by this measure. Do you suppose that we are going to ask the Tariff Commission to prepare our next tariff Bill? Not at all. We do not even intend to ask them to make any recommendation. They are to give us the exact facts with regard to existing conditions, and the ministry will take upon themselves the full responsibility, and the members of this House will take upon themselves the full responsibility which they have to take in the application and use that they make of these facts. This is nothing unusual. We have it in everyday life. A judge sits upon the bench, he wants to know about some technical matter, about a building, perhaps, that has collapsed, what does he do? He names some man who is an expert in building, this man examines the building, and in this way he establishes the facts. Does that in any way impinge upon the dignity of the bench or interfere with the status of the court? By no means, but the judge has the facts placed before him, and upon those facts he gives his judgment.

I am of the opinion that when this measure comes to be understood it will receive the well deserved commendation of all classes throughout Canada. It will, I think, receive the commendation of the producer, of the man who will come to this parliament and ask that he be given a certain degree of protection in the shape of a duty upon that which he has to sell. If he can prove that he is entitled to that protection he will receive it, but if he cannot prove that he is entitled to it he will probably find that the protection which he presently enjoys will be diminished. The only way in which that can be accomplished is by having before us the necessary statement of facts. I want to point out that when we speak of the producer in this country we include the farmer just as much as the man who runs the factory. Almost everybody in this country is a producer, and each man who is a producer will naturally enjoy the benefits that must accrue from this Act. Read the definition at the beginning of the Act. Goods are treated of throughout the whole Act, and what do goods include? They include products of the farm, horses, cattle and other animals, and everything that the farmer produces is just as likely to be subjected to the inquiry of this commission in the interest of the farmer as are the goods which the manufacturers themselves produce. Now, take the consumer. I mean the class of consumers who are broad enough and big enough Canadians to live and let live. I do not mean the class of consumer who insists upon having everything he produces protected, and everything he consumes free. I do not mean that class, they are not in the majority in Canada to-day, and I hope they never will be. But I refer to the consumer who is a big enough and broad enough Canadian to say: I am willing that what I consume shall be, to a slight extent, increased in price in order that there may be built up throughout the length and breadth of Canada diversified industry, and in order that the Canadian people may not be reduced to the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water. It is very much to the advantage of the consumer that he should know whether he is being overcharged in the price he has to pay, and I believe that when the consumer realizes that there is an impartial commission created to investigate such matters on his behalf, and ascertain whether he is overcharged for what he purchases he will say: That is what I want.

It seems to me that this Bill commends itself to the industrial worker as well. He is both producer and consumer. He probably pays a little more for what he consumes, but he is protected in what he produces in the industrial establishments of this country, and as he reads this Bill he will see that it provides a means by which an investigation can be made as to whether he is securing a just and fair proportion of the selling price of that product to which his labour has contributed. That is what he wants to know. He wants to know whether he is getting an adequate proportion of the return which comes from the work of his hands, and he will have an opportunity to ascertain the facts when the provisions of this Bill go into operation. Therefore, he will say: I welcome this measure.

The man who wishes to invest his capital in the industries of Canada, will he not find in the impartial report which this commission will present means of ascertaining whether our Canadian industrial enterprises are upon a sound and permanent basis? If, after he examines the reports, he is convinced, as I am sure he will be convinced, that they are worthy of his confidence, he will invest his money and we will, as a result of the publication of such reports, bring into our country the money which we are so anxious to see invested in our industrial enterprises.

So, it seems to me that it is a good thing for the producer, the consumer, the industrial worker and the investor, and, that being the case, I can defend, and will be glad of the opportunity of defending on any platform in this country, the introduction and passage of the Bill that we now have before us. What we members of this House called upon to pass legislation, want, is to know the real facts and the exact conditions as they exist in Canada before undertaking to deal with the tariff.

If I may be permitted to give advice to the government, I would suggest that, although the Bill does not designate what the qualifications of the commissioners are to be, there are some things that might be avoided in making their appointment. I think it would be a mistake to endeavour to outline in the Bill what class of men should be appointed as commissioners. You would probably limit the choice and I can assure you that to secure men of the calibre that are required, you should limit the choice as little as possible. The whole Dominion of Canada is not too big a place in which to search for the very best men. I would not think it would be advisable that these three commissioners should be representatives of particular interests. Some one may say: We should put a manufacturer on; we should put a farmer on; we should put a transportation man on, but these three, each representing a different interest, would fight their fellows for their own particular industry, or, to avoid a disagreement, would make a compromise which would be satisfactory to none. That is not what we want. We do not want the members of the commission to feel that they are there to represent a particular interest; we want them to feel that they are there to represent the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Nor, do we want technical experts. Sometimes we are told that this must be a board of technical experts. If you commence to name technical experts, you will soon find that you require a very large number of them. If a man is a technical expert in the matter of iron, for instance, he knows very little about woollen or cotton. He way be perfectly familiar with one article and know very little about other commodities. I do not think we want technical experts, men who have spent their whole lives dealing with a particular classification, because we have a great many different classifications and because, as a rule, men who are familiar with some particular article, are not able to take the broad view that is necessary of other businesses besides their own. If I may be permitted to offer advice to the ministers, I would say that they should not necessarily confine their choice to men who have fought and bled for the Conservative party. I think that if there is any man in Canada who is eminently fitted for this position, he should not be rejected by reason of his previous political record. We want the biggest men we can get, but we want men who are not out of sympathy with the policy that the party on this side of the House avowedly stands for. We want men who are not out of sympathy with the idea that protection, reasonably applied, is what Canada needs for her development. Let us have three big, broad-minded Canadians, every one a man of administrative ability, who can organize and arrange the work and prepare the lines of investigation.

We want men of judicial capacity who can hold at arms-length the evidence that is placed before them and can correlate the various facts and put them in their proper place. We want men who can determine and weigh the value of evidence and who can eventually make reports to this House in which the statements made are properly and proportionately set out. Now, salaries such as are mentioned are not much for men of that size and character. You must admit that the salaries of the Cabinet ministers are too small, but the ministers have other honours that come to them, and I would hate to believe that it is the salaries that keep the ministers in their places. But, even the salaries that are mentioned in this Bill are none too large for men of the kind we want. If the government secures the sort of men we want I venture to say that there will not be one of them who will not be called upon to make a financial sacrifice when he enters the service upon these terms. If broad-minded, fair-viewed men are chosen, and if they are given an opportunity to make of this Tariff Commission what it can be made, I am sure they will win the confidence of the country, they will hold the confidence of the country, and they will be only too gladly continued in office by the present opposition, when, in the far distant future, they have an opportunity of doing so.

This Tariff Commission is put under the direction of the Minister of Finance, and that has been in some quarters criticised as inadvisable. Well, it seems to me the most natural and proper provision that could be made. Who else is there that is competent to generally direct the work that may be done by this commission? It will be impossible for them to take up all the schedules of the tariff at once; some one must tell them what work to begin upon; some one must guide them in the direction they are to follow, and it is natural and right they should be under the direction of that man in the

Cabinet who is charged by his fellows to look after the revenues of the country and who will have to introduce and defend any tariff legislation that will be submitted to this House. I sincerely hope that this Tariff Commission may be prompted to take up and continue this work in a systematic and useful manner. I hope the people do not imagine that the moment this board is created they can start an heterogeneous series of representations to the commission. The commission will probably take up the tariff schedule by schedule, and will study them systematically and will send for witnesses when they want them, and when a man is asked to come and give his testimony it will be after the commission have prepared themselves by advance knowledge to receive and properly value what may be told them. And after the tariff has once been carefully gone over and we have a library that will result from it, then that commission will continue to be a permanent commission because rectifications will always be necessary. Conditions are changing in Canada from year to year, and it will be necessary to have a board that will understand the tariff thoroughly and which can receive applications and hear complaints and pass on recommendations if they seem to be desirable.

Coming now to the duties of the commissioners—and I do not propose to take the Bill clause by clause, but simply to make a sort of general sketch of the duties of the commissioners as I see them—it means that the commission is directly charged to make inquiries. To make inquiries into what? to make inquiries as to the facts and conditions as they exist in Canada and elsewhere. Now, from the point of view of the Canadian producer, the Tariff Commission will inquire, first, as to the cost of raw material at the various points where the raw material is turned into manufactured products. The cost of raw material naturally includes the cost of transportation to the place where it is used. Then they will study the cost of creating the raw material into the finished and marketable product. That will naturally include wages, superintendence, overhead charges, the cost of selling, and some times the cost of carrying to the consumer, and it will include a legitimate interest on the money borrowed and a legitimate dividend on the actual money invested. These factors and many others all go into the cost, and it requires a scientific body to ascertain what the costs actually are. Next to that it will be necessary to ascertain what it costs to transport the product from the place where it is manufactured to the place where it is consumed, an expense which usually falls upon the consumer and an expense which it is necessary to know or otherwise we would not be able to ascertain whether the ultimate selling price was just and proper. Finally, as respects the producer, we have the right to know, and we intend to find out, just what the labour conditions are throughout Canada. I think we desire here in Canada to maintain a standard of living for our industrial workers that is in keeping with our Canadian civilization. The nations which compete with us so frequently for our home markets do not have the same standard of living as we do, and we do not wish to see our workingmen reduced to the condition of the workingmen in these countries. We therefore wish to know what it costs the workingman in Canada to live as he ought to live, what wages he is making in Canada and whether he is getting a fair share in the selling price of the manufactured article. Those things we ought to and shall know if this commission fulfils its purpose.

So much then from the point of view of the purchaser. The tariff commissioners will ascertain the cost of the raw material and the assembling thereof; the cost of manufacture; the cost of transportation, and they will study the conditions of the industrial workers who are engaged in these productions. They go further, because in order that we may know how to equalize the cost of production as in foreign lands with our own, it will be necessary for them to prosecute their studies in the countries which compete for our home markets, and there also they will fully ascertain the cost of the raw material, the cost of manufacture, the cost of transportation and the labour conditions as they there exist. Then, when we have these facts for comparative purposes, we shall be able to judge what it will be necessary to put upon these commodities produced in Canada, by way of a customs duty, in order to protect our home market, as against the producer elsewhere.

Now, taking up the Bill from the consumer's standpoint, this Tariff Commission purposes to carry on an investigation which certainly is in his interest and for his benefit. It purposes to ascertain what is the selling price of the manufacturer, of the wholesaler or middleman, of the retail merchant, in order to see whether in these successive stages the commodity is so enhanced in price that it reaches the ultimate consumer at a cost that is higher than is fair to him. Every circumstance and every condition that affects the ultimate selling price will be germane to the inquiry of this commission. If it should be alleged and shown that there be any combine in restraint of trade which unduly enhances the price of the article

to the consumer; if it should be shown that there are secret agreements between the various producers which advance the price beyond what was legitimate; if it should be shown that industries were endeavouring, on watered stock which represented no real assets, to pay dividends, and on account of this state of affairs trying to get an enhanced price from the consumer, that would be known. If there were excessive charges beyond such as were reasonable and right, saddled upon the product, and attempted to be taken out of the consumer in the ultimate purchase price that would be germane to this inquiry. If there was discrimination, if there were rebates in railway rates; in fact if there was any circumstance or condition which might unduly or unfairly enhance the price of the article, eventually to the consumer, every one of these circumstances might be legitimately studied and reported upon by this commission.

If the price is found to be artificially enhanced, the claim for protection would to that extent be vitiated, and the facts brought before this House would enable this House to put the penalty where it belonged. If I were a member of the opposition, it seems to me that I would not ask for the creation of any better instrument than this to enable me to get at the actual facts of the case from the consumer's point of view. When you get the reports of these commissioners, as you will from time to time, and have a chance to read them, you can determine the lines of action; and, with everything uncovered, I cannot see where it will be possible for any injustice to remain in our tariff.

This commission has also the right to deal with other matters that may be referred to it from time to time by the government. Any other matter relating to trade or commerce will be proper work for the commission. There is a special clause to enable the board to meet emergencies that may from time to time arise. I suppose it will apply to trade treaties. Last session when we were called on to discuss the all-important question of reciprocity with the United States, the members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives had in their hands voluminous reports containing a complete study of the conditions prevailing on both sides of the line with the relative cost of production in Canada and the United States. They went into the discussion prepared at every point. But what had we? What did the civil service officials spoken of by the hon. member for Halifax give us? Did they give us any carefully prepared statistics? They gave us absolutely nothing that we could not have picked out of the blue-books for ourselves. We went into that discussion dependent on United States Senate and House of Representatives for information and if we had not been able to see ourselves as others see us, we would never have succeeded in convincing the people of Canada that the bargain was for us an unwise one.

We were discussing the other day trade relations with Australia. When the government may have a measure on that subject ready to submit to this House, what more profitable than that they should ask the Tariff Commission to ascertain what would be the probable effect upon Canada of an arrangement such as proposed. That I take it is the class of special subjects which will be from time to time referred to the Tariff Commission.

Now, some objections have been raised to this measure. I do not attach much importance to the constitutional objection. We have heard a great deal about Royal commissions. This is not a Royal commission in the ordinary sense. A Royal commission is a temporary body appointed to investigate some specific subject, and as soon as it makes its report and findings, it is dismissed, because its work is done. This commission is not of that character. It is a permanent body which we hope will be continued from year to year, and it will not make findings in the way Royal commissions usually do.

It has been objected in some quarters that we propose to endow this commission with inquisitorial power. That in a sense is true. The commissions will have power to summon witnesses, to order them to bring their books and papers, to examine them under oath, even to inquire into a man's private business. It will have power to compel witnesses to attend, though I do not suppose it will ever have to resort to that. It has not been so in the United States. The Tariff Board there has never had any difficulty in getting the producers to come and give it all the information it desired. It is proposed to put the burden of proof on the man who asks for protection. He will have to prove that he is entitled to have his request complied with, otherwise he will not get it. On that point let me quote from the address of Professor H. C. Emery, the Chairman of the Tariff Board of the United States:

> If, however, the principle should be firmly established that a protective tariff, however necessary or desirable, is none the less a favour, and that the burden of proof rests upon the producer to show cause why such protection should be granted, the matter of power (to examine books, &c.) becomes relatively unimportant.

You have only to say to the producer, 'if you are not prepared to give us the evidence to show why we should give you pro-

tection, do not wonder if we do not give you what you ask for.' Under these conditions people will be only too glad to give us the fullest possible information. It is possible that the Tariff Commission may from time to time find it necessary to secure confidential information which they may not see fit to put verbatim into the evidence, because it must be remembered that in that way they will have greater freedom and get nearly at the facts-inasmuch as men will speak freely when they feel that they are not going to give their competitors in the same line of business al the inside information in regard to their own particular enterprise. That is only legitimate and right.

The Bill provides that the commissioners shall report through the Finance Minister to the Governor in Council. That again seems to me right and proper. It must be remembered that the government, on the findings of fact from this commission, will be called upon to frame their Tariff Bill. There is absolutely no attempt to evade any ministerial responsibility by this arrangement. I do not anticipate that any Tariff Board will ever prepare a Bill, or recommend that the duty be 25 or 30 or 40 per cent on specific articles. They are required only to inquire into questions of fact as to the real conditions existing here and elsewhere. When their evidence and findings have been placed in the hands of the government, the cabinet, more especially the Finance Minister, will determine what form the Tariff Bill will take; and after it has been submitted by the Finance Minister to his colleagues and been approved by them, the Bill, together with the evidence on which it is based, will be brought by the government to the House and will become the property of the House. Every member of the opposition will then have an opportunity to go over the evidence and judge for himself whether 20 or 25 or 30 per cent is the proper rate of duty based upon the facts disclosed. If I were a member of the opposition I would ask nothing better than that I might have the facts before me, admitted by both sides, and then I could hold the government to follow lines that are reasonable and right.

One more feature strikes one in connection with this commission which is to be commended, that is, the endeavour to make the body as far as possible a permanent one. It is appointed for five years, and the hope is implied if not expressed that the members who are appointed in the first instance will, if they make good, go on for a further term of five years. They are made eligible for re-appointment, which implies that it is hoped that they will accept reappointment. Men should go into this work expecting to make it their life-work, and I hope they will continue in it for many years, even though administrations may come and go.

There are some things which cannot be put into the Bill which it seems to me will fall naturally within the scope of this Tariff Commission. One thing, I think, would be to make a glossary or dictionary of the tariff, so that we would have it in plain language and would know what the items meant, and the customs officials along the border would all interpret a definition in the same way.

Another thing which the commission might do would be to establish a customs museum in which we would have samples of the various articles mentioned in the schedules, so that they could be seen and handled by our customs officials who would thus learn how to distinguish and classify them. It might even be possible for this Tariff Commission to assume eventually more or less civil service qualifications and exercise educational functions. To whom could we better give the duty of determining what candidates were best qualified to enter the customs service, and the best means of preparing and training men to enter the higher grades of that service? In a great man yways this commission could render extremely useful service outside the ordinary lines of this Bill.

The conditions in Canada in 1912 are vastly different from those in 1896. Our revenue has grown until it is three times as great and our customs receipts are four times as large as they were 15 years ago. The unscientific methods which were good enough for Canada in her boyhood and early manhood are not good enough from 1912 onwards. We want something better, and we think we have found the way to get it. The experience of busy ministers in the past has been spoken of to-night. Well, we had Mr. Fielding, Mr. Paterson and Mr. Brodeur, ministers in the late government, making peripatetic voyages throughout Canada, stopping at different places and taking evidence. Every theorist, every crank, every inveterate free trader of the English school, every man who had something to say appeared before them and gave his evidence. There was the most heterogeneous conglomeration of evidence collected that one could possibly imagine. It was all typewritten and filled several Saratoga trunks, and I venture to say that not one of the ministers ever read it through. We have ample evidence of that in the fact that Mr. Fielding, after he brought in his Tariff Bill to the House, made upwards of one hundred changes in it, showing that he had not very thoroughly digested the matter submitted to him. Should we call on our ministers to make such an experiment again? It is evidently impossible

for ministers, if they are to properly manage their departments, to have sufficient time at their disposal to travel through the country taking evidence or to sit down and discuss tariff matters with every one who has theories on the subject. We ought not to ask our ministers to do that, and we are seeking to appoint a commission who will collate the facts and submit them to the ministers who in their turn will lay them before the House. What we want is the truth and nothing else. Those who are accused of advocating high protection want nothing but what they are entitled to. The fullest possible light that can be thrown on the business of those who claim protection will be furnished, and if it be found that, under that scrutiny, their pretensions do not hold good, this House will know it, and will withdraw any excessive benefits in the way of protection to which these people are not entitled.

In closing let me emphasize this fact. This commission, which is to be appointed, will be charged to investigate facts and conditions. They will not take on themselves the duties of ministers or of members of parliament. They are not going to prepare any Tariff Act. They will not make any recommendation such as that such an article shall be protected to the extent of 25 or 30 per cent. That will not be their duty. Every prerogative enjoyed by the ministers and members of this House will remain absolutely unimpaired when this Act passes. We shall be called on to exercise our judgment and best faculties in determining what shall be the tariff duty just as before. The only difference will be that we shall no longer be groping our way in the dark.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, Nova Scotia). It must be perfectly manifest that we are on the eve of another great struggle between the two classes—the high protectionists and the moderate protectionists. My hon. friend from St. Antoine Mr. Ames), was not speaking ten minutes before he repeated the statement three times that the consumer may suffer an increase in the price of the goods he consumes by reason of the appointment of this commission. He further made the statement that the tariff at present shows the pressure of the clamour of consumers who make much more noise than their numbers justify. I must congratulate the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) on the frankness with which he discussed this question. Knowing, as we do, the interests which he controls in this country, we would be very much surprised if he took a different stand. This government is doing very well in the way of appointing commissions to relieve themselves of responsibility. They are not very long in power, but during the few months they have been in office they have appointed commissions by the dozen. The principle of adequate protection, as it was defined by the right hon. the First Minister (Mr. Borden), seems to have had its reincarnation about the year 1907. I would ask permission to quote from the 'Canadian Manufacturer' of May 17, 1907, an article which is interesting in view of the present conditions:

Mr. R. L. Borden, leader of the Conservative opposition, in the Dominion House of Commons, will, it is stated, in a few days, tour Ontario and other provinces and address public gatherings on the important issues of the day; and it is expected that some of the Conservative members of Ontario will accompany him for speech making purposes.

Whatever the other important political issues may be which Mr. Borden and his friends may discuss before the electorate, it is to be most ardently hoped that the question of tariff protection will not be neglected but kept well to the front, and we also hope that from this time on not only the Conservative speakers, but the Liberal orators also, will not fail to inform the people on that subject.

Mr. Borden entered parliament in 1896, just after the defeat of the late Conservative government, which, because of their having attached greater importance to other issues than tariff protection, forfeited the prestige of their party and went into opposition. Perhaps they thought that other issues were of more importance to their party and to the country than that which had placed them in power. Those issues might have been considered of greater importance, but while attention was given to these, that of protection should not have been neglected as it was, with the result that such protection as we have since had, as exemplified in the tariff, is administered from a hostile standpoint. It may be that Mr. Borden and his friends are staunch protectionists; it is to be hoped that they are, but during the entire session of the Dominion parliament so recently ended, we do not remember any occasion of pronounced and vigorous speeches having been in favour of the policy of tariff protection, either by Mr. Borden or any of his lieutenants. On some occasions something may have been said, but they were of a perfunctory character, in which no particular ardour was shown. Many grand opportunities have occurred during the discussion having reference to the adoption of the proposition of the Finance Minister, but 'Hansard' fails to record any elaborate and telling arguments in favour of protection by Mr. Borden or his friends, such as thrilled the members and the country under the régime of Sir John.

This remarkable lack of sympathy and enthusiasm was a result, without doubt, of the peculiar stand taken by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association at their Halifax convention in 1902, and before and since that occasion, when the association and the country were assured that the tariff had been taken out of politics—that if any difference of opinion existed, they were regarding the administration of the tariff, all being agreed that

protection in some shape or other had come to stay. Canadian manufacturers and the believers in protection throughout the country, a great and powerful element that had been able to make the National Policy an unbounded success, found themselves, Sampson like, the victims of a deceitful Delilah.

Are Canadian manufacturers—are the people of Canada who are believers in protection, to have this valuable belonging restored to them? Who is to restore it? When is it to be done? How is it to be done? Will the Conservative party under the leadership of Mr. Borden or of any other man undertake the job? Talk is cheap. What is wanted is men of action who will be up and doing. Who are they to be?

From the Bill which has been submitted this afternoon and the stand taken by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), there is no longer any doubt in the public mind as to who the people are, who will give high protection to Canadian manufactures so long as they remain in power. The Prime Minister made the statement that the government had not received any request from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association for the adoption of this measure. It is perfectly manifest to the hon. gentleman as it must be to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association was not likely to go to the government to extract any promise as to their policy with respect to protection; they would rather come to them to require the fulfillment of promises made before the elections, made by the party led by the Prime Minister before the government was formed; made, I have no doubt, before the Minister of Finance was so unexpectedly called to the high position in the government that he occupies at the present time. There was no political communion; no sympathic affiliation between the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister except on the question of the interests, and I think I am not doing the Minister of Finance any injustice, when I say that it was well understood throughout Canada that he was to represent the interests in the government of the present day. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association met in Montreal some weeks after the elections, and if I am not mistaken, among the resolutions they passed on that occasion, was one in favour of a Tariff Commission,—presumably for the purpose of 'taking the tariff out of politics.' I was somewhat at a loss to understand how, under our principles of constitutional government, a Tariff Commission could take the tariff out of politics. But the Minister of Finance has dispelled any doubt existing in my mind as to that point, because he has frankly stated that the tariff will not be taken out of politics by this measure. We on this side are thankful for his frank statement. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) pointed out how impossible it is for the government to relieve itself in respect to its responsibility for the Tariff. What is the object and purpose of the Bill? They appoint a Commission to inquire as to conditions in respect to tariff matters for the purpose of reaching a conclusion as to whether or not protection should be increased in this, that, or the other direction. When the government brings down its tariff measure in the future, and they are charged with giving a certain industry too much protection, the answer probably will be: We have done this on the report of the Tariff Commission which was appointed for the purpose of instructing and advising us as to the amount of protection these interests need.

Mr. BURNHAM. If the hon. member (Mr. Kyte) will allow a question, I would like to ask what difference there would be between that and the recommendation of experts?

Mr. KYTE. That was well explained by my hon. friend from Halifax; and I think if the hon. member for Peterboro (Mr. Burnham) will take the time to read the speech of my hon. friend, he will see his question answered. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) intimated that the Tariff Commission should not be made up of men out of sympathy with the principles for which the government stand. That is another intimation that the tariff commission will be selected from the ranks of the high protectionists. I am sure it is not necessary for us to have that statement from the hon. gentleman in order to reach a conclusion on that point. Up to the present time, the government has been called upon to appoint many persons to office. Some positions have been opened, some have been created; and the government, during the last three months have busied themselves with the work of making appointments. In no case have they gone outside the ranks of their own party to fill a position. Even in the case of a post-office with a salary of $35 a year, they do not go outside of the ranks of their party to fill the place. If they, in the case of a post office with a salary of $35 a year are so mindful of their party interests that they will not allow even a small position to escape them, we can easily understand what will happen in the case of appointing men to positions at $7,000 a year. I am also reminded that, in cases where they are called upon to fill positions, they are not even limited in their choice to the electors of Canada, but go outside these ranks and appoint females to offices, as was done recently in the county of Rimouski.

The Bill provides that the Tariff Commission shall summon before them such people as they desire to give evidence, but it contains no provision under which

a person can go before the committee voluntarily to present his views. Taking the authority of the hon. member for St. Antoine, we know that the commission will consist of high protectionists. We know that they are perfectly aware of the sympathies and sentiments of the government that appoints them, and they will naturally go for their advice to those who are in sympathy with those interests and conditions. But should a representative of the consuming classes desire to give evidence, there is no provision by which he can go before the commission voluntarily for that purpose. There are in this country two classes—the consumers and the manufacturers; and this country has been divided for many years between these two classes and will continue to be so divided. I aver that it is absolutely unfair to the consumers to give such large and important powers to one class of the community to the exclusion of the other class. We have in this country the division between capital and labour. When questions arise involving the interests of these parties, boards of conciliation are asked for to adjust these differences. Would it not be preposterous to imagine that in selecting such a board of conciliation, only the representatives of capital should be appointed on the board? If such a thing were attempted by the government, there would be such a cry all over this country against the manifest injustice of it, that the government would not dare to renew the attempt. But we know that differences will arise between the consumers and the manufacturers; and the government, by their Bill, and by the policy which they have announced and defended in the past, will have only representatives of the manufacturers upon this Tariff Board, so that only that side of the question will be enquired into.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) tell me in what section of the Bill he finds that provision?

Mr. KYTE. It is found in the speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine, when he stated that only men in sympathy with the government and what they stand for, will be appointed upon the board. This Bill is an attempt on the part of the government to draw the consumers and artisans of Canada into a game of chance after they have carefully loaded the dice.

That is the result of the operation of this Bill, that is what will inevitably follow should the Bill be adopted as it is now before us.

The farmers of this country, the consumers of this country, of whom the hon. gentlemen opposite speak so lightly, are surely entitled to some consideration, and what is there in this Bill that is going to help them? Down in the maritime provinces the large and important fishing industry is not suffering from the want of more duties, this government cannot improve their condition by increasing the duty ;the only thing they can do for the fishermen is to enlarge their markets. But hon. gentlemen opposite are irrevocably opposed to any such proceeding. Therefore we are driven to the conclusion that the only interest which is being considered by this government is the interest of the manufacturing classes of Canada. Within the last few months we have seen some instances of the attitude of this government towards the manufacturers and wealthy producers. Not long ago we had a discussion upon the new interpretation which the Minister of Customs placed upon the lumber duties, the supporters of the government contended that no new ruling was made; but the fact is that the ruling which they did adopt resulted in enhancing the price of lumber very largely to the consumers of western Canada, and to the advantage of the lumbermen who are members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. Another instance the junior member for Halifax brought up in the House some days ago. In the month of November a circular was sent out from the Department of Customs to all customs officers in Canada pointing out that a certain twine used in the manufacture of lobster traps had heretofore been admitted free of duty, but that hereafter a duty would be levied upon that twine. Subsequently it was discovered that a mistake was made, and the circular was recalled. But the fact that it was issued at all indicates how watchful are the members of this government and those associated with them lest one dollar might escape from the coffers of the government that can be properly or improperly levied upon the consumers of Canada. I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to point out one instance where this government has shown any desire to decrease the burdens upon the consumers rather than to increase them. Up to the present time it has been the boast of the government and their supporters that now an era of high protection will again be introduced, and the article I read a few moments ago indicates that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association have been able to accomplish what they sought to do in 1907, but which they were somewhat fearful the right hon. the leader of the government might not undertake to do for them. I said a moment ago that the reincarnation of adequate protection might be said to date from 1907 when that article was published. In 1908 there was not the same movement on the part of the capitalists and manufacturers to take control of the Conservative party. Since then, however, they have been moving onward until they

have finally got possession of the citadel, and they bid fair to control this government as long as it lasts. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Ames) referred to the courage of the government in undertaking to pass this Tariff Commission Bill so early. Mr. Speaker, the courage of the government reminds one of the courage of the settler when his hut is attacked by a bear, and he climbs up among the rafters and leaves his wife on the ground to beat back the intruder. The action of the government in bringing down this Bill does not show courage but rather a lack of courage in desiring to divest themselves of the duty of framing a tariff.

The hon. member from Montreal referred to the fact that when the late government was in power and sought to draft a Tariff Bill, they sent three ministers throughout the country for the purpose of hearing evidence, and my hon. friend could not refrain from sneering in that instance also at those people who were in favour of a low tariff. Many cranks and faddists he said came before the commission to give evidence and free traders such as there were in England fifty years ago. Let me remind my hon. friend that there are in Canada to-day many free-traders and there will be in Canada many free-traders in the future who will take their trade policy from the mother country, instead of adopting the high protection policy of the United States. There is reason for believing that the high protection which has existed in the United States for the past forty years is fast coming to an end. Conditions point to a change there. The experience of forty years in the United States, which has given rise to the creation of trusts, to great aggregations of wealth to the detriment of the consuming classes, should rather be a warning to this government against pursuing a similar policy. The United States are about to discard the policy of high protection in order to reduce the price of living to the consuming population of that country. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem somewhat jubilant over the fact that they are in power at the present time. Let me remind them that the great issue before this country in future is to be the issue between high protection and lower tariff. A protective policy for protection's sake is becoming discredited, not only in Canada but everywhere else. A policy of protection for revenue, a moderate protection such as will be necessary to meet the public services of the country, is the policy of the Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada.

A few weeks ago I read in the 'Montreal Star' a list of the millionaires of that city. Well, we are all gratified that the city of Montreal is so prosperous, and that so much wealth is centred there; but in reading that long list of millionaires we cannot avoid the conclusion that they have grown up in the last fifteen or twenty years by virtue of the protective system in Canada. Now Canada has not fared badly during the last fifteen or twenty years. We have had a moderate system of protection, and under that system capital has increased, cities have grown in population, industries have flourished. Therefore I can see no reason why any radical departure should be taken in Canada in respect to the tariff. There is no doubt that the only persons who profit by high protection in this or any other country are the men who have capital invested, and when capital earns remunerative dividends as it does under the present system, millionaires will multiply. I see no reason, therefore, why we should so frame our tariff as to make it still easier for men to accumulate immense wealth to the detriment of the rest of the people.

I am opposed to this Bill because it is a subversion of the principles of responsible government, because it is an attempt on the part of the government to evade responsibility. They may say that all this commission will do is to seek evidence bearing upon the tariff. But the commissioners themselves will understand that the main object of their existence, the purpose for which the Act has been passed, is to afford an excuse to the government for increasing the tariff, and they will naturally go to those sources of information which will enable them to report to the government facts in favour of raising the tariff, and without doubt their report will be tinctured with their own personal conviction that protection is the best thing for Canada.

The right hon. Prime Minister, in the observations he made, in reply to the speech of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), pointed out that at the Imperial Conference a resolution was passed looking to the appointment of a commission to investigate trade matters throughout the different portions of the British Empire and said that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was present and supported that resolution. He endeavoured to draw a parallel between that commission and the one now under consideration. I can scarcely imagine that the Prime Minister fully appreciated the importance of what he was saying, when he led the House to draw the inference that there was an analogy between the two. I submit that there is no analogy. The commission intended to be appointed by the Imperial Conference was for the purpose of investigating trade conditions and endeavouring to ascertain how it would be possible to secure a greater volume of trade between the mother country and the different portions of the empire. There is before the government at

the present time a proposition to extend our trade with Australia and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) I understand, will go to that far off colony in the near future, for the purpose of interviewing the government with a view to increasing our trade with them. The mission of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is analogous to that of the commission that was to be appointed by the Imperial Conference, but it has no analogy whatever with the commission that is now under consideration. The question of tariff and the question of extending trade are entirely different things, so much so, that they are almost contradictory. For instance, when we are seeking to enlarge our trade with another country, we do not start by increasing our tariff against the products of that country. We had an opportunity of extending our trade in the direction of the United States a year ago, when the people of the United States showed a desire to increase their trade with us. What did they do? Did they increase their tariff against our goods? No, they took the duties off our goods, to enable them to get into their market free of duty. Therefore, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this question of a commission for the purpose of enlarging our trade between different parts of the empire is an entirely different proposition from the one before the House at the present time.

I have listened up to the present time with the greatest interest to the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in support of the Bill. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) made a fair and frank statement, one which is perfectly intelligible to any person who desires to get the same grasp of the principles of the Bill which he himself possessed. The right hon. the Prime Minister did not go into the principle of the Bill any further than to make a defence for the government in attempting to delegate the powers that they really should exercise to the commission proposed. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), has gone further and he has stated the case for the protectionists of this country. Up to the present time we have not had any speeches from hon. gentlemen representing the farming communities in the west. I sincerely hope that before this debate is closed we will hear the views of hon. members on the government side representing Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in respect to this Bill. I may not be correctly informed as to the sentiments of the people in that part of Canada but my judgment is that they are hostile to any proposal on the part of the government looking to a further increase in the tariff duties. I will await with interest the view taken by hon. gentlemen representing these provinces on the government side of the House, but whether or not the gentlemen from these provinces are in favour of or against the Bill, I speak for those consumers in the eastern part of Canada whose interests will be injured and whose prosperity in the future will be greatly hampered if the policy of protection, enunciated by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, is carried into effect. As far as they are concerned, there is no doubt as to where they stand on this important question, and, feeling as I do, I have no hesitation in recording my vote in what I believe to be their interests.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Mr. Speaker, as the hour is somewhat late, as it has been intimated that there are five members on this side of the House as well as five on the other who are yet to speak, and as we were here until after twelve o'clock last night, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We will continue the debate.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 8, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. — Mr. McCraney.

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

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

HON. MR. LEMIEUX AND DISMISSALS.

Mr. BELLEMARE:

1. Is the government aware that in the newspaper 'Le Devoir,' on the 30th January last an article appeared which reads partly as follows:—

'Mr. Lemieux and the Dismissals.

'Editor of 'Le Devoir.'

'Dear Sir,—In reply to the defiance of Hon. Mr. Lemieux to produce the names of ten employees that were dismissed in 1896, you will find inclosed a list of the names of those

who were dismissed on the 30th December, 1896, by the Laurier government, of which Hon. Mr. Lemieux was then one of the most zealous friends, although simple member for Gaspé.

'On the 30th December, 1896, these brave fathers of families were, on the eve of New Year's Day, cast out on the street, . . . and one of the number was my poor father. Hence it is that I speak whereof I know. They were sent off without any reason whatsoever, unless it be that they were Blues, and that the Rouges governed.

'Now, Mr. Editor, Mr. Lemieux rages against Mr. Monk, asserting that he has dismissed hundreds of brave fathers of families. How comes it that, even as I write, in the county that the hon. Minister of Public Works represents, at Lachine, no dismissals have yet been made? The Liberals of Lachine who may be dismissed have only to thank Hon. Mr. Lemieux. . . Learn, Mr. ex-minister, that in vain you shout, . . . it will have no effect. We know the love for the French-Canadian that Mr. Monk has, and you. . . will never make us forget the one who has ever been devoted to us.

'You have asked for ten names; read now the following list and remember as you count them that these dismissals were only on the Lachine canal, at the Lachine locks. On the 30th December, 1896, were dismissed: Adolphe Leblanc, lockman, Lachine; Alex. Carignan, lockman, Lachine; Ephron Picard, boom guardian, Lachine; J. B. St. Aubin, lockman, Lachine; Alex. Clément, lockman, Lachine; Camille Cousineau, bridge keeper, Lachine; Damase Chartrand, bridge keeper, Lachine; Oscar Bélanger, lockman, Lachine; James Teirney, lockman, Lachine; Edouard Lauzon, lockman, Lachine; Urgel Viau, lockman, Lachine; Theo. Davis, lockman, Lachine; Roderick Hogan, lockman, Lachine, Alexander Snider, lockman, Lachine.

'And I will add that two years later they found a way to superannuate Messrs. J. B. Deschamps, canal collector, and Louis Paré, each with a small pension not sufficient for livelihood, happily they had some savings.

'Amongst the dismissed was Mr. Damase Chartrand, who had had the misfortune of losing a leg through an accident at the locks during the summer of 1896. The Conservative government had made him a bridge keeper, in order to let him have easy work. With the others, on the 31st December, he received, mercilessly, his dismissal. Is this enough, Mr. ex-minister? You asked for ten names; count them well. . .

'Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for your kindness, I remain, &c.,

'RAOUL CARIGNAN,
Lachine, son of one of the dismissed.

2. If so, does the government intend to take steps to find out the truth concerning these statements?

Mr. MONK:

1. The attention of the Minister of Public Works has been called to the article in question.

2. The accuracy of the statement contained in this article can easily be verified on reference to the records of the Department of Railways and Canals.

POSTMASTER AT SCOTCH VILLAGE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who was the postmaster of Scotch village, Hants county, Nova Scotia, previous to 1903?

2. For what reason was there a change made in the postmaster of that place in that year?

3. What is the name of the new postmaster appointed in 1903?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Jeremiah Northup.
2. The postmaster resigned.
3. Thomas E. Nelson.

AUGUSTE MICHAUD.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Was Auguste Michaud, an employee of the Intercolonial railway at St. Flavie station, county of Rimouski, dismissed?

2. If so, on what grounds was he dismissed and at whose request?

3. Has an investigation been held in his case?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. For offensive political partisanship, to the personal knowledge of Mr. H. Boulay, M.P., by whom the charge was laid.

3. Instructions were given, by the department on February 2, 1912, to C. E. Gelly, of Quebec, to hold an investigation.

GASOLENE ENGINES ON FISHING BOATS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many fishing boats engaged in fishing in Canadian waters are equipped with gasolene engines?

2. What was the number of engines in use in Canadian fishing boats each year for the five years ending December 31, 1911?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. At the end of the fiscal year 1910-11 there were 4,588.

2. No figures are available for any year previous to 1910-11. The statistics for the present year are not yet complete.

TRANSPORTATION OF FRESH FISH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How much was expended during the last fiscal year by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in assisting in the transportation of fresh fish?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. $48,141.97.

POSTMASTER OF ST. AMOUR.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Has there been a change made in the postmastership of St. Amour in the county of Prescott, since the 1st of January, 1912? If so, for what reason?

2. Who was appointed postmaster in the place of the previous one and who recommended his appointment?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes. It was decided to reinstate Mr K. St. Amour, who was unjustly dismissed from the postmastership in November, 1896.

2. Mr. St. Amour was reinstated on recommendation of Dr. E. G. Quesnel.

MR. RAOUL DESCHAMPS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Has Mr. Raoul Deschamps, of Notre Dame de Grace, been appointed to some position in the Department of Public Works? If so, what salary does he receive?

Mr. MONK. No.

MRS. J. N. COTE.

Mr. VERVILLE:

Has Mrs. J. N. Cote been dismissed as charwoman? If so, what were the reasons for her dismissal and by whom was said dismissal recommended?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No. Mrs. Cote was employed for temporary work from September 19 to November 1, 1911, when her employment ceased.

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF MEDICAL SERVICES.

*Mr. BELLEMARE:

1. Who is now the director general of medical services?
2. Since when has he occupied his position?
3. How long is it since his appointment?
4. Has his time expired?
5. Why and on whose recommendation has he been kept on duty?
6. Is the intention of the government to remove him soon?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1. Colonel G. C. Jones.
2. December 22, 1906.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. The term for which he was originally appointed expired on December 22, 1911.
5. In the interests of the service, on recommendation of the Minister in Militia Council.
6. He has been reappointed for a period of four years from December 22, 1911.

STATUE ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LANDS, QUEBEC.

*Mr. BELLEMARE:

1. What are the limits of the land west and east of the land belonging to the Federal Government, situated opposite the legislative building at Quebec?
2. Has the statue, which the Quebec government has just erected to the memory of the father-in-law of Mr. Gouin, been placed on land belonging to the Federal Government?
3. Did the Quebec government ask the Federal Government for authority to erect this statue on property which does not belong to the province?
4. If so, when was this request made, and if granted, on what conditions?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. The limits of the land belonging to the Federal government situate opposite the legislative buildings at Quebec are as shown coloured red on the attached blue print.
2. The government has no information.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Militia Council for the Dominion of Canada, for the year ending March 31, 1911—Mr. Hughes (Victoria).

PAYMENT OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Mr. Speaker, could any member of the government inform me when the cheques for the census enumerators will be issued? I have received many letters about this matter, the services were rendered a long time ago and there seems to be some unnecessary delay.

Mr. ROGERS. Any delay that has occurred is due to the fact that the accounts that have been sent in are not regular. Everything possible is being done by the department to adjust them, and have them paid as rapidly as possible.

APPOINTMENT OF TARIFF COMMISSION.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. White (Leeds) for the second reading of Bill (No. 88), to provide for the appointment of a Tariff Commission and the proposed amendment of Mr. Guthrie thereto.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). The objections which have been taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to this Bill may be summarized under three heads, first that there is no call whatever for the Bill, and no proper reason given for its introduction; second that it is a subversion of constitutional government or certainly constitutional practice in Canada and, third, that it will tend to more closely ally the question of the tariff with party politics. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), twits the Finance Minister (Mr. White, Leeds), with not having given sufficient

reasons for the introduction of this Bill. It is a peculiar thing that upon very many subjects with which, on account of the very short space of time that this government have been in power, we have not yet been able to deal, we are twitted by the opposition from day to day for not introducing such legislation, or at any rate declaring our policy. Upon the debate in reply to the speech from the Throne, this House was divided, because the government had not declared its policy on the naval question. We have been twitted because we have not announced our policy with reference to the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, and we have been twitted that we have not brought down legislation with respect to the granting to the provinces the land within their borders. And yet to-day, when we do bring down legislation implementing one more of the promises made by the present Premier (Mr. Borden), when he was in opposition, we find the opposition objecting, and stating that we were not justified in enunciating our policy to the people of this country. So it seems we would not be able to satisfy the opposition no matter what we did. But the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), answers his own argument in his speech. He says that we have no reason for bringing in this legislation, yet at page 2666 of 'Hansard' he says:

For some years back, I have been one of those who have found fault with the statistical information gathered by the Canadian government. A much better system might well be evolved and put in practice, instead of the present one which is neither accurate nor convenient. I believe that all the information which the Finance Minister, judging hy his remarks, desires, he could obtain by the appointment of experts added to the departments of Trade and Commerce and Customs. There is no necessity for the appointment of a permanent Tariff Commission at all. You could appoint to the Customs and Trade and Commerce departments, expert technical men, who would get for you all the information which these commissioners are supposed to obtain. I believe that this would be a much less expensive way of arriving at more satisfactory results. These experts would be at work under the eyes of the minister and be responsible to him for their work, whereas the commission will be an irresponsible entity.

So that the hon. gentleman himself points out reasons for introducing this measure. The only contention of the hon. member is that the proper method of collecting information had not been adopted. Later on in his speech my hon. friend said:

Let him amend the Customs Act, if necessary, to make this change. I believe that both sides of the House would support an amendment to that effect. We do not begrudge any expense to get necessary information, but we do not want legislation which will be a most radical departure from a cardinal principle of our constitution.

The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) said that he had suggested to the late government three years ago that a change should be made in the administration of the Customs Department, he had suggested to the then Minister of Finance, (Mr. Fielding), that there should be established what he called a Tariff Bureau. I would like to know the difference between a Tariff Bureau and a Tariff Commission. It is a matter of name. He is going to establish a tariff tribunal to gather information and it seems to me a rose by any other name would smell just as sweet. Thus I say that these gentlemen have answered themselves when they say there is no reason for the appointment of this Tariff Commission.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said that the Minister of Finance in introducing this Bill had simply copied cheap Yankee legislation. He said:

The bill is largely an American model, nothing more or less than a cheap Yankee device.

The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) says:

In the United States there is no such thing as a Tariff Commission, and there may never be—likely there never will be. Strictly speaking, there is no tariff board.

We have the hon. member for South Wellington saying that this Bill is an exact copy of something which the junior member for Halifax says does not exist. That is a peculiar state of affairs. Upon this point the hon. gentlemen have again answered themselves. The hon. member for South Wellington holds out a challenge to the Minister of Finance to disprove his statement that this proposed Tariff Commission will have the effect of increasing the tariff and that it was introduced for that purpose. If I thought the institution of the present Tariff Commission was being placed before this House and passed by this House for the purpose of increasing the tariff of this country at all times and would not be used also for the purpose of reducing the tariff, I for one would vote against it, and it is not fair to say that because a Tariff Commission was passed in the United States and because a protectionist party happened to be in power, therefore, the commission was created not only to preserve a high tariff in the United States, but to increase that tariff, because we know that in the last few years in the United States public opinion has been in favour of lowering the duties and that commission was appointed concurrently with

that feeling in the United States. I shall read the words of President Taft in his message to Congress, upon that particular measure, and see whether he thought that the creation of a Tariff Commission in the United States was intended for the purpose of increasing the tariff:

It is not unlikely that in the light of accurate statistics we may find that certain schedules in our tariff are too high. If we do, I shall at that time not hesitate to immediately recommend their revision. I believe the work of a tariff board should be to secure and present evidence, not to frame a tariff. With this evidence before it Congress will act fairly and wisely and the United States have under this method, a tariff established on a thoroughly scientific basis, as it should have been a quarter of a century ago.

So that the challenge of the hon. member for South Wellington is answered by the President of the United States himself in a message upon the very subject of which my hon. friend was speaking.

Let me point out some other inconsistencies between the statements of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and the statements of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) at page 2662 of 'Hansard' told us:

The fact therefore is that we are going to have three permanent tariff commissioners; a board just as permanently appointed as a bench of judges is appointed.

He entered a strong protest against the Bill because it created such a permanent tariff board. But, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) half an hour afterwards directed all his remarks to the importance of having a permanent tariff authority, and to ensure that permanency he urged that civil servants be selected to form a tariff bureau. What inconsistency there is between these gentlemen on the opposite side of the House! If only a few more of them would speak they would tear to shreds every argument they have used against this Bill. Then, we were told by gentlemen opposite that the appointment of this commission would have the effect of more closely allying the tariff with party government, and as a remedy against that the hon. member suggested that there should be officials taken from certain departments, officials under the control of the government, and to some extent depending for their promotion upon the minister, to form a 'tariff bureau', and he contended this bureau would be freer from party bias than the board proposed under this Bill, which my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) said would be composed of men as independent as are the judges of the land. The fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are driven to such a line of argument shows the weakness of their case. The three gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House usually present good strong reasons to support their views, and the fact that their arguments in the present instance are so illogical and so inconsistent simply shows that they have been casting around aimlessly for some contention to buttress their objections to this Bill. Then, the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) referring to the probable appointments to the tariff board stated that there was no doubt but that the appointees would be Conservatives. Well, so long as we have party government in this country, so long will the party in power favour its own friends, other things being equal. We might as well accept that idea as a start. It is a principle of party government that the party in power should appoint officials in whom they have confidence. Suppose, for example, that after we had been returned to power at the last election by an overwhelming majority on the principle of moderate protection, and on the principle of sustaining our tariff substantially as it is, except with such variations as are necessary from time to time, and that then we should turn around and appoint three free traders on this tariff commission, would any one suppose that we would be carrying out the mandate of the people and doing our duty to those who trusted us to administer the affairs of the country? No, we would be guilty of a breach of faith. However, that may be, I want to remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) that it is not true that in all cases this government has followed the practice of appointing only its own friends. Why, the very minister who introduced this Bill comes from the ranks of his own party, and the man whom this government placed at the head of the Transcontinental Railway Commission is a Liberal. It will therefore be seen that although we have the right, if we choose, to appoint party friends, we have so far exercised our best judgment in calling to the various public positions men who we think can best administer public affairs in the true interest of the country. Another reason why we are introducing this Bill is to carry out a promise made by the Conservative party when in opposition, and this government believes in implementing its promises, although, I hope it will not cost us as much to implement our promises as it cost the late government to implement its guarantee to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Let us look at some of the duties which will be cast upon this new tariff board. It will be one of their first duties I presume to consider each item in the tariff. Now, I have given a little attention to this tariff for my own satisfaction, and I am free to say that I know very little about it, although possibly I do know as

much about it as most hon. members in this House. Here is the tariff and I find there are three thousand seven hundred different articles dutiable and free in schedule A, and these again are grouped into seven hundred and ten items, so it is pretty safe to say there is not a single member in this House who knows what every item in that tariff is. It is also safe to hazard the assertion that not one half the members of this House know where the products come from, the local conditions of production, the cost of transportation, and what the duty is or what it ought to be. This board will be composed of specialists competent to study the tariff, and, as we know, this is an age of specialists. Every man who comes to the government urging a change in the tariff is a specialist in his own line, and when he appears before the minister to urge his case he necessarily has an advantage over the minister because he has studied his own special line of business and knows what suits his own needs. It is quite apparent that the time has come when we must have some regularly constituted body with proper powers of investigation, in order that we may intelligently legislate with respect to tariff matters. Under present conditions, some one walks into the office of the Minister of Finance or some deputation complains that the tariff is too high on a certain article and another comes in and says the tariff is too low. A deputation waits on the Minister of Finance urging him either to lower or to increase the tariff and that deputation presents arguments from every standpoint in favour of their request, and as to the accuracy of these statements the Minister of Finance of course has no assurance. Is it not well to have such a board as is now proposed to advise the minister; to seek information and to present a well considered and carefully thought out report to him? Let me give you an example of what I mean. Within the past few weeks there came from my own riding two deputations, one of them being on behalf of the Coal Association of the province of Ontario. That deputation pointed out to the Minister of Finance what was news to me, that if a vessel loads with coal at the town of Owen Sound and sails for Port Arthur, touching at an International port en route she does not have to pay duty on that coal; but, if the same vessel loads coal at Owen Sound and does a coasting business, and does not touch at an international port she has to pay a duty of fifty-three cents per ton on that coal. That case is brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance, and of course the Minister of Finance cannot be expected to know all the circumstances and conditions which made that imposition of duty in the one case imperative, and in the other not. Such a case as that would be a matter for the consideration of a Tariff Commission.

This body of experts would be able to take evidence on that. That certainly has the effect of diverting trade through international waters, because in one case there is a duty of 53 cents a ton on coal and in the other case there is no duty.

Then, the cement manufacturers may come down here. In my town there are three cement companies, and I understand the west desires a reduction of the duty on cement, because the people in the west are complaining that the price of and duty on cement are too high. They say that a cement merger has been formed and is paying on watered stock a dividend which is equal to 25 or 30 per cent on its legitimate stock. These cement gentlemen come down here and say, the price of cement is high, not because of the tariff, but because of the high freight rates between the east and the west. This commission has power to investigate both the cost of production and the cost of transportation to the west. In the State of Kansas there is a cluster of mills turning out cement which undersells to a great extent the cement produced in this country, and what is the reason? It is because they employ the cheap labour of the Latin races from Europe to whom they pay a lower rate of wage than our people will accept. In addition, alongside of the cement mills are silk mills in which the women of these Latin races work, so that the combination of the two makes it possible for these people to live on a rate of wages which would be ruinous to the workingmen of this country. These are matters which this commission will take into consideration. They are stated to me as facts, but I do not know whether they are facts or not. Therefore, I want the commission to take evidence and find out.

Then we had the fruit growers coming down here and saying that any lowering of the duties on fruits would be injurious to them, and you heard the answer of the late Prime Minister to the effect that he did not know whether the representations made were true or not, and that as reciprocity was on the tapis he could do nothing. The grain growers of the west also came here with their representations. The farmers of Ontario came saying that they were injured by the introduction of cheap American pork, and asked to have the duty on pork increased. Was any man in this House able to say definitely and accurately whether or not those duties should be increased, without some authoritative statement from a body of experts such as that proposed by this Bill? I could go on and illustrate by references to many other things. Take the Combines

Act. If a deputation comes to this House and says, we believe there is a combine in this country, in a certain article, by reason of which the price of that article has been unduly enhanced, who in this House knows whether that is the case or not? This commission has power to go right into the factories and investigate their books and bring the men before them and do anything else necessary to see whether the price has been unlawfully enhanced or not.

The next argument presented to the House by our hon. friends opposite is that the passage of this Bill would subvert the constitution of this country. I will admit that if there is anything in this Bill which gives legislative or executive action to the Tariff Commission, that argument is perfectly sound. I myself would vote against giving this commission any legislative or executive action with respect to the alteration or revision of the tariff. But the whole argument of hon. gentlemen opposite is based on an assumption which does not exist, and which would lead me to believe that they had prepared their speeches on this Tariff Commission, in the expectation that it would have some legislative or executive action. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) referred to the resolution that was moved by Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the last Imperial Conference, which he said bore no analogy to the functions of this commission. If the hon. gentleman had read that resolution, I think he would not have made that statement. What was the resolution that Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved on that occasion. It was one praying that the Imperial Government would appoint a commission composed not only of representatives of Canada, but of representatives of every other portion of the empire, and of Great Britain as well, to do exactly what this Tariff Commission is going to do. I will read that resolution:

> He asked for the appointment of a Royal Commission with a view of investigating and reporting upon the natural resources of each part of the empire represented at this conference, the development attained and attainable, and the facilities for production, manufacture, and distribution; the trade of each part with the others and with the outside world, the food and raw material requirements of each, and the sources thereof available. To that extent, if any, the trade between each of the different parts has been affected by existing legislation in each, either beneficially or otherwise.

That commission was to do nothing but investigate and report, just what is proposed for this commission. Was there any question of the subversion of Canadian autonomy when the right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition, and who is supposed to be the omnipresent protector and vigilant mentor of Canadian autonomy, moved this resolution at the last Imperial Conference? Yet the cases are exactly analogous, because that commission was simply asked to go and investigate facts and report, just as the commission now proposed is to do.

I wish also to refer to the Railway Commission, which hon. gentlemen opposite appointed when in power. We have no fault to find with them for that; on the contrary, we have commended their action in that respect time and again, and so have the people of this country—why? Because there was a time not long ago when all the duties performed by the Railway Commission were performed by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council—more or less of a political body. But there came a time in the development of Canada when, by reason of the development of our railways, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council could not attend to the many questions brought before it, and it became necessary, in the interests of this country, that railway rates and everything pertaining to railways should be assigned to a commission; and that commission was given powers greatly in excess of those given to this commission.

This commission will only have power to investigate and report. It would never do to give it the right and the power to do anything which would affect the revenues of the country. We are giving it much less power than we gave the Railway Commission. To the Railway Commission we gave power, not to do anything that would affect the revenues of the country, but to control the railway freight and passenger rates throughout the whole Dominion; and in that respect we gave them executive power and took from ourselves the right to have anything to say in fixing traffic rates on railways. Yet, although when we vested in the Railway Commission this sole executive power to deal with railway rates, hon. gentlemen opposite had nothing to say but on the contrary fathered that proposition; now, when we are about to appoint a commission which will simply have the power to investigate and ascertain the facts, and will not have any executive power at all, we are charged with subverting the constitution. Can hon. gentlemen opposite really realize the meaning of their words when they make such an argument?

The late First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) consented to the appointment of a Waterways Commission. He appointed three commissioners. For what purpose? To ascertain the facts and conditions in connection with the international waters between this country and the United States. But why did he appoint special commissioners for that purpose? Because the right hon. gentleman and the late government

came to the conclusion that the subject of the international waters and the various encroachments on the rights of the Dominion in that connection, were so complex and abstruse that the ministers of the late government had not the time to deal with them, and, therefore, they appointed an International Waterways Commission, whose duty it was to investigate into all the circumstances, conditions and facts and report. What were they authorized to do—their duties are defined in their first report in 1905 as follows:

Whose duty it shall be to investigate and report upon the conditions and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary lines between the United States and Canada, including all of the waters of the lakes and rivers whose natural outlet is by the River St. Lawrence to the Atlantic ocean; also upon the maintenance and regulation of suitable levels, and also upon the effect upon the shores of these waters and the structures thereon, and upon the interests of navigation by reason of the diversion of these waters from or change in their natural flow; and, further, to report upon the necessary measures to regulate such diversion, and to make such recommendations for improvements and regulations as shall best subserve the interests of navigation in said waters. The said commissioners shall report upon the advisabilty of locating a dam at the outlet of Lake Erie, with a view to determining whether such dam will benefit navigation, and if such structure is deemed necessary shall make recommendations to their respective governments looking to an agreement or treaty which shall provide for the construction of the same, and they shall make an estimate of the probable cost thereof.

Our hon. friends opposite will see that the late government gave that International Waterways Commission more powers than we are proposing to give this Tariff Commission, because they gave the Waterways Commission power to make regulations respecting international waters. This will be seen by reference to page 90 of the International Waterways report and carry them into executive action.

In due course by a report of the Committee of the Privy Council of Canada, approved by the Governor General of Canada, it was resolved: That His Majesty's government accept the invitation to co-operate in the formation of a commission. This report, after further reciting that as the subject to be dealt with pertained to 'the regulations of the waters adjacent to the international boundary,' the matter, in so far as Canada was concerned, should be under the Department of the Interior and the Department of Public Works.

On the following page of that report will be found the following:

After the appointment of the Canadian commissioners, the Postmaster General of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in communicating the matter to the Canadian House of Commons, in January last, dealt with the subject-matter of the commission as covering all waters adjacent to the boundaries of the two countries, and in the course of his speech made the following statements: In sections of the country where the boundary is not water, but land, there are streams and large rivers which have their sources in one country and which flow into another. Complaint has been made by the United States that Canadians have constructed some works upon rivers which have their sources in Canada and which flow into the United States, and that these works affect the flow of the waters in their country. We also have made complaints to the United States that Americans have constructed upon some rivers, the St. John river, for instance, works which affect the flow of the waters in our country. It is, therefore, to the mutual interest and advantage of both countries to have the question properly investigated with a view of having concurrent legislation, if such should be found necessary.

For these reasons we have thought it advisable to respond to the invitation of the United States to have this question investigated. We have agreed to a commission to be composed of six members, three to represent the government of the United States and three to represent the government of Canada.

Did it ever occur to any hon. gentleman opposite to object that by establishing that Waterways Commission and giving it the powers we did, the late government was in any way subverting the constitution or taking from this parliament any of the powers which justly belong to it? Not one of them raised any such objection, but on the contrary, the Bill establishing that commission was supported without dissent, because parliament desired that the government should obtain the best information available before deciding on any definite action. Then there was the International Fisheries Commission. Why did we appoint that? Let me here say that if there is anything in the argument hon. gentlemen opposite put forward against the appointment of a Tariff Commission, that argument would apply with still greater force against the appointment of any international commission. Because in the case of a Tariff Commission, this government has absolute control, whereas in the case of an International Commission, there are two governments concerned, each of which has as much say as the other. The government, in the case of the Tariff Commission, may remove the commissioners from office and abolish the commission, but it cannot in the case of an International Commission, which is the outcome of a treaty, without going to Great Britain and consulting the Imperial authorities.

Why did the late government appoint an International Fisheries Commission? Because of the disputes which arose in connection with our fisheries. Some people wanted nets of a certain size, the people of British Columbia wanted certain things

done, and our maritime provinces wanted other things done. The government then did what any other intelligent government would have done. They determined to place these matters in the hands of experts, who would call the parties interested before them, gather the facts, on oath if necessary, and enable the government to devise more executive and intelligent legislation than it otherwise could have done. I can point to commission after commission and ask hon. gentlemen opposite to show one essential difference between the powers given these various commissions I have named, and the one we are appointing today, except that we are not now giving the Tariff Commission such large powers as we have some of the others. Yet we are told that in appointing this Tariff Commission we are subverting our constitution. Why, if that be the case, our constitution must have been completely upset long ago by these hon. gentlemen opposite, and yet we seem to be getting along famously.

A little while ago the question of technical industrial education came up in this House, and my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), himself proposed that this government should do—what? That it should appoint a commission. What for? To visit the industrial centres of Canada, and the United States, gather all the information there obtainable, and then cross the water to the countries of Europe, and after having made all the investigation possible, report to this House. There was then no fear in my hon. friend's mind of our subverting the constitution by the appointment of such a commission. That idea never occurred to hon. gentlemen opposite until the Bill we are now discussing was submitted to the House. They then went into their little chambers and worried about what position they ought to take, and what opposition they could make, and they determined on a line of argument which does not do much credit to their intelligence.

My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax said: I do not care that this commission may not have legislative or executive power. When it brings in a report, that report is bound to be tinctured into the tariff. But does he not know that this commission is appointed simply to ascertain the facts, and you cannot get rid of the facts. You must have the facts in framing your tariff. Let my hon. friend look up the speech made by Mr. Champ Clark on the Bill which was amended by the United States Senate, and he will see that the leader of the Democrats and the advocate of low tariff reform in the United States, while he objected to the establishment of a commission, because it would be composed of Republicans, said that the commission would not have legislative or executive power, but simply power to collate the facts and report; and he went on to say that facts are facts, no matter whence they come, and, therefore, he would not oppose the Bill. My hon. friend said this afternoon that the present government are in favour of higher protection. Nothing of the kind. Suppose the representation is made that the duty on agricultural implements are too high. Well, if they are too high I am in favour of lowering them, but I want some definite scientific information to prove this, and at present there is nobody, and no tribunal from which I can get that information. This Tariff Commission, however, will have the power to enter every factory, every industrial establishment, examine its books find out the cost of production, the amount of capital invested, the dividends paid, and all the conditions governing it, and then report the facts to the government. And on the reports of this commission, the government will come to a conclusion as to what tariff legislation is desirable. To my mind the objection to investigations of that kind should come rather from the manufacturers, and be prompted by a desire to conceal the facts from the country. As President Taft said, when speaking of the tariff board appointed under the Payne-Aldrich law: I do not say that this board should be established, because the tariff is too high or too low, but in order that we may ascertain the facts and revise our tariff if the facts call for a revision.

My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), said on several occasions that there is not in other countries a Tariff Commission similar to this. Quite true, but they have other institutions for determining what the tariff shall be. What is the object of appointing those men? It is simply in order that we may get at the facts, because our tariff must be based on the facts.

Now, let me give another illustration of our lack of information in this House; and, if I refer to the reciprocity treaty, I do so in no controversial way, but in illustration of the need of actual information which we should have in the country, not only to assist us in revising our own tariff, but in negotiating commercial treaties with other countries. Last year, when the reciprocity matter was before the House, we were very anxious to get information as to the prices of commodities on the American side and on our own. In the debate on the 2nd of March, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), said:

I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the message sent by President Taft in reply to a request from the Senate, in which statistics are given as to

the different items affected by the schedule in the agreement now under discussion. These statistics include the prices of various commodities such as beef, pork, butter, &c., in Canada and the United States for a series of years, especially for the last year. In reply to the request the President sent down a list which gave the exact information required by the Senate.

In reply, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, then Minister of Finance, said:

Of course we had to use our own sources of information and hon. gentlemen who criticise the agreement will have to do likewise.

That is the only answer we got. Later on the present Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) drew the matter to the attention of the then Minister of Finance, but the only information he received was that a document had been published by the Minister of Labour giving prices in Canada and labour conditions. But we all know that that document was not compiled with a view to the reciprocity treaty, but merely in connection with the work of the Department of Labour. And the hon. Mr. Fielding added:

There is no other information available.

The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) wrote to the Department of Trade and Commerce asking for information. For we must have information in a case of that kind if we are to give an intelligent decision upon a question whether such a treaty as was proposed should be approved or not. We must know, for instance, whether products affected by the treaty could be raised in a foreign country more cheaply than here and even adding transportation laid down here at a lower figure than they could be produced for in this country. And what reply did the hon. gentleman receive?

I beg to return you herewith your reference No. 172 for statement showing comparative prices of butter and eggs in London, England, and certain points in Canada and the United States. This department has no information upon the subject.

Imagine that! Imagine writing to the Department of Trade and Commerce for information that we ought to have in order to form an intelligent opinion upon a reciprocity pact and then only receive the answer, 'This department has no information!' Think of what this means, especially when on the other side of the line they had a body of trained experts who had been employed for years in collecting facts, so that when the United States government came to deal with this matter they had 'mountains of information'. Hon. Mr. Perley also wrote to the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce on the subject and received this reply:

The compilation of statistics such as that requested in your return has more than once engaged the attention of this department, but we found that it required very considerable work which this department has yet been unable to undertake.

Not only that, but the then Minister of Finance told the people of this country that it was not necessary to have any information in order to negotiate the reciprocity pact. I will read you his speech to that effect. In this very same debate we were twitting hon. members who then sat on this side with having nothing to act upon except the blue-books which had been laid upon the table and which give us no intelligible information as to prices and conditions here as compared with those of the United States. Hon. Mr. Fielding said:

Then, with regard to what took place at Washington, I want to say to my hon. friends that we had abundance of statistics. We had the various documents and public books of the United States and Canada, to which we were able to refer from time to time, and we did not fail to make use of the . . . I wish to add that in my judgment, the information for the purpose of this agreement, was not necessary at all.

Imagine that! And the former Minister of Customs made a similar statement later on, as I will show. These gentlemen went there saying: We do not need information or statistics such as have been compiled by the United States Tariff Commission; we can go down there and, without anything of that kind, negotiate a treaty with the President of the United States. I imagine the two representatives of Canada on one side of the conference table, and on the other side President Taft and some of the brainiest men of the United States, armed with official information as to the prices, as to consumption of products and the extent of production on the American side, and on the Canadian side as well, which they have been collecting for years. I can imagine the smile on the President's face when he found Mr. Fielding did not have, and apparently that he did not want, any information. And when these American representatives asked for concessions and Mr. Fielding gave them, they must have felt that it was like taking candy from children. The Canadian representatives went there without information, without any knowledge to guide them in what they were doing. On the other hand, the American representatives knew the position exactly, their every move on the chessboard of that negotiation was made on definite, accurate, scientific information gathered by men who had been all over the United States and Canada and knew exactly the conditions in both countries. They knew exactly what they were doing, and we were playing the game like

a lot of children. And when the United States unwittingly threw out this lifebuoy, document 849, we grasped at it, and it helped to save us from national disaster. This document was one of the most powerful arguments used by the Conservatives in the recent appeal to the people, for they were able to prove from it that, on the showing of the United States themselves, it would be injurious for this country to negotiate a treaty with the United States. I do not wonder that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) does not want a Tariff Commission appointed, for it was the Tariff Commission of the United States which elicited facts which helped to turn the hon. gentleman's party out of power. I venture to say that had my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had a Tariff Commission in operation a year before, he would not have negotiated a treaty, and the chances are he would have been still on this side of the House. That is one of the most cogent arguments I can give for having authentic information on which we could base an intelligent conclusion.

Now, by way of digression, let me show the kind of information that these gentlemen in the United States collected. I refer first to the paper schedules. I find there are fifty schedules with respect to the paper manufacturing industry alone. And, be it noted, there is not a single recommendation in this report. They do not say to the President of the United States: It is better to do so and so. If our commission were to do likewise, I should object to it, because it is not for them to make suggestions for legislative action. Their message should be: Here are the facts; use your own sweet will upon them. So, in this document No. 849, there is neither suggestion nor recommendation as to what should be done in view of the facts collected, simply 127 pages of official facts with respect to reciprocity with Canada. Can any one find fault with that? And as to this department of pulp and news-print paper, as showing the scope of the investigation, they say:

> The data on pulp and paper included in the following tables was secured from 42 ground-wood mills, 17 sulphite mills, and 27 news-print mills, making a total of 86 mills and representing about two-thirds of the ground wood-pulp and news-print paper production of the United States and all of the sulphite pulp used in the production of news-print paper. An investigation of the cost of production in all the other mills is now under way. The data from Canada were taken from a number of mills producing over two-thirds of the total output of news-print paper in the Dominion, including the best equipped mills . . . All these figures, including those from Canada, have been secured directly by our representatives from the books of the different companies. We prepared exact schedules including all essential items of equipment, cost, and wages; and for each of the companies included in the tables, we have the original schedules covering all the items in detail.

An absolutely thorough investigation of the whole industry. Now, take the wool schedule, and let us see what investigation they made of the question of sheep raising, the basic industry for wool:

> Coming to sheep, we approach a phase of agricultural production that has for several months past been a subject of a painstaking inquiry at the hands of the Tariff Board. We refer to that particular branch of live stock husbandry underlying schedule K of the United States tariff, to wit, the growing of sheep in the various countries and the conditions surrounding the marketing of flock products. This inquiry, necessarily world-wide in its bearing, is not completed. We are nevertheless, able to speak at the present time with a reasonably complete knowledge of the facts concerning the sheep growing industry in the United States and Canada, more especially as relates to comparative conditions in Ontario and such typical states as Ohio, Pennsylvania and Michigan. Representatives of the board have visited some 700 typical farms in the leading sheep breeding sections of Ohio, south Virginia, western Pennsyvania, west Virginia, New Hampshire and Vermont, obtaining facts and figures covering costs and prices. These data are now being analysed and worked out with a view toward developing cost of wool production. In connection therewith the cost of maintenance of sheep per head for a year in Ohio and adjacent states has already been developed. The method pursued in obtaining first hand information as to the cost of keeping sheep was through schedules filled out by experts who personally visited the farms studied.
>
> The accompanying tables show the result of a study of two Ohio counties so investigated, and the data presented may be taken as fairly indicating the cost of maintaining sheep in the localities most largely interested. These figures are tentative, and are subject to revision and possible correction when the entire investigation has been completed.

I quote that to show the thoroughness with which that commission made the investigation. The woollen industry in Ontario to-day is in a decaying condition. Would it not be proper for this commission to examine, after the manner of the United States Tariff Commission, the conditions in Ontario, and in that thorough manner? I think if we can rejuvenate the woollen trade of this country, that is one instance of what this Tariff Commission might do.

Now, Sir, I want to summarize what I think should be the duties of this commission.

(a) Will be a medium of gathering accurate and definite information on production, transportation and prices of goods at home and abroad, without which there can be no intelligent legislation in tariff matters.

(b) This information may be obtained on oath and the production and inspection of the books of any concern to prove or disprove the need of protection or bonuses.

(c) In so far as jurisdiction is conferred on the commission it will tend to remove the tariff from party politics and transfer it to a semi-judicial body but rightly giving it no executive legislative powers to affect our revenues.

(d) It will provide a long felt want, a body of experts on our tariff and on conditions of production at home and abroad.

(e) Will enable the Governor in Council through its medium to decide whether, or not there exists any combine or agreement under section 12 Customs Act, 1907, and to remove or lower the duties on all articles unduly enhanced in price because of such combine.

(f) Will be able to ascertain definitely and report whether or not goods are being dumped into Canada contrary to the dumping clause of our Customs Act and if so to enable the government to have the 15 per cent added.

(g) They can prepare special reports of the cause of the decline in certain industries or in certain branches of agriculture, or trade with other countries, and the changes and effect and operation of the tariff of, or treaties with other nations; on the trade and industries of Canada.

(h) Consolidate the many Tariff Acts, Schedules, orders in council in Canada and our commercial treaties with other nations and compile and publish a glossary on our own tariffs or as President Taft said of their own, to translate it into plain English, and save to a great extent the employment of customs brokers and the worry of importers and others in adjusting duties.

I think these conclusions cover probably what would be the principal duties of this commission. For this and other reasons I have given, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton). We had supposed that we had constitutional government, but I think we can consider now that we are henceforth to be governed by commission. While we have appointed a good many commissions, we have also dispensed with the services of some. I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) to the fact that while the government has seen fit, as a measure of economy, to dispense with the services of three commissioners appointed for the purpose of supervising the construction of the Transcontinental railway, the money that they are going to save in that measure of economy they are going to lose now by the appointment of the proposed Tariff Commission. So if my hon. friend is that friend of economy which he poses as being, he will vote with this side of the House against the second reading of the Bill. It is not economy, I think, either in the matter of the expenditure of money or in the efficiency of the public service, to dispense with three commissioners charged with the responsibility of constructing a work of the most essential advantage to the country, at an expenditure of many millions of dollars, an expenditure that requires the most careful supervision in order to secure satisfactory results. But it is right and proper on grounds of economy and efficiency to dispense with the three Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, then there are no grounds of economy, and I think it has already been shown no grounds of efficiency, for the appointment of the proposed Tariff Commission—three commissioners, at a salary equal to that of the cabinet ministers who appoint them, with a secretary whose salary is equal to that of the Deputy Ministers of the various departments up to a year or two ago.

However, it has been decided by the government to appoint this commission, and we must assume that there is a purpose in the appointment. It cannot be presumed that even a very lavish government would appoint a commission at an initial salary cost of $24,500 a year, and with the almost unlimited expenses that will follow, without a purpose, a purpose I am confident beyond the mere finding of positions at comfortable salaries for their friends.

If I understand the matter, the commission is to be appointed for the purpose of securing information upon which to base changes in the tariff. I heard the Prime Minister discussing that subject, and it seemed to me he wished the House to understand that this commission was appointed merely for the purpose of collecting statistics. But I cannot think, as I have said, that even a lavish government would appoint a $25,000 commission merely for the purpose of collecting statistics. There must be a purpose beyond the mere collection of statistics, and the purpose I think is to be found upon the information collected changes in the tariff. Unless that be the purpose, then there is no purpose that would justify the appointment.

The purpose of the commission, as I understood the Finance Minister in his speech and as I understand those who have spoken on the same side on behalf of the Bill, and as I understand the contents of the Bill itself, is to find reasons —I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker—to find excuses for increases in the tariff, to find out to what extent the tariff can be increased while the people may still be induced to submit to these increased exac-

tions and retain our hon. friends in office.

I quite agree that if there is to be tariff changes it is necessary that there should be information, that there should be inquiry; but in my humble judgment the purpose of the inquiry should be the direct opposite of that which has been indicated from the other side of the House, and by the terms of the Bill. I understand that the revenues of Canada are some twenty or thirty millions of dollars in excess of the needs of expenditure. It would seem to me that there might very well be inquiry as to a readjustment of the tariff whereby the burden of this extra taxation might be removed from the shoulders of the people, and as to such a readjustment of the tariff burden that it would bear more equally upon the wealth and upon the labour of our people. There might be a further inquiry as to how far the present tariff conditions tend to divert the payments made by the consumer into private pockets rather than into the public treasury. If these were the purposes of the appointment of the commission I could understand its propriety.

At the present time the business conditions of this country are exceedingly favourable. The Minister of Finance suggested in his speech that such a time was not the time to make changes in the tariff. I would respectfully submit that if the changes to be made are to be made along the lines that I would wish to see, 'at such a time' is the time to make the changes. The present boom condition in our country is good for the man who has nothing; because he meets opportunity to better his position; and it is good for the man who has much because he meets opportunity to make that much more; but in the interests of the 75 per cent or maybe 80 per cent of the people who have practically fixed incomes, the farmers, the salaried employees or the wage labourers, to whom these opportunities do not come by reason of these good times but upon whom the high cost of living bears exceedingly and to a greater and greater degree from year to year, it seems to me it would be well worthy of consideration if some part of the burden of the $75,000,000 of our revenue that is raised by customs taxation might not, under some readjustment of the tariff, be lessened to reduce the cost of living and so better the circumstances of that 75 per cent of our people.

If the commission to be appointed were to be composed of men holding the well recognized and differing views which are held in regard to customs taxation, and if the members of the commission would loyally represent all the various interests affected, the consumer as well as the producer, and if the evidence as secured were made available to the public and were secured for that purpose, then the proposed commission would be a commission in fact as well as in name. But the men whom it is proposed to appoint will be political and tariff partisans. The commission will act as directed by the minister and will report only to him. It will be a commission in name and in cost but not a commission in fact. As I understand the matter this is a commission to humbug the people into believing that the information being gathered is being gathered in the public interest when really it is being gathered in special interests at the public expense.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that it is not permissible to impute improper motives.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg pardon, Mr. Speaker, I am not imputing motives to any person in the House, it is the legislation to which I am imputing motives as I think I am permitted to do.

To me it seems that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) disputes with the hon. the Postmaster General the position of humourist of the Cabinet. It is surely a joke that $24,500 of the people's money, with unlimited expenses, is to be taken in the people's name for the purpose of securing information which will enable the special interests the better to rob the people by means of tariff changes.

But there is a particularly creamy joke contained in subsection 3 of section 4 of the Bill. This clause provides authority by which the commission may hold inquiries into combines which are alleged to enhance prices. The provision reads:

> 'In the same manner as a judge of the Exchequer Court or any other judge, therein referred to, may be so empowered.'

The men appointed as political partisans to do certain work in justification of party policy, under the direction of, and reporting to the Minister of Finance, are to have the same standing as to inquiries concerning the combines to whom the government owes its existence, as a judge of any court.

I notice that the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) laid some stress upon the necessity of tariff legislation that would protect the labourer. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the labourer, the man whose capital is his labour and who must sell that capital in order to live, is in exactly the same position as the producer who depends upon the export market for the price of his products. The farmer who depends upon the export market must sell in competition with the world; and the labourer, even in the most highly protected country must sell his labour just the same in competition with the world. There is protection for the capital invested in the industries, but there is no protection for the labour that is the industriy.

It is a fact that the labourer is from time to time urged to vote for a high tariff, and it is a fact that up to the present and generally speaking he has done so; but it is not on the promise of higher wages, it is on the threat of the closed factory.

The demand for labour depends, not upon the tariff, but upon the market for the product of the factory, and the higher the tariff the greater the restriction on the demand for the product and therefore the greater the restriction on the demand for labour. At the same time, every increase in the tariff increases the cost of living to the labourer. The promises or the suggestions of benefit to the labouring classes from high tariffs have never been fulfilled and they never will be fulfilled.

The government was elected in opposition to the policy of reduction of taxation and expansion of trade. The defection of the high tariff section of the Liberal party represented in the Cabinet by the Minister of Finance aided most materially in achieving the success of the government. The interests elected the government; they are entitled to their pound of flesh and are demanding it. Admittedly it must be difficult for a government elected on the cry 'let well enough alone,' to accede to the demands of the interests on such short notice, or, in other words, to deliver the goods. But, this Tariff Commission will lay the wires through which the power will be turned on a little later.

In the meantime the interests will be kept quiet and the people will not be alarmed. If the government believes that industry can be built up and resources developed by maintaining or increasing the burden of taxation and by maintaining or increasing the restrictions on trade, they have the mandate of the people to give effect to their views. No doubt they will need a great deal of information, but it is for them to get their information by the ordinary means taken under a responsible system of government. They were elected to increase taxation and restrict trade, let them now do what they asked a mandate to enable them to do, and not seek by subterfuge of miscalled commissions to shirk full responsibility for their policy and its result.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). It is no small compliment to the merits of the legislation now before the House that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) usually the most belligerent of the opposition, glorying in strife and in his happiest mood when the strife is hottest, should be under the necessity of artificially creating the little enthusiasm he did, and that a man of his capacity and his power of language should be under the necessity of, in attacking this Bill, reading from carefully prepared sophisms, and attacking what his friends call a radical measure by excerpts from the radical press. The hon. member for Edmonton, of all men, is at his best in opposition.

If a flaw can be found in the Bill, he is the one to find it; if there is an evil present or to be anticipated, he is the one to reveal it. But, Sir, he has laboured, as he never laboured in this House before, in his attempt to attack the Bill to create a tariff board. I favour this Bill; the hon. member for Edmonton opposes it. Why does he oppose it? If I can grasp that part of his address which dealt with the Bill, he opposes it first because it is expensive—because he says it will cost something over $24,500 a year. That is the annual expense of a tariff board that is to lay the foundation facts for a fiscal policy which collects annually some $73,000,000 of revenue. The hon. gentleman made no comparative references to other countries. He made no comparative reference to the present cost in our country to show that we are going to incur any more expense than we have done before. Nor did he make any attempt to show that the method now adopted is not as good as and not much better than the one we have had hitherto. So it is impossible to say how his argument ended, if it can be called an argument at all. He then went on to say that now was a golden opportunity to reduce the tariff, because we are in prosperous times. Yet he was a member of a government which entrusted the tariff to a Minister of Finance, who for ten years propounded to the House the very opposite argument—that while times were prosperous, while things were going well, the less we interfered with the tariff the better. But the exigencies of opposition necessarily produce anomalies, and, therefore, we need not be surprised at the hon. gentleman finding himself now compelled to conflict with his own policy as a member of the previous government, and to present an argument that destroys the very theory on which that government acted.

I support this Bill, and for the simplest of all reasons, because in my judgment it goes to improve the public service. I can conceive of no other purpose in the Bill. There is no other purpose evident on its face and I can see no ghost behind it. I believe it will work out to the improvement of the public service. The task of framing a tariff in this country has been committed to this parliament by the voice of the people at every general election since there was a Canada, and never more pronouncedly than in the last general election. In that task I can see no divisions. That duty is one, and indivisible, and that duty belongs to the parliament of Canada. But,

Sir, that duty is great, and in proportion as it is great, for at every step in its performance we affect vitally the well-being of every citizen of this country; and in proportion as the responsibility for its right performance is great, in that degree should we take care that we come to its performance armed at every point and well prepared. This Bill provides the means for that preparation; it does nothing more; and it provides the means that seem to me to be suited to the immensity of the undertaking. It provides a means that can expand with the certain expansion of our industrial life.

I support the Bill because whatever this parliament has to do, if it is worth doing at all, is worth doing well, and I believe the commission to be appointed will assist us in the performance of our duty. But surely the hon. member for Edmonton and every other hon. member who has spoken can distinguish between the responsibility for the performance of duty and the procuring of means by which a duty can be well performed.

Now, this measure is opposed by His Majesty's loyal opposition, and why? There have been up to this time four hon. members on their feet, and I apprehend, from the conclusion of the arguments which they presented, that it was decided in the councils of the opposition, largely now composed of vacant chairs, that of the two evils, acceding to or opposing this Bill, the latter was the better one to choose. There was likely much disputing, and much violent disputing if we may judge from the confused and conflicting arguments presented; but when a party addresses itself to the task of engaging the allegiance of two opposite schools of thought by presenting to each of them principles that mutually destroy each other, and arguments that are mutually destructive, when that is the purpose of a party's being then we must expect anomalies and absurdities in its attitude in parliament. The first ground the opposition took was this, that there was no mandate from the country for this Bill. None of them assumed the position that there was no purpose to be served by it. One and all can see that correct and sufficient data for the framing of a tariff are a necessity, and a great one. No one would assert that we have had those data before. Hon. gentlemen opposite have evidently been taught a lesson by the last election. They have evidently learned, from the quandary in which they found themselves, when confronted with the great mass of data in the United States as against our own, when discussing the reciprocity pact; and therefore not one of them has stood in his place in the House and argued that there was not a necessity in this country for more elaborate, complete and scientific data as a foundation for tariff revision.

But they say there is no mandate for this commission. Why, the right hon. leader of the government on 40 or 50 platforms has advocated it in specific terms, and has specifically promised it if returned to power. The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) stated that he himself had heard the right hon. leader of the government on more than one occasion advocate this, but briefly. Now, there is no doubt that it was presented as a more or less prominent feature of the programme of the late opposition; it was laid before this country for its acceptance or rejection; the electorate of Canada came to the polls and signed the contract for its acceptance, and now we are asked to violate that contract. If a specific pledge of a united party prior to an election accepted by the people is not a mandate, then I ask my hon. friends how can a mandate be given? But I ask further, if a Tariff Commission had not been specifically advocated in the platform of the leader of the party prior to the election—if indeed nothing had been said of it—the people of this country have certainly entrusted the Conservative party with the task of framing a tariff. The people have certainly entrusted parliament and the government with the task of framing a tariff, and in so committing that task they give an implied mandate to the government to take the best means to carrying out that work. So that I say such an implied mandate would itself be sufficient even if a specific pledge had not been actually proffered and accepted.

What is the next objection to this Tariff Commission? It is that we could get the same information from officials in the department and that if, instead of taking officers immediately under the wing of the minister we choose to appoint a commission, we are thereby raising a barrier between the people and the government. Well, I can see no difference in principle between the gathering of information by a commission specially appointed for that purpose and obtaining it from officers directly under the control of the minister. But I can see a great difference in the practicability and thoroughness of the one method as compared with the other. In the one case we have a body of men specially appointed for the purpose of investigation and specially qualified, and divorced in proper measure from the control of the minister in charge. These men are appointed to do specific work and are responsible for the quality of the work they do. I should think, therefore, that we could obtain much better results from the work of a commission of that kind than from officials in the Customs Department who could neither be specially trained for that purpose nor have the same facilities for doing the

work. It, therefore, seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite are simply beating the air when they quote Bourinot and American constitutional precedents to show that this parliament is divesting itself of responsibility when it authorizes the government to employ a commission of experts in order that it may be put in possession of the facts and the information that is required on which to base tariff legislation. This is all the Bill does.

Then hon. gentlemen opposite proceed to argue that there is an evil spirit behind this measure that the ghost of high protection is behind it, and that it is part of a scheme by which the government hope to evade responsibility for imposing a high tariff on this country. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) said that the battle is now on between the moderate and the high protectionists of Canada. Well, I can assure my hon. friend, if that would give him any encouragement, that if the battle is on between the moderate and the high protectionists, he will find me in the army of the moderates. But where does he see the gauntlet for that battle in the Bill before us. We are told that the ghost of high protection is stalking around this measure because in the United States, which is a country of high protection, there is a Tariff Board. They say there is a Tariff Board in Japan, one in Germany and another in France, and that all these countries are protective. But when the hon. gentleman opposite cites France, Germany, Japan and the United States as countries having Tariff Boards, he should remember that these countries are the advance guard in the industrial progress of the world.

German statesmen at one time belonged to the school now represented in this House by the lonely member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). Prince Bismarck was one who once belonged to the school my hon. friend represents in Canada, but after lookink over the world, after looking especially into the record of the United States, he said that the history of that great republic was a lesson to him in industrial progress, and he thought that Germany ought to benefit by that lesson. He, therefore, in 1878 a year that is also historic in Canadian annals, abandoned free trade in Germany, and gave that country a protective policy. To-day Germany is the leader of the world in industrial growth. It has seen fit to introduce business methods into the conduct of its national affairs. It has delegated to well qualified individuals the task of collecting data on which to base legislation. That is a task we are giving to this Tariff Commission in order that it may collect and collate all the information and data possible and submit the same to the minister responsible so that he may, in his tariff legislation, carry out the will of the people. Other European countries are moving in the same direction. Hon. gentlemen opposite say to us: We do not want you to collect the facts, we do not want you to have data collected by this independent commission which you can submit to the people in order to show that the tariff you put in force is a just one. I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite should take that position. For years back the Liberal party has been an organized anomaly as regards its fiscal policy. There are in that party whole squadrons of men whose opinions are diametrically opposed on fiscal questions. The only cement that keeps them together is their opposition to the government. Now, we must either embody the principle of protection in our tariff or eliminate it. Has any hon. gentleman opposite declared that he would eliminate it? Would the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) eliminate it? Would even he, representing a constituency in the far west eliminate that principle from our tariff? He remains silent. Why, if he did, by whom would he be opposed? He would be opposed at once by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) whose spineless amendment he now supports, and he would be supported by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), possibly by some others who think that a certain local sentiment in their constituencies would back them up

And he would have the support of a section of the electors of this country who still harbour the free trade theory. These two sections are both sitting together in the opposition, both clinging to principles which cannot live together. And, while that conflict of opinion obtains among hon. gentlemen opposite they must necessarily assume absurd positions in this House. I have often felt sympathy for the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads the opposition. For between the two factions that he leads, the directly opposite schools, the right hon. gentleman has been pitchforked for twenty years, between free trade doctrines on the one side and the protectionist doctrinaires on the other, until finally he landed without any opinion at all. And the right hon. gentleman, in order to lead a party that endeavours to combine irreconcilables, has been compelled to acknowledge to the people of Canada that, between the free trade theory and the protection theory he inclines neither to the one side nor to the other. On this side, of the House, as I have previously stated, if a war was on—as the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), both devoutly hope—between the moderate protectionists and the high protectionists, I am

on the side of the moderate protectionists. I believe that in this young country, with, for a long time at least, a far greater store of natural resources than we are able to bring to a developed state at home, we must, for some time at least, follow a protectionist policy. I also believe that the best objects of protection are served by a moderate tariff, by a policy that accedes to and recognizes the interests of all classes. I believe also that the interests which each section has in that policy are not in every sense equal or in every sense uniform. I believe that, under these circumstances, the proper policy is a policy of reasonable protection doing justice to the consumer, as well as to all others.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On agricultural implements, for instance.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Yes, as on everything else. And if my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will read the address I had the honour of delivering in this House in January, 1911, he will find that I stood then where I stand now; that I stated then—not in the same words perhaps, but in words with the same meaning—just what I state to-day. And I would remind those who see evil spectres behind this Bill, those who think that clause by clause and sentence by sentence it is quite innocuous but that there is something terrible, but all unseen in this measure presented by the government, let me remind them that the Board of Tariff experts in the United States has presented several specific reports to Congress and the president, and that every recommendation made by the president in pursuance of those reports has been in favour of a revision downwards; that the Tariff Board of the United States, as between the high and the moderate protectionists—if such exists over there—has favoured the moderate protectionists every time. But no report of that body, or of any other such body that pretended to economic intelligence, has ever favoured a policy of free trade there or here. So that, I should think, if hon. gentlemen opposite could see any light at all through the confusion that exists around them, they would favour this Bill especially if they are, as stated by the hon. member for Richmond, moderate protectionists. Because wherever the Tariff Board has operated it has brought about conditions of moderate, rather than high protection.

Now, Sir, I have stated concisely my reasons for supporting this Bill, and have endeavoured to meet what I conceive to be the arguments raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. If there is any that I have missed, I would like to hear it now. If there is not, I would like to know why these hon. gentlemen oppose this Bill. Of course, they are subject to the exigencies of party warfare; they want to look both ways when the general election comes on. Unless they can say rightly or wrongly—that we are Haman's-gallows protectionists, they cannot say anything; and as they want to fight our tariff, be it good or bad, they feel they must oppose our tariff commission as well. That is practically the sole reason that animates the opposition. There can be no other.

Now, if our tariff is going to be made in a back room, if it is going to be made in the ante-room of the Stock Exchange, if it is going to be made in the private closet of a campaign committee, then I am willing to concede that the fewer facts that are presented to the public and to parliament, the better; for a system of that kind loves darkness rather than light. But, if the tariff is to be made to suit the necessities of business and of all classes of business, farming included, if the circumstances that govern it are to be business circumstances and not party political circumstances, then the more facts we have the better, and the more light we have the better. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not frame their tariff upon that principle. And, so far as they altered it and revised it, or left it alone, as time went on and as circumstances and our industrial life developed, they were animated by this principle—if you call it a principle—that their course was dictated on the one hand by political friendship and on the other hand by political antipathy. If that is to be the guiding principle of the party in power we should have no Tariff Commission, and the smaller the body of facts we have the better. But folly is the very essence of such a tariff and disaster its result; and I concede the point that darkness is its best associate and ignorance is its only fortification. I commend the government in proposing this Bill, because it is a specific implementing of a specific promise to the Canadian people. I commend it because it promises to this country that we will endeavour to get method into our business legislation, such as people who succeed introduce into their own business affairs. I think this is only a step. I do not think it will give all the results that some anticipate from it. I know that its difficulties will be much greater than many expect. But I believe that it will give some substantial results. And I believe that the principle embodied here, instead of being combatted should be extended from one department of our legislation to another until we should have more systematic and equitable laws throughout with results more generally suited to the conditions in Canada.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford). Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest and pleasure to my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, in his address in moving the second reading of this Bill. I listened

with interest, because I am always anxious to know what an hon. gentleman means by a Bill he has introduced.

I was particularly interested to hear what arguments the Finance Minister could use to justify the Bill. I listened with pleasure to the very clear, simple and excellent speech with which he moved the second reading of this Bill. I am one of those who at all times are willing to hear arguments; I am not anxious to hear arguments surcharegd with hot air from anybody or on any subject. Therefore I would not attach too much importance to the so-called arguments of some hon. gentlemen who have spoken since the Finance Minister on the other side of the House. They have not said much about the Bill, but they have had a lot to say about many other things. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have long been in favour of a statistical department in the Finance Department, well organized, for the purpose of collecting statistics and facts, as hon. gentlemen opposite call them, to afford information to the Finance Minister in compiling a tariff. I think everybody in the House recognizes that the Finance Minister, no matter which party he belongs to, requires all the information he can get when he compiles a tariff. Therefore we are all united on that point. The question is which is the better way to get that information. My own opinion is that the best way to get it is by means of a statistical branch in connection with the Finance Department, or the Customs Department, something like the Insurance branch now belonging to the Finance Department. It has been said by an hon. member opposite, I think the hon. member for St. Antoine Montreal (Mr. Ames), that in 1907 when three ministers of the late government travelled through the country getting information for the purpose of compiling a tariff, their work amounted to a farce, or words to that effect; he said they gathered a lot of material that was absolutely impossible for them to digest. Now one strong argument in favour of a statistical branch in the Finance Department is that it would not take away the purpose the late ministers had in view in travelling through the country to get information. With all due deference to my hon. friends opposite, I think they will find that the people will insist on getting access to the minister himself, that is to say, interested parties will insist on seeing the minister himself. Therefore he will not get rid of the trouble, he will not be able to avoid interviews with various interests, by appointing the proposed Tariff Commission. Nor do I think that he ought to refuse to see directly the various interests particularly interested in the tariff. Now when these three ministers belonging to the late government went through the country they came in personal contact with the people most interested in the tariff; not only that, but they became acquainted with the country through which they travelled, they visited the factories, and they endeavoured to acquire information from the working man and the farmer. Now how many farmers and how many working men will the Finance Minister see if he sits in his office and depends entirely upon the reports of the Tariff Commission? I think, even with the Tariff Commission, it will still be necessary for the Finance Minister to visit various parts of the country and get his information at first hand. But if he had the aid of such a statistical branch in his department as I am advocating, he might be able to get rid of much of this trouble.

The Minister of Finance in introducing his Bill laid stress on the fact that it gave the Tariff Commissioners authority to examine people under oath. That authority could also be given a statistical branch of the Finance Department; to summon witnesses and hear them under oath if they wished, and under section 12 of the Tariff Act, the Governor in Council have that right, now on certain conditions arising. Parliament could easily authorize the Finance Department or any other department to examine witnesses under oath in matters pertaining to the tariff. The hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, (Mr. Ames), said, and I believe he was correct, that the manufacturers and others who are interested in the tariff would be only too glad to produce their books so as to guide the tariff makers in their work. That argument would apply equally to any proposed statistical branch in the Finance Department. I belive that the officers of such proposed statistical department could travel through the country and get information just as well as the Tariff Commission, and at much less expense. After all, if we come to examine the cost my plan would be far more economical. They might find it advisable to visit the United States. It is a very necessary thing in framing a scientific tariff to ascertain the experience of other countries with which we are competing, both as to labour and material, and as some hon. gentlemen have said, as to transportation also; and all these things could be done by the officers of a statistical branch within the Finance Department.

Now then as to the expense. It is all very fine for hon. gentlemen opposite, with a large surplus at their credit, to say in the words of the girl 'Paw's rich, and Maw don't care.' But there is a vast difference between the proposed Tariff Commission and a statistical branch in the Finance Department or the Customs Department. As to expense it will be a constant source of expense. The expense of the commission

itself, that is, the salaries of the three commissioners, would be unimportant in comparison with the vast expense that will be necessarily incurred in the operation of this Tariff Commission. There are secretaries and clerks belonging to the commission, with constant travelling, all of which will amount to a very large expense.

I presume, however, that that matters little to our friends on the other side of the House; we on this side of the House have always endeavoured to be economical.

After all the most important feature of this Bill will be the personnel of the Tariff Commission. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) very naturally surmised and suggested that the Tariff Commission was urged upon my hon. friends opposite by the high tariff party. We all know that there is in Canada a class of people who are in favour of a high tariff. Personally I am a moderate tariff man, I am in favour of a moderate tariff. I am in favour of a reasonable protection, but it depends entirely on what you consider a reasonable protection. I can quite imagine that a commission of this kind or a statistical committee attached to the Finance Department, if they properly attended to their duties, could gather a very great deal of information for a minister and for the government. I can quite understand they could do a great deal of good, but I can also understand that they could do a great deal of harm. Hon. gentlemen opposite who are in business know that it would be very easy for any commission to so colour their reports to the Finance Department as to get the Finance Department to increase the tariff on any particular commodity on which they wished it increased. I can see a very grave danger if the surmise of the hon. member for South Wellington is correct that this commission has been dictated by the high tariff class, that the tariff may be raised on a very plausible theory. Every business man knows that it is a simple thing for people compiling statistics to colour the statistics, and if they will only give facts, if the commission is as innocent as it actually looks, then apart from the difference in the expense it could do just as good work as a statistical committee of the Finance Department. It would lack, however, that particular advantage of the other system that the minister himself would have to do a certain amount of travelling throughout the country to gain information. My hon. friends laughed at the old ministers when they compiled the tariff of 1907. Let me remind them for a moment that we sat here last year for three months and heard hon. gentlemen opposite extol to high Heaven that very tariff which my hon. friend who has just sat down said was no good. We heard them extol that tariff and say they did not want any change, that the tariff was absolutely perfect.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Who said that?

Mr. NESBITT. All of you said that without any exception.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. gentleman quote from 'Hansard'?

Mr. NESBITT. I will not bother hunting 'Hansard', my hon. friend knows that all of his friends said that, and said it on the platforms all over the country. First it was: Let well enough alone. Next it was: Where is it leading us, which was the same thing clothed in other words. I wish to say to my hon. friends that the tariff of 1907 compiled by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, was the best tariff ever compiled in Canada and one of the best and sanest tariffs ever compiled in the world.

My hon. friend spoke about the information which the Americans had. That information was not given by the Tariff Commission of the United States, or by the Tariff Board. Both the Tariff Board and the special Tariff Commission of the United States were appointed for the purpose of gleaning information for the Executive of the United States, and it was only last fall that any of that information was given out. It was given to the President first and only very recently, on two schedules, to the Congress of the United States. My hon. friends say they cannot change the tariff until they get the Tariff Commission appointed and get the information. Then will it not be a long time before we have any change? It has taken the Tariff Board of the United States, if I mistake not, two years to make a report on the wool and iron schedules, let alone all the schedules that have to be gone over. My hon. friend who has just sat down told us how Bismarck sat on his throne and looked abroad across the world and saw the United States advancing more rapidly than Germany and so adopted a scientific tariff in Germany. Let me remind my hon. friends that it was only last week or the week before that they had an election in Germany and the socialists gained unprecedentedly and they are in favour of lower tariff. In the United States whichever party wins either the presidential elections or the next congressional elections, will support a lower tariff. Therefore, if there is anything in what my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) says that this Tariff Commision is simply appointed by the high tariff class in this country, there would, in my judgment, be very grave danger. I do not think we should have two classes in this country. I think the government of Can-

ada should be here to serve the interests of the whole people not of any class of the people, and I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, no matter what pressure may be brought to bear upon him, will be above catering to the views of the high tariff party and will make a tariff, whenever it is brought down, that will be just as much in the interests of the farmer and of the working man as in the interests of those who want to make fortunes in a day.

I do not know much about my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White). As I said I was pleased with the way he introduced his Bill. I, of course, know that words sometimes count for very little; some people use words to express their thoughts and others to hide them; I hope my hon. friend is not one of the latter class, and that he will carry out what he told us was the intention of his party. I am strongly in favour of a department within the Finance Department and also of the ministers gathering by themselves for their own use, by contact with the people, all the information that they can gather with reference to the compiling of a tariff.

There are certain errors and anomalies no doubt in the present tariff, but that is a condition which it is impossible to avoid, because changes may take place in a business any day that would make the tariff bear hardly in some direction. But taking it as a whole, I do not think there is any man on either side of this House, who can justly say a word against the present tariff. I am sorry the Minister of Finance was not able to give us some idea of the personnel of this commission, because we could speak very much more intelligently as to the merits of the Bill if we knew from what class of the community these commissioners would be drawn. On a question of this kind you want men of ability, it is true, but you want men of more than ability, you want men of unprejudiced mind, and I need not say that there are few people in this country who have absolutely unprejudiced minds. Even the judges on the bench have to be there sometimes for a number of years before they can look at a question with an unprejudiced mind. Therefore, you want on this commission men of ability and of wideness of business knowledge, and above all, of unprejudiced views, if they are going to serve the purpose which is intended by the Minister of Finance. I would also urge on the minister that when the Bill gets into Committee of the Whole, he will reconsider his intention to appoint a permanent commission. There is no reason in the world why the commissioners should not stay on that board so long as they are giving service, but, on the other hand, if a commissioner be not satisfactory, there should be power in the minister to remove him. Under the wording of the Act as at present, it would require on the part of the Minister of Finance a great deal of force of character to remove any one of these men. We are told that these commissioners are supposed to look into the cost of labour, but, surely, that ought to be the work of the Department of Labour, and if the Department of Labour is doing its duties, and has the statistics it should have, then it ought to be known what is paid for labour in every line of business throughout the country. But, there can be no particular hurry about the passage of this Bill, and I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that now, having introduced it, he should let it stand over until next session so as to allow the different Boards of Trade and other bodies throughout the country to think it over, and to formulate their opinion with regard to the proposal. So far as I am personally concerned, I think it is impossible for the Minister of Finance, or for the government, to have too much information before it in compiling a tariff, if they wish to do justice to the people of the country generally. I repeat that the Minister of Finance would have been more wisely advised had he formed a tariff bureau within his own department, and by means of which I am certain he could compile just as good a tariff as he can by utilizing the services of such a board as this.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). The Minister of Finance must be highly gratified at the reception his Bill has received at the hands of the members of the House. From the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who spoke first for the opposition, to the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) who spoke last, all of them without exception have stated that so far as the Bill itself is concerned, they have little or no fault to find with it. Nearly all the arguments on the opposite side of the House have been based on the supposition of some sinister motive which they fear will be brought into the administration of this law and in regard to the appointment of the commissioners. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) made only two points in connection with the Bill, and in support of one of them he quoted the following from a speech made by the right hon. the Prime Minister:

> My idea of a tariff is one which would give the industries of this country a fair chance and more than a fair chance perhaps, to stand up against competition in countries where it may be the standard of living among the labouring people is lower than in Canada and lower than it ought to be anywhere. That is a reasonable proposition. A permanent tariff commission if established would be

the most fitting authority to decide on this point.

Now, if there can be found anywhere a clear cut clean statement of principle in regard to the protection of all the labouring classes of this country, it is to be found in that statement, and yet we find the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) leaving out the true application of these words and endeavouring to make them apply only as between the producers and the consumers of this country. Later on, the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) said:

> If they can have more than a fair chance somebody is going to suffer; it is at the expense of somebody else. At whose expense is it to be? Certainly at the expense of the great consuming masses of this country.

Now, that is a most unfair deduction from the words of the Prime Minister; no greater misstatement could be found anywhere than is to be found in that paragraph, and yet it is upon them that the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) based almost his entire argument.

The right hon. leader of the government clearly and distinctly said that in his opinion the people of Canada, in competition with nations having a lower standard of living and a lower wage scale, should have fair protection and a fair chance to build up their industries; and yet the hon. member deliberately misquoted the application of the principle so clearly laid down. If there is one reason more than another why at this particular time I give this Bill my unqualified support, it is that hon. gentlemen opposite have played with skilled fingers on the instrument to produce discord between the various classes and portions of this Dominion. They have over and over again endeavoured to set the manufacturer against the farmer and one province against another. If there were no other reason, that reason alone would more than justify us in introducing this Bill, because when it comes to be thoroughly understood throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion that there is a commission appointed by the government of Canada, with full authority and power to act independently, to gather statistics of fact, and to collate them, not on behalf of the manufacturer, not on behalf of one class or another, but in all their relationships with each other, it will I believe do more to do away with that feeling of mistrust than any other thing that could possibly be conceived by this government. If there is one thing about which I have had a feeling of disgust since I became a member of this parliament, it has been this, that day after day, as we open our post office boxes, we find there special pleading for certain Bills that are asked for in this House, and that we find our corridors filled with lobbyists making special pleas on behalf of some concessions which they desire to obtain. I venture to say that if we have this independent commission appointed, it will to a very large extent check that practice, because every member of this House will have placed in his hands accurate information on which he may base his judgment. When a member on this side of the House ventured to ask the hon. member for South Wellington whether he was in favour of protection or not, his answer was: 'A tariff for revenue only.' That is not a new term in this House or throughout this country, and for a moment or two I would like to say what I conceive to be the meaning of a tariff for revenue only, and compare it with what we call a protective tariff. The principle of a tariff for revenue only is something like the principle applied at the Donnybrook fair, whereever you see a head hit it—wherever you see a dollar, grab it. If I understand the distinction between the two parties, it is this. While both parties agree that we shall raise the revenues of this country by means of a tariff, those in favour of a tariff for revenue only are men who, disregarding all other interests, disregarding what the effect may be on the industries of the country—on the producer, the consumer, the mechanic, the labourer or the artisan—are prepared to get revenue at any cost and under any conditions, whereas those of us who are protectionists go further and say that it is our duty, in taxing the people, to see that the tariff is laid down equitably as between all classes of the community, and is so applied that every industry in the country is amply protected and nurtured in order that it may increase and grow and prosper.

If I understand it aright, that is the cardinal difference between our friends in opposition and our friends on this side of the House. For that reason we believe that we should give careful consideration to the probable effect of every duty imposed. Knowing the intricacy of making a tariff, probably the most intricate of all the duties of a government, we believe that by gathering all the facts bearing upon the relations between the producer and the consumer, the relations between the trade of this country and the trade of foreign countries, the freight charges between the east and the west, how they apply and modify or increase the amount of protection on any particular article, we should have a thoroughly scientific tariff. The assertion made by hon. members opposite that to say we are in favour of a protective tariff means that we are in favour of an increased duty, can easily be shown to be not in accord with the facts. Over and over again the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) has shown in this House that in the actual amount of taxes taken from the people of Canada

there has been less than one per cent of difference between the so-called revenue tariff and the tariff as applied for protective purposes under the Conservative government. So that, taking the facts as they are, we find that we can give a reasonable protection that will build up our industries and develop our home markets without increasing the amount of taxes taken from the people of the Dominion. This is our reason for earnestly desiring that we should have placed in our hands all the facts bearing upon the framing of a tariff. The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) said: You are appointing a commission in order that you may do away with responsible government, and in order that this commission may stand between the Finance Minister or the government and the people. I venture to say that in that, as in his other arguments, the hon. gentleman was far astray. He spent a large portion of his time in reading extracts to show what the duties of a Royal Commission were.

Let me ask the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), what is the attitude of all railway corporations throughout the world to-day? Each of these corporations has a bureau for collecting statistical information. If you were to ask the president of any railway company on what the company is guided in its conduct of the road, he will tell you that it is largely guided by the facts furnished by its statistical bureau. Surely no one in this House will venture to say that the staffs of these bureaus of statistics appointed to collect the facts, are the men who are really managing and regulating the policies of these railway companies.

Another argument advanced is that by the appointment of this commission, we are doing away with constitutional government, and making these Tariff Commissmissioners the real framers of the tariff. Let me give another illustration to show the fallacy of that argument. I had the privilege of listening the other evening to Sir Edmond Byron Walker when he gave a sketch of the operations of the large financial institution of which he is the head. After he had placed before his hearers very clearly some salient facts in connection with the progress of that institution, he said:

> If there is any gentleman present who at any time, when any trade question arises, would like to avail himself of the information possessed by our bureau of statistical information he is welcome to it. By simply sending word we will be pleased to place at his disposal all the facts connected with trade questions.

What was the important point brought out by that statement of Sir Edmond Walker, who is at the head of one of the largest financial institutions in Canada? Sir Edmond realized that no institution could act promptly or formulate any policy with regard to trade unless the facts were in its possession, and he ventured to say that the Bank of Commerce had at its disposition one of the best means of ascertaining all facts in connection with trade and commerce that could be found in the Dominion, but would anybody venture to say that because these banking institutions have each a bureau for gathering statistical facts to enable them to better administer the funds entrusted to their care, the directors were delegating to the men they appointed to collect those statistics the management of these institutions? I do not think any hon. member would have the hardihood to make any assertion of the kind, but hon. gentlemen opposite do not hesitate to take that ground when it enables them to criticise a policy of the government. All that these Tariff Commissioners will be appointed to do is merely to collect and collate all the facts in connection with the various industries of this country. They will then place these facts before the minister, who in turn will submit them to the government and the House. There is a clause providing that, under certain conditions, the members of the commission may withhold secret confidential information obtained by them in the course of their investigation. Every hon. member will realize the necessity of a provision of that kind. Hon. members will see the necessity of reporting the facts to the minister who administers the revenues of this country, and who will use his discretion and judgment in giving these facts to the House. In my opinion this Bill is a step taken in advance legislation, and I am glad that the government have had the courage to implement the promise made in this connection by the right hon. the First Minister. The bringing down by him of this Bill will be a great factor in restoring business confidence throughout all portions of this Dominion.

In the late campaign, I was able, owing to the very unusual and peculiar circumstances to give a unique illustration of how this tariff will work out under certain conditions. It was largely owing to these peculiar conditions that I gained the great majority which I did in the last election. Hon. members who were here last session will remember that in the discussion on reciprocity, the hon. member for Nanaimo and the hon. ex-Minister of Inland Revenue took the position that the proposed reciprocal tariff would be a great advantage to the coal mining industry throughout the Dominion. I took exception to that position, and owing to very unusual and peculiar circumstances which

arose in the west, I was able to vindicate the position I took. I would like to cite my experience to the House, in order that hon. members may see the necessity for our having every information possible before making any changes in the tariff. On either flank of the Rocky mountains, according to Prof. Shortt of Nova Scotia, is the largest coal field in the Dominion, if not on the American continent. The largest of these coal areas, 80 per cent, are situated in the riding of Kootenay, which I have the honour to represent. The coal operators took the same view as did the hon. member for Nanaimo and the hon. the ex-Minister of Inland Revenue, namely, that the proposed reciprocal tariff would open to them a large market to the south of the line, and therefore be of great advantage to them. I took the ground, however, judging by past experience, that it was to the interest of Canadian trade as well as the trade of that particular district, that we should manufacture that coal and coke in our own country. During the election, and for several months previously, there had been a strike in that district and the coal mines were not being operated. What was the result? The result was that the Granby smelter, the second largest on the American continent, was shut down; following this, the metalliferous mines closed and 8,000 men were thrown out of employment. I was able to point out to those idle men that the reason these mines were not working was because there was no coal or coke going from east to west. In this great riding of Kootenay we have three railway divisional points, Cranbrook, Nelson and Revelstoke. The railway crews were all idle except a few who were working on a third or half time, because there was no coal or coke going from east to west. Remove the tariff on coke, I pointed out, and allow it to go south instead of east and west, and you will remain permanently idle. That smelter will remain closed, your metalliferous mines will not reopen, and you will have 8,000 or 10,000 men coming in competition with the coal miners, right in the coal district of the Crowsnest Pass.

I will demonstrate that to you. You will remember that Mr. J. J. Hill, the father of this reciprocity movement, bought the control of the Crowsnest Pass Company. He then commenced to ship his coke and coal south. And we found it to be necessary to apply to the provincial government, threatening to put an export duty on coal and coke in order to keep our smelters running. On the face of it, it looked as if the broader market would be a great advantage to our people. But when they realized that the coke going south to the smelters of the United States and the coal to supply the railways of the United States would be hauled, not from the divisional points of Cranbrook, Nelson and elsewhere, but from the divisional points of the American roads, destroying these towns, and closing our mines and smelters, they saw the force of the argument. And the result was, that I received over ninety per cent of the total labouring vote. I give this as an illustration of some of the necessities of looking carefully into the results in all the relations of the tariff.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GOODEVE. When you left the Chair at six o'clock I had just given an illustration of one of the effects of the tariff, and was showing how it was inter-related to so many other industries in the province of British Columbia. I will not attempt to work out in detail the result of the tariff on that particular industry, as my object was simply to make an illustration of the necessity of a commission of this kind in order to ascertain all the facts, and bring them before the House and the people. We have another great industry in our province, namely, zinc and lead. This is probably one of the most technical and complicated of the natural resources we have in the Dominion. They are a class of metals that are difficult to handle, and yet are used in nearly every industry in Canada. We had a clear illustration of that principle a number of years ago, when all the Boards of Trade in the Dominion of Canada met in the provincial House in the city of Toronto, with the president of the Toronto Board of Trade in the chair. At that time we were seeking in British Columbia to obtain a readjustment of the old tariff, and it was pointed out how the whole industry of the manufacture of agricultural implements would be affected by any change in that particular tariff. But the result of our getting together and frankly discussing the entire situation in all its bearings, was that we were able to induce the government to make some slight alteration in the tariff, with the result that there was established in the city of Montreal a large corroding work in which a large amount of capital is invested, and which has been a great employer of labour. Here is one of the natural resources of an outlying province, away out on the Pacific coast, and yet it directly and indirectly affects a great industry in the largest commercial city in the Dominion of Canada. There again is an illustration of the necessity for actual information in regard to these matters which concern the tariff.

Then we have another great natural resource in that province, one that has been recently discussed in this House, I refer to the great lumber industry, the one in which probably more capital is invested than in any other industry in our province, and one which is vital to the prosperity and growth of our province. Now I think every hon. member will admit there has been an effort made by nearly every hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House to try and set the farmer against any protection of that great industry in our province. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the relation of that industry to the Bill before the House; I merely want to say that every lumberman in the province of British Columbia, yes, every lumberman throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion from Nova Scotia westward, would welcome a thorough investigation into their business, and I believe it could be shown, and would be shown, that it is not only in the interest of this great industry itself, but in the interest as well of the farmers and of all other people in this Dominion, that that industry should receive protection. So along these broader lines, not in any narrow way, but in the very broadest way, we believe this Bill is a great step in the right direction, because we think it will engender a confidence in the minds of all classes of the community. We believe in no other way could the same confidence be engendered in the minds of the people as by the appointment of this independent commission, which would be free from the control of parliament, and would be just as independent as the Railway Commission, which has won the confidence of the people of Canada. It is because I believe also, Mr. Speaker, that it will bring the consumer and the producer together and will thus be in the interest of the worker and the labouring man as well as the manufacturer, that I am strongly in favour of this Bill. I want to say that I have absolutely no sympathy with the little provincials, men whose vision is bounded by the gate posts of their front yard and the pumphandle in their back yard, men who would cut and carve this great Dominion into small sections, divided by schisms, men whose souls are shrunken by the dollars that they would tie around them. We take a broader view of the destiny of this great country. Indeed it is difficult for us to grasp the great future of this wondrous Dominion of ours. In addition to the music caused by the rustling of the golden grain on our wind swept prairies, in addition to the lowing of the kine and the bleating of the sheep on its foothills, we should yet see great factories established in our western districts, making use of our inexhaustible supplies of coal and iron, and yet cheaper raw materials of natural gas and electrical energies of our great water-powers, giving employment to an ever increasing population in varied industries. I call the attention of this House to the fact that there lies in our great west, not only the magnificent coal-bearing strata to which I have referred, but the very cheapest power known in the civilized world to day. We have this great glacier bed producing electricity in abundance, we have natural gas in abundance, we have the iron, we have the coal, we have everything that goes to form the basic necessities for a wonderful manufacturing development. On that ground I appeal to this House, to both sides of this House, in support of this Bill. We should not treat this as a political matter, we should seek the best way of developing every portion of this far-flung empire. On that ground, believing as I do not only in interprovincial, inter-dominion and inter-imperial trade, believing as I do that in working together along the lines outlined by this Bill, we can build up in this great Dominion the brightest gem in the greatest commercial empire the world has ever seen, I shall have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, New Brunswick). I do not know whether I would come within the class of the narrow, contracted back yard politicians that my hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve) has been so graphically describing, or whether I would be one of the empire builders that he has spoken of in the latter part of his peroration. But, Sir, unfortunately perhaps for myself, I am unable to arrive at the same conclusion as the hon. gentleman in regard to the value or necessity of this Bill. I think that no person can find fault with the government for attempting to get information on every question which enters into the lives of the Canadian people; and if I believed that this Bill was only for the purpose of getting accurate information on all the great trade questions, I could not find very much fault with it. I am bound to assume that the Minister of Finance is sincere when he tells us that he wants to get information. Perhaps it would not be derogatory to the hon. gentleman—I am sorry he is not in the House at this moment—to tell him that he has not been in public life very long; he does not know the wiles of the deceptive politician, and until we have some evidence to the contrary, it is only fair to say that he is sincere in trying to get the information.

Let us look for a moment at the origin and history of the scheme which has resulted in bringing down this Bill. We had not any difficulty when our friends were in power in getting information on which to frame a Tariff Bill. In 1897 and in 1907 the ministers of the Crown made an itiner-

ary over the Dominion of Canada. They gathered a lot of information, they codified that information, and on that information they framed a Tariff Bill. I remember distinctly that instead of finding fault with these gentlemen for getting the information, fault was found that they were spending too much time over it. But let that be as it will, the late government were able to frame a tariff under which Canada prospered more in the next ten years than she had ever done in all her previous history. If conditions had remained as favourable as they were during those ten years, then I cannot say that there would have been much need of a change. But conditions change in Canada as well as in all other parts of the world, and the time came when the government found it necessary, in the course of eight or ten years more, to make another itinerary of Canada to see what the changed conditions were. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson, with a very able secretary, whom I am sorry to say is not now in the employ of the government, travelled from one end of this country to the other, they obtained further information, and on this further and additional information they framed the Tariff Act of 1907. There were not many changes made, perhaps not as many changes as some of us would have liked to see made; but I maintain that the viciousness which has sprung from the tariff had not commenced to show itself in 1900 or in 1907 as it does at the present day. Therefore, as there are changed conditions, we need a change in the tariff.

It is in the mind of every hon. member in this House, of every thinking man in Canada, that the time has come when there will be a change in our tariff relations. It has been argued here that all over the world where the highest tariffs prevail we have had the greatest prosperity and three-quarters of the speakers on the other side of the House have instanced Germany and the United States as evidence of the greatest prosperity and have ascribed that prosperity to a high protective tariff. If that be true, it is a remarkable thing that in all of these countries a very serious agitation is going on to get a reduction of these high protective tariffs. I spent a few days in Germany last summer and although I was not able to make as extensive economic investigations as I would like, every man I was able to talk with, and I am sorry their number was not large, claimed that the taxation was something terrific, the cost of living almost beyond endurance and what with the taxation and the army and navy they could not tell what was going to happen. It was prophesied to me by many people that the result of the next election would show a wonderful increase in the representation of the Socialists, and the elections have shown this prophecy to have been well founded. We know that the doctrine of the Socialists is not only to get rid of the army and navy expenditure, but to get rid of high protection as well, because high protection in Germany is producing to a very great extent the same results as it is producing in the United States and in Canada.

I come now to the greatest example of high protection the world has seen, the United States. I do not think my hon. friends the high protectionists of Canada will claim that the great development in the United States is altogether due to high protection. The United States would have developed in the last 50 years if they had not had a tariff at all. The very richness of their soil, the prodigality of their natural products, the great influx of population from all over the world, naturally make the United States great. The United States would have become a great country without a tariff. If they had resorted to direct taxation, they would have had an enormous prosperity, but they would not have had the conditions that they have to-day, the trusts, mergers and combines, with which they are now contending. The result of this high protection has been to create these trusts, mergers and combines, and now we have a revulsion of feeling, almost amounting to a revolution in the United States against the condition of affairs which the tariff has created. A year and a half ago when elections were held over a great portion of the United States, the high protection party was swept out of power from end to end of that country. It is hard to tell what may take place in the next elections owing to conflicting interests, all we have to do is to read the papers and there we will see that there is the same unrest in the United States to-day as there was two years ago and I do not think a person can be blamed for prophesying that no matter which party may come into power as the result of the next election there will be a reduction of tariffs and the voice of the people will be a protest against the high taxation under which they are groaning now. Take any newspaper in the United States, take the Boards of Trade, take any expression of public opinion and there you will find simply one outcry against the enormous cost of living.

Coming to the Dominion of Canada, we find exactly the same condition of affairs, we find the same outcry going up from the people against the high cost of living. Who are better able to judge the political and the public barometer than our protectionist friends or the Manufacturers' Association? We find that away back in 1909 the Manufacturers' Association at their annual conference first intimated or proposed this idea of a Tariff Commission

and a resolution was passed at that meeting embodying this doctrine and suggesting that the government should appoint such a commission. We heard very little about that Tariff Commission for the next year or two. It is true that just before the election the right hon. the leader of this House (Mr. Borden) advocated it as a plank in his platform. But let me show you what was the attitude of the gentlemen who were the originators and the fathers of this scheme, who have urged it along and who will benefit by it. When you learn the views of these gentlemen you will not have much difficulty in arriving at a conclusion as to who is behind this scheme and whom it will benefit and what the result and general scope of the investigations of this commission will be.

I find that at the meeting of the Manufacturers' Association held in Toronto in October last this matter was referred to by practically every speaker who discussed tariff questions. I have no quarrel with the Manufacturers' Association as individual members of the community. They are gentlemen who are working in their own interests and when working in their own interests they probably believe they are working in the interests of Canada. They are controlling large industries, they are doing a great work for Canada, and I do not wish to say anything derogatory to the individual members. I do, however, say and I think I shall not be contradicted that the one aim and object of the Manufacturers' Association as an association is to secure as much protection as they possibly can for their manufactured products and to obtain their raw materials free of duty, wherever it is possible to do so. That I take as being the aim and object of the Manufacturers' Association of Canada. This matter was referred to by President Rowley in his address. He concludes that address as follows:

> No matter what the cost may be, and no matter whose toes may be trodden upon, let us first get our tariff right and fair——

That is right and fair from the manufacturers' standpoint.

> —then let us ensure its stability, making from time to time only such slight modifications as the changed conditions of the country demand. As manufacturers we should be able, we should be willing to view the creation of a Tariff Commission with complacency; so I hope we will all facilitate this work as far as we can, by giving such data as we are able to supply.

You do not find any protest on the part of the Manufacturers' Association. The president says: Let us get our tariff right and fair and as manufacturers we can view the workings of this commission with complacency. But that is mild compared with statements made by the chairman of the Tariff Branch of the commission, Mr. Russell, of the Russell Motor Car Company of Toronto. Mr. Russell makes a very exhaustive report on practically every branch of the Canadian manufacturing industries, and when he comes to this particular branch he makes some remarks which I think are of more than ordinary importance when we consider the manner in which certain gentlemen on the other side of the House have received the suggestions or perhaps stronger terms which we have used against this Bill. The right hon. leader himself, I thought with more heat than was really necessary or perhaps entirely proper in view of the splendid work which the Manufacturers' Association did for him in September last, took particular pains to disavow any connection with the Manufacturers' Association and even went so far as to say that only one member of that association had ever spoken to him about it and that member was opposed to it.

Well, we have to take the word of the right hon. gentleman, but I would like to know if the Minister of Finance would pledge his word to the same extent and I would like to know if the Minister of Trade and Commerce would make the same declaration as the Prime Minister has made. Does the Conservative party expect the people to believe that the Manufacturers' Association are not the originators of this scheme? Are not the men who are behind the Manufacturers' Association the men who are pushing this legislation along and are they not the men who will benefit by it? Why, you only have to take the history of the Conservative party since 1878, and the question is answered. The Manufacturers' Association and the high protectionists are the men who want this legislation and it is to pay them for their magnificent support in September last, and to carry out the principle advocated by them in all these years that this Bill is being promulgated. I make bold to say that on account of that very thing, more than anything else, I am opposed to this Bill. The Minister of Finance told us, and the supporters of the government have reiterated the statement, that it was never intended that the commission would have anything to do with making laws, and that the information they collect will be handed to the government and the government will frame the tariff as the government sees fit. That is true, taking the literal wording of the Bill, but what are the views of Mr. Russell, Chairman of the Tariff Branch of the Manufacturers' Association? I quote from 'Industrial Canada' for November, 1911, the words of Mr. Russell:

> Usually commissions which have been appointed have been appointed for administra-

tive work, for carrying out administration. This commission has to do an entirely different thing. It has to do no administration work but law-making work, the actual making of the laws; the making of the laws for which the parliament of Canada will be responsible. The composition of that Tariff Commission and its ability to obtain information, the use which will be made of that information, whether public or private, and all that sort of thing is going to be of tremendous importance to the whole of Canada and to the manufacturng interests perhaps specially, and I think it is of tremendous importance that our tariff committee for this coming year shall be seized with the importance of that and prepare their recommendations accordingly.

Well, Sir, when you read that statement of the chairman of the Tariff Branch of the Manufacturers' Association, you have the whole thing in a nutshell; you have the very thing that the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) contended for; you have the very thing for which the Liberal party of Canada is contending today, and you have the pith of the reasons why we are asked to pass this legislation. Does anyone mean to tell me that the government are going to appoint a commission which will cost from $50,000 to $100,000 a year and keep this commission doing nothing else but investigating? Remember that this commission is only going to make such investigation as the Minister of Finance requires them to make and that when the Minister of Finance asks this commission to make an investigation into the cost of production of any article in Canada and they submit a report of their findings, does any man mean to tell me that the government will not accept the findings of that commission in framing their tariff? Why did the government appoint this commission, why did the government give this commission such powers, why spend all this money on it if they do not accept their recommendation? No matter how you work it out, indirectly this commission is to make the tariff law of Canada.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will the hon. gentleman show me any clause in the Bill which authorizes the commission to recommend any particular line of action?

Mr. CARVELL. I am surprised that my hon. friend asked me that question. I tell my hon. friend that section 4 of this Bill provides what are the duties of the commission and the hon. gentleman cannot show me where that commission has power to make one bit of investigation except under the direction and at the instigation of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell), has not answered my question. The hon. gentleman said that if this commission made a recommendation the government would be bound to follow it, and I say there is no clause in the Bill which provides for any such thing.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think my hon. friend does his intelligence the justice which it demands. In the first place I never said so. I said that no man could conceive of a government going to all that expense, and all this trouble unless they were to accept the findings of this commission, and I repeat it. And my hon. friend knows, and I repeat it, that they have no power to investigate anything except what they are directed to investigate by the Minister of Finance, or by the government, and my hon. friend knows they will make no investigation into anything only what they are told to investigate. I go further and I say that my hon. friend ought to know that they will only investigate that which the government wants them to investigate, and if the government wants to put a duty on a certain article they will send the commission after it, and they will be pretty liable to get the evidence which, in their opinion, will justify them in raising the duty. I believe this Bill should not be adopted because it is misleading; it will not produce the results expected of it in the way of taking evidence. The whole object of this Bill and the only powers conferred on the commission under this Bill are to investigate into cost, price, transportation, labour, &c., when so directed by the minister. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), spoke last night on this question, and he is a gentleman whose honesty when discussing tariff matters I always admire. The hon. member (Mr. Ames) told the whole story. He said that these gentlemen need not necessarily be Conservatives in order to have a place on this commission, but he said they must be high protectionists.

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

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend will not quarrel with me very much when I say that that means that they must be protectionists.

Mr. AMES. Yes, but I did not say anything about high protectionists.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames), said they are going to appoint a commission of protectionists, and he says this commission will not have any trouble in getting evidence, because, he says: 'we will furnish the evidence.' Well, that is just what we object to. When the minister sends out the commission to investigate the cost of boots and shoes, of course 'we'

will furnish the evidence, and 'we' will take mighty good pains to see that no evidence gets before the commission except the evidence which justifies either a retention of the present duties or an increase as high as my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) can get it. That is the kind of evidence that this commission will get, and that is one reason why I object to it. I object to it again, because of the secret clauses in it. I do not believe the present parliament has any right to pry into a man's private affairs. The result of this will be that nine-tenths of the evidence which is adduced before this commission—because remember the only evidence we will have in the ordinary working out of it will be the evidence of the manufacturers themselves—will be evidence which the protectionists and the protectionists commission will consider as confidential, and therefore the public will not be allowed to have it.

The result will be that we shall have findings by this commission, but we shall not have the evidence on which those findings are based. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), last evening said that we on this side of the House should welcome this commission as a means of getting information, but in the working out of this scheme, we shall have very little information. There will be confidential information given to the commission, but we shall have only the conclusions of the commission without seeing the information on which its conclusions have been reached. There has been considerable talk here about the necessity for information. I do not think anybody denies the necessity for information, but I do not believe there is much necessity for more information than we have at the present time. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about this haphazard tariff; but this haphazard tariff has got along pretty well so far as Canada is concerned, and the people of Canada have got along pretty well under that tariff. If you went to-day to the Departments of Trade and Commerce, Finance and Customs, I believe that you would get pretty nearly as much information as you would require in order to come to a pretty good conclusion as to what is necessary in framing a tariff for any branch of Canadian industry. I wonder if the hon. member for St. Antoine thinks that it is necessary to appoint a Tariff Commission to tell the government whether the duty of 30 per cent on boots and shoes should be retained in the interest of this country, or raised to 35 or 40 per cent, when the fact is known to every man who thinks in Canada that the hides from which leather for those boots and shoes is made comes into this country free of duty. We had the admission of the hon. member for St. Antoine in this House the other evening that with a preference of only 5 per cent the Canadian manufacturers of boots and shoes could wrest the trade of Australia away from the United States; and then he tells us that we cannot make boots and shoes in Canada to compete with those from the United States without 30 per cent protection. Does he think the government wants further information on that point? If they ask the hon. member for St. Antoine, they will get all the information they want.

Mr. AMES. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the boot and shoe manufacturers of Canada were never able to persuade the Conservative government that they needed over 25 per cent protection, but that the Liberal government gave them 30 per cent without their asking for it?

Mr. CARVELL. I was not a member of that government, and, therefore, I cannot answer my hon. friend's question; but I can hardly believe it—I do not say that offensively. If the hon. gentleman wants us to believe that the boot and shoe manufacturers of Canada never asked for more protection during the days of the Conservative government, they were a different class of people from the men who are manufacturing boots and shoes in Canada to-day. Now, my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) this afternoon stated that he was not a high protectionist, but a low protectionist. Well, I have always a great deal of confidence in anything which that hon. gentleman says, because in my judgment he is one of the ablest men and possesses one of the best reasoning minds in this House. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie does not require information from a Tariff Commission to show him that the time has come when the duty on farm machinery should be reduced, because last year he introduced a resolution into this House, and spoke upon it on more than one occasion, declaring that the time had come when the duty on agricultural implements should be reduced. Do the other hon. gentlemen from western Canada want any further evidence? The manufacturers of farm machinery in Canada last year not only supplied two-thirds or more of the home market, but exported between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000 of farm machinery to all the civilized countries of the globe, in competition with the whole world. In the face of that fact, do these hon. gentlemen want any further evidence from an expert Tariff Commission to enable them to decide whether the duty on farm machinery should be retained at 17½ per cent, or reduced? I will tell you in what respect I think the evidence of an expert Tariff Commission will be useful to our hon. friends opposite. The primary

object of this measure is, I believe, to get at just such wavering minds as the hon. member for Portage la Prairie and other members from the western portion of this Dominion. In 1907 thirteen hon. members supporting the Conservative party did not want any further evidence to convince them that the time had arrived when the duty should be taken off agricultural implements, and I see two or three of those gentlemen before me to-night. So firmly were they convinced of the necessity of that demand that on the third reading of the Tariff Bill they moved an amendment, and compelled their own leader to vote against it, in order to put themselves on record; and these men have gone through western Canada from that day to this parading the fact that they had voted for the reduction or abolition of the duty on farm machinery. These hon. gentlemen did not want any further evidence in 1907; the hon. member for Portage la Prairie did not want any further evidence last year; but the government wants further evidence, because the government wants to show these men that they are wrong—and see how simple it is. The government appoints this commission; it hands over to it a certain statement; it says we want you to investigate the question of the duty on farm machinery, and give us the evidence that will convince the hon. member for Portage la Prairie that he is wrong; and in all probability they will produce the evidence. That is one of the reasons I am opposing this Bill. But it may be said that I am imputing bad faith, that I am drawing conclusions not warranted by the facts. I say I am not.

That is the logical conclusion of this Bill which is forced upon the government by the Manufacturers' Association. It is the logical conclusion of this Bill which only gives the commissioners the right to get information when directed to do so by the Finance Minister. It is the logical conclusion of a Bill which only enables the tariff commissioners to get the sort of information the Finance Minister may require. It these commissioners were at liberty to gather information at their own discretion and of their own free will, without dictation from anybody, one of the great objections to this measure would be removed. But if they had such power, that would defeat the very purpose of this legislation, because we might get a man on that commission who would have sufficient industry to do some work on his own initiative and who would summon before the commission parties who would not give the kind of evidence which the government required. Therefore the government have taken precaution to muzzle their own appointees so that they will not be able to do anything except what they are directed to do.

Do the government want information from an expert tariff commission to tell them whether it is necessary to grant a bounty to the manufacturers of iron in this country, after these manufacturers have received some $15,000,000 in bounties in the last 15 or 18 years? Surely not. Do the people of this country believe that the iron and steel industry needs a bounty? I am not going to talk bounties now because we shall probably have an opportunity later on to discuss them.

Mr. AMES. What does your hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) say?

Mr. CARVELL. I have no care for the opinions of any man on earth on this question. I am giving my own. Let me tell you, Sir, that when the Dominion Iron people were trying to get the bounties renewed last year, their great plea was that by the reciprocity agreement they were going to lose eight cents per ton on coal and therefore ought to be recouped by a duty on steel rods. Well, the duty on coal was not removed, yet they are coming here asking the government to make them a present of a half a million or a million dollars more in the shape of a bounty. Do my friends from western Canada, who are not directly interested in the manufacture of iron and steel, want any evidence to convince them that a bounty is unnecessary? I should say not.

I come to another item. I think it was the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) who wanted evidence regarding the cement industry. I am surprised that there should be a man in Canada who wants further evidence in order to come to a conclusion as to whether or not the duty should be retained on cement, after the evidence given by Sir Sanford Fleming during the last eight or nine months. Sir Sanford Fleming gave evidence which was incontrovertible. He proved that some shrewd capitalists bought up practically all the cement industries in the country for $12,000,000, merged them into a combine, issued $7,000,000 of bonds, and $10,000,000 of preferred stock, and placed that stock on the market at par. They paid for the property and had $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 to the good, then they issued $13,000,000 of common stock, which is now selling at 28 cents on the dollar.

Mr. EDWARDS. How much did the Liberal party propose to reduce that duty by the reciprocity agreement?

Mr. CARVELL. Eight cents per barrel.

Mr. EDWARDS. How does that compare with the duty imposed by the United States?

Mr. CARVELL. It brings it to about the same.

Mr. EDWARDS. I beg your pardon, it did not.

Mr. CARVELL. If that came from any other hon. gentleman, I would ask your ruling Mr. Speaker, but as I do not care what the hon. member for Frontenac may say, I shall not ask him to withdraw it.

But hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that they want further evidence on the question of cement.

Does it not, I would ask, appeal to the intelligence of every one, that when you can bring cement from England, Germany or Belgium and lay it down at any Canadian seaport or lake port at 50 cents per barrel cheaper than you can buy it from the manufacturing industry in Canada, and when you can go to any of the American lake ports and buy cement there 50 cents cheaper than you can in Canada, and when you have in the freight from the seaboard or lakeport all the protection that you can need—is it necessary to have a Tariff Commission to tell us whether the duty ought to be retained on cement or not? That is about as preposterous as the argument of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) about the duty on boots and shoes.

Another objection I have to this Bill, which is as vital as any of the others I have enumerated, is that it does not provide for any investigation into the capital stock of any of those companies engaged in manufacturing. Take the cement industry as an example. Let us suppose that this Tariff Commission is going to investigate the cement industry. They will go to the cement combine and ask how much it costs to make a barrel of cement. They will ask that combine to produce its books and we will suppose that the combine gives correct answers. Let us suppose that the combine gives correct information and full information regarding the cost of transportation and the other expenses that enter into the cost of production, the commission will then be met by this plea on behalf of the cement company: You have no right to reduce the duty because if you do we shall not be able to pay dividends. We have to pay interest on the bonds, dividends on the preferred stock, and we ought to pay dividends on the common stock. But if you reduce the duty, we shall not be able to pay dividends on the preferred stock much less on the common stock; and the Tariff Commission will report that it would be an injustice to reduce the duty on cement. But, there is one thing, on which the commission will have no evidence whatever and on which they will not have the power to obtain evidence, and that is as to the amount of water in the capital stock. They will not be able to determine whether the $13,000,000 common stock is all water, besides $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 of preferred stock. The result will be that this commission will submit a report to the government, not based on the real facts at all. I would be glad if any hon. member will show me where, in the four corners of this Bill, this commission has the power to inquire into the capitalization of any company and ascertain how much is cash, and how much water and on what amount of capital the company ought to pay dividends. Without that power the commissioners might as well be kicking their heels around Sparks Street as trying to investigate any combine.

For these reasons I am opposed to this Bill. The only possible excuse for it is to furnish the government with some pretext for making the protective features of the tariff still more protective.

There cannot be any other reason for it. I oppose it because this body has not sufficient investigating power; it has no initiative. These commissioners can only investigate what they are told to investigate, and have no power to institute investigations of their own and learn the conditions of any branch of trade except those which they are directed to investigate. Their conclusions must of necessity be incomplete and inefficient, and must be an unsafe basis for action by the government. Above all things I oppose this measure because, in my opinion, no matter what may be the avowed intention, the logical result, the necessary, the only logical result, will be to foist upon the people of Canada a higher protection than that under which we are groaning at the present time.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon). Mr. Speaker, I had always assumed that Don Quixote was the fantastical creation of a vivid imagination, nothing real about him, there may, perhaps be some allegory in it. Had the author lived now, he might have applied his idea of Don Quixote to hon. gentlemen opposite. They have raised in their imaginations ghosts, spectres and bugaboos in respect of this Bill, and, having raised them, they are prepared to overthrow them. It is stated of Don Quixote that on one occasion when he was riding with Sancho Panza and looked out upon the plains, and saw about thirty substantial windmills, he said to his companion, 'Providence directs our efforts better than we ourselves could have wished. Look yonder, friend Sancho Panza; there are at least thirty outrageous giants whom I intend to encounter, and, having deprived them of life we will enrich ourselves with the spoils, for they are our lawful prize and the extirpation of that cursed brood will be an ac-

ceptable sacrifice to heaven,' Sancho Panza tells him of his mistake, but his ears are closed. He mounts his steed, couches his lance and rushes on to overthrow these enemies of his imagination. His lance is splintered against the substantial mills, and he and his horse thrown to the ground. So hon. gentlemen opposite have been attacking creatures of their own imagination, and with similar result. They have assumed, as the hon. member for Carlton, N. B. (Mr. Carvell) assumes, that there are things hidden away in the Bill, which he admits he cannot find there, but which he supposes must be intended. One fantastic enemy raised by their imagination is that the Bill means a delegation to the commission of the authority, and responsibility of the Finance Minister and the government and parliament to decide on questions of taxation, and the tariff. Another bugaboo is that this means the encouragement of combines, another that behind it all is the Manufacturers' Association. Another ghost is that all that the government wants is something to bolster up a higher tariff, and more protection for the manufacturer. Seeing these things, they mount their dessicated steed, and, raising their paper shields they rush with their couched lance to overthrow these spectral enemies. And what will be the result? Instead of meeting these creatures of their imagination, they will meet facts. That fact that the Bill is conceived with the bona fide intention of benefiting all the people. That the object of the Bill is to ascertain facts to get at the truth of things; and they will find their lances broken against these facts, and themselves overthrown by the truth.

There gentlemen should have no doubt about what is in the Bill or its purpose for the honest Sancho Panza on this side of the House the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds), and the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), have told them of its purpose and of their mistake. But they persist in their attack, and the result will be that they will be unhorsed and their lances broken, and they will lie breathless upon the ground.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Never breathless.

Mr. AIKINS. No, never breathless. I take the expression back and apologize to hon. gentlemen opposite. They are never breathless. The Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister have told hon. gentlemen on the other side that the purpose of the Bill is to ascertain the fact of the cost of production of commodities at home and abroad, and other facts. The hon. member who has just spoken, says that the inquiry is to be limited, and that the commissioners cannot inquire into such things as the capitalization of the companies. If the hon. gentlemen will look at the last two clauses of section — of the Bill, he will find the following:

All conditions and factors which affect and enter into the cost of production and the price to the consumer in Canada.

What does that include? It includes the amount of capital——

Mr. CARVELL. No, the cost of production, not the capitalization.

Mr. AIKINS. I presume that the capitalization of the company, the capital invested in it, will be a factor in determining the cost of production.

Mr. CARVELL. So do I.

Mr. AIKINS. Look further, and you find this provision:

Generally all the conditions affecting production, manufacture, cost and price in Canada as compared with other countries.

We have been told by the right hon. the Premier and the Minister of Finance, that, in order to ascertain the facts broadminded, virile men will be appointed, men capable and experienced in investigations, men capable of ascertaining facts, analysing, and systematizing them, report them to the government and the House, and the House will give them to the people. For nothing will satisfy the people except full information. The safety of democratic legislation lies in publicity. So the hon. minister has said frankly that what is aimed at is to ascertain the facts and he will submit the facts to the government, the House, and the people. It is objected that the Bill says the commissioners are also to submit their 'results.' 'Who sticks in the letter sticks in the bark.' And what are their results? Simply the facts they have ascertained. Nowhere in the Bill is it stated that the board to be appointed is to submit its opinion and recommendations and suggestions to the minister, to the government, or to the House, and upon the facts so ascertained and reported is to be based a tariff which is to govern the trade of Canada. A tariff is essential and necessary. For the country is committed to the principle of protection.

We must have a protective tariff. I am well aware that some years ago hon. gentlemen opposite and their predecessors did not have that idea. For instance, at the Liberal convention in 1893 we find the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier saying:

But I appeal to your judgment in the face of the experience of the last fifteen years under the system which was introduced by the Conservative government which was dubbed the National Policy to say if that system is not vicious in principle, iniquitous in

its terms and dangerous in its consequences. I say that it is vicious in principle. I want to know—and I put the question so as to be heard through the length and breadth of this country—by virtue of what principle will you tax a man to enrich his neighbour? By virtue of what principle will you tax the farmer in order to give work to the workingman? On what principle will you tax the workingman in order to give better prices to the farmer?

A little further on he stated:

I submit to you that the ideal fiscal system is the British system of free trade. Sir, my loyalty, as I have stated, does not ooze from the pores of my body, but I do want to go for an example to the mother country, and not to the United States, much as I respect and love the people on the other side of the line. I say the policy should be a policy of free trade, such as they have in England, but I am sorry to say that the circumstances of the country cannot admit, at present, of that policy in its entirety. But I do propose to you that from this day henceforward it should be the goal to which we aspire.

Three years after that the right hon. gentleman and his party attained power, and what happened then? Did they adopt free trade as it was in England? They adopted the policy that was dubbed the National Policy, and the country has lived under that policy to the present day. It is true that the right hon. leader of the opposition and his friends recently endeavoured to depart from that policy, and they have been corrected for it. So we may take it as a fact that the settled policy of Canada is a policy of protection. As other young nations have prospered under such a policy, as Germany and the United States have prospered under it, so is Canada prospering under it. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Carvell) has declared that Canada is prosperous. Why? Because of the protective policy. Now if a protective policy is right, and we believe it is right, we must see to it that the protection is a reasonable one. I believe that every supporter of the government in this House is in favour of a reasonable policy of protection. They do not want a high protection, but they want some measure of protection, and if it is necessary to have a tariff it must be a sane tariff. In order to have a sane tariff it is necessary to know the facts. I think I may state it as a principle that a protective tariff that will be justified by the country must be one which, in respect to the various commodities which are produced in Canada, either largely or entirely from our own raw material, will be based on the cost of the production of the article imported, the cost of its transportation to Canada plus the duty, equalling the cost of production in Canada plus a reasonable profit to manufacturers. Now what does such a principle involve? It involves the necessity of an inquiry into the cost of production at home and abroad, the necessity of an inquiry into the transportation rates, into the capitalization of great companies, into the cost of labour, and all other things which go to make up the equation I have mentioned.

If that be necessary, we must have capable men and experienced men to make that inquiry. It has been suggested by an hon. member on the other side that it was the duty of the Finance Minister to visit the factories and industrial centres, and find out for himself how matters stand. Imagine a minister visiting all those factories to find out what was going on; imagine him attending all the labour congresses, all the farmers' conventions, in order to ascertain their wishes and their views. What would happen in his department while he was gone? Already the ministers of this government have too much work on their hands, so much that it is impossible for them to look after the details of their offices; and yet this hon. gentleman proposes to throw upon their shoulders the additional duty of visiting all the manufacturing establishments in this country. I think the true solution of this question lies in the establishment of the commission that is proposed by this Bill. It will be necessary for the government to ascertain the facts in order that they may formulate a policy based thereon. It will not do for the farmer to say that he must be protected to the detriment of his fellow citizens, or for the labourer to say that he must be protected to the exclusion of all others, or for the manufacturer to say the same thing. This Tariff Commission must ascertain just what facts are causing the contention of each class. If the tariff is to be so arranged that important object which should claim the attention of this Commission, that the cost of the production of the article in the foreign country, with the cost of transportation to Canada plus the duty, is to equal the cost of production in Canada plus a reasonable profit to the producer, if then that point is departed from downwards, the result will be that the Canadian producer will lose the Canadian market, the labouring man will lose an opportunity for employment in Canada at fair wages and the manufacturer will have to go out of business. On the other hand, if the tariff is raised beyond that point, there will shortly arise what the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) described as informal trusts and combines, which are things not to be desired. The hon. gentleman said that they had already arisen. Perhaps they have, but why have they arisen? Because the tariff has not been properly adjusted, because it is not

correct in principle. If they have arisen they have arisen under the administration of the late government. But a proper tariff will correct those evils, will prevent the origination of combines. Therefore, I say it is very desirable that the government should ascertain all the facts, obtain all the information possible, on which to base a sane tariff, and such a tariff will undoubtedly correct the irregularities and discrepancies which are now complained of. We are hearing complaints from the farmers of this country, we are hearing complaints from the western farmers that the tariff bears unequally upon them, and I am inclined to think that it does. But I am pleased to have the assurance of some members of the government that one of the first things that will be done by the Tariff Commission will be to ascertain the facts concerning the condition of the agriculturists in Canada. If that is done, I feel confident that better conditions may be brought about for the farmer, that the interests of the employed will be conserved without prejudice to the employer, that the interests of the manufacturer will be safeguarded without any detriment to the workingman or the farmer. All these various interests must be considered in order to frame a tariff that will bear equally upon all classes of our population. If a proper tariff is obtained protecting properly the farmer, the industrial labourer and the manufacturer our country will prosper and many people will not have to resort as they did before 1879 to the soup kitchen for their existence.

Mr. EDWARDS. I wish to direct the attention of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) to page 2495 of 'Hansard', January, 1911, which contained the speech of Hon. Mr. Fielding with regard to this reciprocity agreement. I asked the hon. member: How much did the Liberal party propose to reduce the duty on cement by the reciprocity agreement? His answer was, 8 cents. I said next: How did that compare with the duty on cement imposed by the United States government? His answer was it made it equal. I said no, it did not.

Under the reciprocity agreement I want to refer the hon. member to the page already quoted where the minister says that under the reciprocity agreement the United States tariff will be 8 cents. The rate proposed by Canada will be 11 cents. The reduction proposed by Canada was 1½ cents. I ask the hon. gentleman to take that into consideration along with his statements in answer to my questions a while ago and see if he feels justified in the heat he displayed and the rather discourteous manner in which he referred to myself.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend asked about coal, and I said 8 cents.

Mr. AIKINS.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was not talking about coal, I was talking about cement.

Mr. CARVELL. I was talking about coal, he asked the American rate, and I said it was the same, that it would bring it to the same.

Mr. EDWARDS. 'Hansard' to-morrow will show your position to be even more ridiculous than ever.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I heard the question put by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), and I am positive that the question could only have related to the proposed reduction of the duty on coal, under the proposed reciprocity agreement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It does not do to say oh, oh. The hon. member was talking about coal when the hon. member for Frontenac put the question.

Mr. CARVELL. I was talking about coal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). It was not my intention to take any part in this debate, but after some of the views which have been expressed with reference to this Bill for the appointment of a Tariff Commission, I feel I would not be doing my duty to myself or to my constituents if I did not discuss for a few moments some of these questions. I was not surprised to hear the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) advocating the appointment of a Tariff Comission, or advocating a protective tariff in this country. This is the same hon. member who, last year, when the reciprocity proposals were before this House, a measure which presented to the people of western Canada at least, a measure of tariff relief, of freer trade and new markets, said that if the reciprocity agreement went through it was one bulwark of the grand old doctrine of protection gone. I am not surprised that he is in favour of a Tariff Commission which is designed to get excuses to increase the tariff instead of reducing it.

I was more surprised when I heard the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) who is a friend of mine, and whose friendship I hope always to retain, advocating the doctrine of protection in this House this afternoon. I am unable to understand as a western man how any man in this parliament who represents a western constituency can advocate protection. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) was the gallant champion of the farmers' rights in this country. He was the man who moved

for the reduction of duties on agricultural implements and at the same time, when the reciprocity agreement was before the House and the country, an agreement which included the reduction of the duty on agricultural implements, was one of the most ardent opponents of that agreement. Hon. members must be judged by their actions rather than by their words. I was not so much surprised at the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) to whose addresses I always listen with a great deal of pleasure, as they are full of poetry, full of eloquence, and whom I am glad to follow in most things except politics. But I apply to him the same remarks as I have applied to the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, how any man representing a constituency in western Canada with the economic conditions now existing there can stand here and advocate the doctrine of a high protective tariff, I cannot very well understand, and I think I know something about the economic conditions that exist at least in Saskatchewan and in part of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. STAPLES. Who advocated a high protective tariff?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend has heard what I have to say, I say again that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie and the hon. member for Brandon have to-day advocated the maintenance of a protective tariff in Canada.

Mr. STAPLES. You said a high protective tariff?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). You can take that out of it if you like, and I have no doubt my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) is prepared to advocate the same views as the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. These hon. members during the late parliament and the parliament before, were the most ardent advocates of the reduction of the duties on agricultural implements and yet when the reciprocity proposals came before this House and the country every one of them, when they had a chance of supporting a specific reduction, opposed that particular agreement. That is the position they are in to-day and these gentlemen, ever since I have been in western Canada, have gone through that country stating that the Liberal party had never reduced the tariff and that the Conservative party in western Canada was the party in favour of a low tariff. I have heard these gentlemen say that on the platform. I would support the Liberal policy to-day as during the past few years, if for nothing else than for the reduction of tariff they made in connection with the British preference. That was a substantial reduction in the tariff. The Conservative party has for years been directly opposed as shown by their speeches and votes in this House, to the British preference. At the same time, during the recent election, they shouted loyalty from the housetops and said that we in the west would interfere with the British preference because we wanted to trade more freely with the United States. They say the Liberal party never reduced the tariff and there is no difference in the policies of the parties with respect to the tariff. Every member of this House who is familiar with the records of the Department of Trade and Commerce knows that the average rate of duty on goods dutiable and free entering Canada in 1896 was about 19 per cent, whereas in the past few years under the Liberal administration it has been about 15 per cent. You say that means nothing to the consumers? I say that during the fifteen or sixteen years of the Liberal administration, it saved the people of this country $100,000,000 as compared with what they would have paid if the old Conservative tariff of 1894 had remained in force.

The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) referred to cement this afternoon and he said that the reason for the difference in price of cement in western Canada as compared with Ontario is the excessive freight rates. The hon. member for North Grey was in a measure correct. There is a large difference in the price caused by the excessive freight rates we pay on cement entering western Canada. But I call attention to this fact that in western Ontario to-day the farmers and the contractors, every consumer, is paying for cement $1.75 per barrel whereas in Buffalo directly across the line, the price is $1.25. What is the cause of that? It is not freight rates, it is that immense cement merger which I believe was one of the greatest steals ever perpetrated in Canada, which has made a millionaire of one man, Max. Aitken, has enabled him to go to the old country, to get a seat in the House of Commons and obtain a knighthood.

And that was all done by the tariff. If these so-called lords of high finance sitting in Montreal can purchase cement plants throughout Canada for twelve million dollars, capitalize them for eighteen million dollars and put the rake-off of six million dollars in their pockets, who is going to pay for all that watered stock. It is the man who buys the cement, the man who wants to put a cement floor in his stable that pays for that over-capitalization. And Sir, I say that is caused by the protective tariff on cement.

But somebody will say to me: what is your position on the tariff; you are a moderate protectionist. Well, I do not acknowledge the name of protectionist at all; I have always supported a tariff for revenue, and I do not believe

in framing a tariff from the standpoint of protection. I believe that the tariff of this country, particularly on the necessaries of life should be reduced. I do not want to see it wiped off altogether, but I say: reduce it gradually. I am not an enemy of the Manufacturers' Association, nor of any manufacturer in this country, but I say there are a great many manufacturing industries in Canada that could reasonably stand a small reduction in the tariff at the present time, and cement is one of them.

Take the tariff on agricultural implements. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) and the Conservative member for the province of Manitoba, will all agree with me when I say that the manufacturers of agricultural implements could reasonably stand a reduction in the tariff to the figure of ten per cent. I do not think that is an unreasonable proposition. I believe that some of my Conservative friends in Manitoba would vote with me in a proposition to reduce the tariff on agricultural implements to ten per cent. These agricultural implement manufacturers have been competing for years with other agricultural implements in Australia and in Russia, and of recent years in France, and surely they can compete in their own markets with a lower tariff than the present rate of seventeen and a half per cent.

Not long ago I referred to the Canadian tanner's combine in this House, and my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) did not agree with me, and he gave an explanation of why the price of canned goods in western Canada had increased since the formation of the Canadian Canners' combine. I may tell the House that during the past year and a half the price of canned goods in my district has increased from fifty per cent to seventy-five per cent on all lines of goods. Is it any wonder that the people of the province of Saskatchewan are not very anxious to support a protectionist tariff for the benefit of the manufacturers?

Mr. MARSHALL. What is the cause of the increase in the price of canned goods?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon friend will not be at a loss to give some explanation for that increased price.

Mr. MARSHALL. Answer that question if you can.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I will tell you then, it is because the Canadian canners have formed a combine in Ontario and have unduly enhanced the price of canned goods.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is not so at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say—

Mr. MARTIN (Regina).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) has the floor.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Does my hon. friend (Mr. Marshall) wish to ask a question?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, you are making a statement which you cannot back up.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I quite realize the anxiety of my hon. friend (Mr Marshall) for whom I have the greatest respect, but I say that the great difficulty with the Tory government we have now in power, is that one half of its supporters in the House are mixed up with combines in the province of Ontario. I do not blame these men for making all they can out of their business, but I am giving you the point of view of the people in the province of Saskatchewan. If I lived in Ontario like my hon. friend (Mr. Marshall) I might take a different view of the matter and especially if I held a large block of stock in the Canadian Canners' combine.

I would take the articles which are necessities for the consuming population of this country and I would reduce the tariff on them until it reached, say, a minimum of ten per cent. It may not make much difference to some men in this House who become millionaires by reason of the protective tariff whether they pay five dollars or six dollars for a pair of boots, but it makes a great deal of difference to the people who live in the rural parts of Ontario and Saskatchewan and the other provinces of the Dominion, and so I would reduce the tariff on boots and shoes to a nominal rate. I would take gasolene, and oil, and tinware, and kitchen utensils and I would reduce the tariff to a minimum on them.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) aware that the late government which he supported raised the duties on boots and shoes by five per cent. and never reduced the tariff on boots and shoes at all?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The hon. gentleman and all other hon. gentlemen who sit on that side of the House are always very anxious to refer to what the late government did. In answer to what my hon. friend has said I want to say that I was not in concurrence with the policy of the late government on matters of tariff and I did not agree with the tariff that was maintained by the late government. I advocated time and again, although probably not from my place in the House, although I did on two or three occasions advocate here a reduction in the tariff—but before the various ministers of the government I did advocate the necessity in the interests of western Canada of reducing the tariff

on the necessaries of life. That is the platform I stand on to-day and that is the platform I shall continue to stand on so long as I live in Canada. Will any one tell me what reason there is why by means of a monopoly in tinware, any man in this country should be allowed to become a millionaire by taking money from the pockets of the common people and putting it into his own pocket? And, Sir, these very same men who control the tin monopoly in Canada when other men wanted to get a tariff of ten per cent put on sheet tin to be manufactured in Canada, came to the late government in a body and opposed any tariff favour being given to anybody but themselves.

An hon. MEMBER. Who are they?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend knows them and he knows they sit on the government benches and not on this side of the House. I say that in any matter relating to the tariff I shall always view with the greatest suspicion the action of this government because many of the government supporters sitting in this House to-day are interested in the monopolies and trusts and combines in Canada to such an extent that they cannot let the interests of the people of the country appeal to them in connection with such matters when they come before this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LALOR. Is it not a fact that all these combines which the hon. gentleman speaks of were organized when the Liberal government were in power?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). If my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) was sharp enough to get ahead of the Liberal government in organizing a combine he is entitled to great credit for it. I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor), like the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall), has something to do with the Canadian Canners' combine, and I have no doubt that no matter what commodity I refer to some hon. member on that side of the House would get up and put to me a question about it. I want to say that I am in favour of a gradual reduction in duties, especially on the necessaries of life, including such articles as agricultural implements, boots and shoes, gasolene, oil, cement, canned goods, woollens, and all articles which may be properly classified as the necessaries of life for the labouring and agricultural population. I believe that no member from the west, whether Liberal or Conservative, will venture to say that this is not a proper policy as far as western Canada is concerned, and so far as the consuming masses in any part of Canada are concerned.

Now, there does not seem to be unanimity among the members of the government with respect to the effects of this Bill. The Secretary of State, speaking in Arnprior the other day, said:

> The present government would divorce the making of tariffs from political pull; a new departure from the practice of their predecessors. A Bill has been already prepared for the establishing of a Tariff Commission which would thoroughly examine every tariff and see that it was not mixed up with politics.

According to the Secretary of State they are going to take the tariff out of politics, but according to the remarks of the Finance Minister when moving the second reading of this Bill, you cannot take the tariff out of politics and that is not the object of the measure at all.

Somebody is wrong; I presume it must have been the Secretary of State, because I believe that what the Finance Minister says is perfectly correct, that you cannot take the tariff out of politics, and I do not think we should try to do so. The tariff is a matter of taxation, and perhaps the most important matter with which this parliament has to deal from year to year. At the same time, there does not seem to be unanimity on this subject even in the ranks of the government themselves.

Now, the only reason given by the government for bringing in this Bill is that it is for the purpose of getting information. We all agree that it is very important that we should have information with respect to goods manufactured in this country—the cost of the raw material, the cost of labour, the cost of transportation—so as to enable us, when any item of tariff reduction or tariff increase comes before us, to form a proper opinion respecting it. But I say now exactly what I said when I spoke in the debate on the address—that I am absolutely opposed to any Tariff Commission being appointed in this country which would in any way tend to relieve the government of the day of the responsibility of dealing with the subject of tariff taxation. We can only judge of what is the intention of the government by certain things that have occurred. I would point to one thing that occurred. A request has been made of the Prime Minister to investigate the cement combine; and what does he say? He says: this is a matter for the Tariff Commission. The hon. member for South Wellington yesterday asked the Minister of Customs whether or not certain triphammers would come into this country free of duty. They are not manufactured in Canada, and there is no reason, according to protective principles, why they should not come in free. The Minister of Customs replied that this was a question for the Tariff Commission. Before the Bill

has passed its second reading, the government are actually sheltering themselves from responsibility behind the proposed Tariff Commission.

Why does the government not take steps to investigate the cement combines? Why does it not appoint a committee of this House for that purpose?

Mr. BRADBURY. Why did not the late government investigate it?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). If the late government were in power to-day there would be a committee now to investigate the cement combine.

Mr. BRADBURY. Who allowed this combine to be created? Was it not the hon. gentleman's friends who refused to stop it when their attention was called to what was contemplated by the present combine?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend talks nonsense. He does not give the combinesters, the heads of the mergers who sit on his own side of the House the credit of having brains enough to form that cement merger. I have not a personal acquaintance with the men behind the cement combine; no doubt my hon. friend has. I say we can only judge of the object the government have in view in appointing the Tariff Commission by the straws which indicate which way the wind blows. That object is to have a body of men behind which they can shelter themselves from responsibility when any question of tariff increase or tariff reduction is brought before them.

Now, who asked for this commission? Certainly the people whom I represent have never asked for it. The statement has been made in this debate that this matter was discussed from one end of this country to the other. As far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, that is not the case. No Conservative in that province during the recent campaign ever discussed it. We in the west have not asked for it; we would like some time to discuss it; I would like to know what the people of the province of Saskatchewan think of it before I can cast an intelligent vote on this measure. Therefore, I am in favour of delaying this Bill for a time. Some may say, as I have heard Conservative members say in the lobbies of this House, that it does not matter very much what the people of the west think about anything. There is scarcely a man from the province of Ontario sitting in this House to-day who knows anything about the needs of western Canada; otherwise the people of Ontario would not have voted against the reciprocity proposals to enable us to trade more freely with the United States. If I need any proof of what I say, it is found in the fact that just as soon as there is a grain blockade in the west, the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Railways ask the Interstate Commerce Commission to reduce the rates on grain to Duluth to correspond with rates to Port Arthur in order to give us temporary relief. Why did they not consider that last September? We have had grain blockades in the west for many years, and shall have them for many years to come, and the only way to give us relief is to allow us to ship our grain over American railways. If hon. gentlemen who occupy prominent positions in the government to-day would go into the province of Saskatchewan and see grain rotting on the farms of men who have not enough money, some of them, to build proper granaries to house their grain, I think they would change their views on this matter.

I was rather interested in a declaration of policy by the Minister of Finance. I have always regarded the Conservative party as the high protectionist party in this country. There is the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) for instance, he is a high tariff advocate; so are many other members from the province of Ontario. But I was somewhat interested in what the Minister of Finance said with respect to his policy, and I have no doubt it is the policy of the government with respect to protection. He said: I am a believer in adequate protection. He did not define adequate protection.

Mr. BURNHAM. How do you define high tariff?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I will give my hon. friend a definition of high tariff given in this House, I think, by the present Senator Taylor, formerly a prominent member of the Conservative party in this House.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). A Chinese wall.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). They mean a Chinese wall, as the hon. member for Red Deer has just said—a tariff wall high enough to keep out competition from any foreign country. Either the hon. member for Halton or the hon. member for Peel said he was a believer in putting a Chinese wall around this country so that it would prevent any goods from a foreign country coming into this country at all.

Mr. BLAIN. I never heard of it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will say for myself that the hon. gentleman has no right to make such a reference to me. I will state what I did say at one time in regard to agricultural protection, that I was prepared to put a Chinese wall around Canada, and for the protection of the western people I am prepared to do it to-day. I spoke of agricultural protection; I made no refer-

ence to manufactured goods. Now I hope the hon. gentleman will not repeat that again and misrepresent me.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The hon. gentleman is the last member of the House that I would attempt to misrepresent in any way; but in reading some of the speeches made by these hon. gentlemen, I got that impression. It may have been somebody else.

Mr. BLAIN. If it be necessary for me to deny it, I give the statement the most emphatic denial.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I am somewhat surprised at the anxiety of hon. gentlemen opposite to pose as free traders. We have had a definition of 'adequate protection' given by hon. gentlemen opposite. According to that definition, it is protection sufficient to keep out the competition of any foreign country. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has said that he would be glad to give the people of the west adequate protection to their agricultural products. The people of the west however would not thank him very much for any such protection. What they desire is not protection but more profitable markets for their products and easier access to those markets, but taking the meaning given to adequate protection by the Tory party, namely, protection sufficient to keep out competition from foreign countries, how would that affect the great provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, where there are practically no manufacturing establishments. We are compelled to pay excessive freight rates on a 2,000 mile haul of manufactured goods from the east, and are compelled by our protective tariff to buy these goods in our eastern provinces. If we had instead a tariff of 10 per cent on these goods, we could buy some of them in the United States, and the day is coming when we shall be forced to do so. We shall be forced to do so because of the increased cost of living in the west due largely to the excessive prices we have to pay for the purpose of building up the manufacturers in the east. Manufacturers in Ontario and Quebec will do well to consider this point, for the day will come, when we shall refuse to buy goods from Canadian manufacturers.

An hon. MEMBER. Are the manufacturers of western Canada in favour of adequate protection?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I shall have to refer my hon. friend to the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) for a definition of 'adequate protection.' So far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned and a large part of Alberta and Manitoba, we want no protective tariff at all because we have no manufacturing industries there. We are in the initial period of our existence, thousands of people are coming in to settle in these provinces, why should they be compelled to pay 17½ per cent duty on their agricultural machinery and 25 per cent to 30 per cent on their boots and shoes and 25 per cent on their tinware for the purpose of building up manufacturing establishments in eastern Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. Demagogue.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). An hon. gentleman has referred to me as a demagogue. I would like him to meet me on any platform in Regina and apply to me that epithet.

Mr. NICKLE. May I ask a question?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I have no objection to being asked questions but I have been interrupted pretty often.

Mr. NICKLE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he expresses the policy of the west, when he says they desire free trade and the complete overthrow of our present fiscal policy?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend is going too far when he imputes that statement to me. I do not want to be understood as saying that I am a free trader out and out at the present moment. The hon. gentleman could not have been here when I gave my ideas regarding a protective tariff, or he would not have put the question he did. I said I was in favour of a gradual reduction on the necessities of life until the tariff was reduced on such goods to a minimum of ten per cent.

Mr. BURNHAM. Is the hon. gentleman opposed to a protective tariff in the west just now because manufacturing industries there are in their infancy? In that case when would he be in favour of it?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The hon. gentleman, I suppose, is trying to refer again to infant industries in the Dominion. We have heard in western Canada about infant industries needing protection, and no doubt my hon. friend thinks that the manufacturing industries in the east are still in the infant stage. What I say is that we have no manufacturing institutions of any kind in Saskatchewan to-day. Possibly if we had a large number of manufacturing industries there, which would supply our needs, the manufacturers, and probably a large number of the people, might be in favour of protecting them. But I am endeavouring to point out the urgent needs of western Canada at present, and what will be its urgent needs for years to come. There are people who think that in western Canada we are going to build up large manufacturing institutions. I do not think that

is at all possible. It is certainly not possible to anything like the same degree as in Ontario where you have water-power, cheap fuel, and cheap labour to a much greater extent than in Saskatchewan, Manitoba or Alberta. I do not wish to acquire the reputation of being an extremist in this House, but I want to put my views fairly before you. I have expressed them to-night in a stronger way than I probably would if speaking in western Canada because here I am addressing many representatives from eastern Canada.

There is a provision in this Bill which strikes me as somewhat peculiar. We know now that the policy of the government is one of adequate protection. Section 4 provides:

> In respect of goods produced in or imported into Canada per the commission shall, under the direction of the minister, make inquiry as to——

Under a government whose policy is one of adequate protection, the minister, who is the exponent of that policy, is to direct the Tariff Commission to inquire into certain things and report to the minister. It seems to me that instead of reporting to the minister, it ought to report to parliament, How is the ordinary member of parliament to get the information which this commission collects unless it reports to parliament direct? Then subclause 2 provides that the commission shall make inquiry into any other matter upon which the minister desires information. This whole Bill is based on the policy of adequate protection advocated by the Minister of Finance; and the members of this commission, who will no doubt be adequate protectionists, are only to investigate such things as they are instructed to investigate by this adequate protectionist minister.

Subsection 6 of clause 5 provides:

> Should evidence or information in its nature confidential, relating to the business or affairs of any person firm or corporation be given or elicited in the course of any inquiry, the evidence or information shall not be made public by the commission in such manner as to be available for the use of any business competitor or rival of the person, firm or corporation, respectively, but this subsection shall not apply to an inquiry under subsection 3 of section 4 of this Act.

If that means business secrets, some peculiar method of carrying on business by which a manufacturer is enabled to profit more than his fellow manufacturers, I would not make any objection. But that section leaves the door wide open to make anything you like 'confidential information.' I submit that it would be safer to draft a clause more definite in its form to make clearer what is meant by this expression.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina).

I think the whole question of the commission comes down to a matter of what kind of men are appointed on it. As was said by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) there are various classes of economists in the matter of the tariff. There are high protectionists —perhaps nobody will admit that he is a high protectionist. Some call themselves moderate protectionists as does the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). Then there are men who call themselves free traders. I submit, with all due deference to the Finance Minister, that he ought to put a man on the commission whose views tend somewhat towards free trade, if he wishes to deal fairly with the consuming masses of the country. If he puts only protectionists on the commission, whenever they take evidence as to the manufacture of any class of goods, they will have their minds biased in favour of the view that we should have some protection for this particular class of goods, and, if possible, will increase the amount of protection given under the present tariff. I have no idea whom the Minister of Finance will appoint on the commission. But I venture to predict that its membership will not include a farmer from western Canada. The minister will probably say he wants tariff experts. If that be so, then why not increase the staff in the Department of Trade and Commerce and his own department and gather information in that way? I cannot see but that he will get exactly the same result, and with less expense than by creating a tariff commission. It is not likely that there will be on the commission a representative of the great consuming classes, but probably they will all be men who are in favour of protection, which means that they will be taken from the ranks of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I hope not.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) will see to it that a farmer from western Canada goes on the commission.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. gentleman may depend on it that I will do all I can to have that done.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). When the commission is appointed we shall be able to judge how much influence the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) has with the government. I have spoken a good deal longer than I had intended to, and I have dealt with a good many matters of which I did not intend to speak when I rose, but which I was led to discuss by questions put by hon. members opposite. I am opposed to the Bill and will support the amendment of the hon. member for South Well-

ington (Mr. Guthrie) for these reasons—some of which I have not dealt with at length: It tends to weaken the doctrine of ministerial responsibility; the purpose of the Bill, as stated by the Minister of Finance, can be attained by less objectionable methods; there is no demand for such legislation; the appointment of such a commission means the recognition of the principle of protection as a necessity in this country; this legislation is introduced at the request of the manufacturers who are interested in maintaining protection, and the result will be to foist on the people of Canada a higher protective tariff.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon). Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to introduce any new information into a debate which has commanded the attention of the House so long as this has done. But I rise, with your permission to speak on the Bill, and to give it my support. I believe that the principle of the Bill is proper and that the methods by which that principle is to be applied are workable. To my mind, there is no question more important that can engage the attention of parliament than one of this kind, one relating to the tariff which regulates the trade and commerce of our country. The tariff might well be compared to a tree. Trunk, branches, leaves, blossoms and fruit are in Ottawa, but its roots ramify to every part of this great Canada of ours. I think that an unprejudiced survey of the history of Canada since confederation, will convince any unprejudiced inquirer that the people of Canada believe in a protectionist policy. And no hon. member has yet risen in his place who has seen fit to deny that proposition. The hon. member from Regina (Mr. Martin) came near to denying that he was a protectionist, but he himself admitted that he believed in protection for revenue only. The money which we require to carry on our public works, to build our railways, to operate our canals, to dredge our harbours, to light our coasts, to pay our steamship subsidies, to protect our fisheries, and for all our public services, comes from this source—the tariff. Anything therefore which enters so completely into every phase of our national life is a matter which requires the most serious consideration of those whom the Canadian people elect to represent them in parliament.

The Finance Minister has substituted a Bill to create a tariff commission and to define the powers of that commission. Some hon. members have said that behind the clauses of the Bill there lie hidden in the deep recesses of the minds of the Finance Minister and his colleagues a desire to endow that commission with powers superior to the powers of parliament. Sir, in a democratic country like Canada, that would be impossible. The parliament of Canada could not and would not create a body superior to parliament itself; the creature is always inferior to the creator. And, as I read the Bill, there is no delegation wathever of the powers of parliament. Nor is there any conflict of power, if I read the Bill correctly, and I think I do. I anticipate that the men who are to be appointed on this commission will be, in time at least, specialists in that particular line. Some hon. members who have spoken in opposition to this measure, seem to believe that this commission will have legislative powers. The two gentlemen who spoke first in opposition to this measure, had that in mind, judging from the tenor of their remarks. This commission can have no legislative powers; at the very most, it can only be an advisory body. Canada is a democratic country, and the men who come here to legislate for Canada and the people of Canada themselves, would not stand for any abrogation of the powers given to parliament.

Parliament is the one body that legislates for the people of Canada, and if the government were to attempt to pass over to a commission that power which parliament possesses, parliament would be exceeding its functions. Now as I construe the meaning of this Bill, this commission is to be purely an advisory body, a body of specialists who shall gather information to submit to the Minister of Finance and his colleagues, upon which they may frame a tariff, should they at any time deem it advisable to do so. The government may accept the advice of this commission, the Bill does not say that they shall accept it; they may not. But that body will be in a position to furnish the Cabinet a large amount of information with respect to the various commodities covered by our tariff, information which they cannot get under the present system. It has been said that the Tariff Commission will not present opinions, but facts. Now if there is anything that the government require in framing a tariff it is facts relating to the cost of production of the various commodities that enter into our complex commercial life. Some one has said that this will result in an irrational tariff. I do not think any argument has been advanced which supports that contention. In fact, if I view the Bill aright it will have a tendency to keep a balance as between the manufacturer and the producer in Canada. Now, how is this to be done? It is going to be done by examining the cost of production at home and abroad. The commissioners will have power to investigate conditions, to learn how much it costs to produce the commodities we use in our everyday life.

It will also have power to take expert advice from specialists in any particular line. It seems to me that information of that kind would be of great use to the Cabinet. The commissioners will be able to find out the cost of the raw material. It has been well said that the raw material of one manufacturer is the finished product of another. I take it that the tariffs of all countries are more or less approximate to a scientific tariff. I believe it is impossible to frame a real scientific tariff. A tariff can only approximate the actual cost of any commodity. But if this commission submits to our government information that is only approximate as to the cost of an article, it will supply information that no Cabinet of Canada since confederation has ever had. Then they will inquire as to the cost of assembling these raw materials in the final manufacture, and that will include the cost of producing the raw material, and the transportation to the point of assemblage. After that, it will inquire into the cost of manufacture, and the factors which enter into that are the cost of labour, the cost of the plant and interest thereon, the insurance on the plant, and so forth. Further, they will inquire into the cost of selling that commodity. This is information which has never been given, either to the government or the people of Canada. With this information at hand they will be able to compare the cost of producing these articles in Canada and abroad. Then they will be prepared to advise the government as to what measure of protection is required upon any one of these commodities.

Mr. Speaker, I am a protectionist, I subscribe to the doctrine of protection. The protection I advocate is the difference between the cost of producing an article by our foreign competitors and the cost of producing that article at home, plus a reasonable profit to our Canadian manufacturer. That is the protection I believe in, and that is the protection which I believe the people of Canada in general endorse. But this profit must not be too large, nor must it be too small. If it is too large, it will create the combines and mergers which some hon. gentlemen opposite referred to. I think this commission, if it lives up to the expectations which we have of it, will prevent absolutely the existence of combines and mergers, that is one of the things which commends it to my mind. The commissioners will have information as to the cost of production which will make it possible for our government to frame a tariff under which combines and mergers cannot profitably exist. I take it that is a field where this commission will find its most useful work; it will maintain that balance between interests that is so esential for the permanent progress of Canada. Up to the present time we have had in Canada nothing but a hit and miss policy with regard to tariffs, absolutely without any sound reason at all. One section of the community interested in a particular commodity will come to the government and submit their arguments, while the people who are opposed to them will not have an opportunity of doing so; consequently the government will frame a tariff, not after investigation into both sides of the question, but upon the recommendations of one side alone. This Bill is going to eliminate that injustice, because this commission is going to investigate sources, to find out what it costs to produce an article that enters into consumption.

In the negotiations which preceded the reciprocity pact between Canada and the United States, we were shown the striking difference between the manner we frame our tariffs and the manner they frame them in the United States. I was much impressed with the fact, during these negotiations, that the men who came to Ottawa on behalf of the United States government were possessed of knowledge which our government did not possess. They had detailed information with reference to various branches of industry in the United States which our people did not have with regard to the industries of Canada. I am in the judgment of this House if that is not the fact. It was marvellous to my mind how the men who conducted the negotiations on the part of the President of the United States, and who came to Ottawa, were seized of all the conditions which surround the various products of this country as well as of their own country. They gave me information about the products of Canada and the cost of production in this country which I do not think our own government possessed, information which our own commissioners did not have, because they did not have a body of trained experts to procure the information for them. Now the commission provided for by this Bill will fill that gap.

Mr. Speaker, any man who studies political economy, even in the most superficial way, will admit that the home market is the best. It is our desire to preserve this home market. In an agricultural country like this we must have manufacturing communities to consume the products of the soil, the products of the farm, the products of the sea and the products of the mine. That is the policy which we are aiming at, we want to build up a home market which shall consume the products we produce within the borders of our own country. Now the more you reduce the cost of transportation between the producer and the consumer the cheaper will the article be to the consumer. Consequently the home market is the best.

It is, therefore, to build up a home market that the Conservative party has always directed its energies, and I hope always will.

Some one has been good enough to send to the members quotations on the question of trade. I have here a little card sent out by the Canadian Home Market Association. This contains a quotation by one of the greatest presidents the United States ever had, President Lincoln, who said:

> I do not know much about the tariff but I know this much: When we buy goods abroad we get the goods and the foreigner gets the money. When we buy goods at home we get both the goods and the money.

That epitomizes far better than any words of mine could do, the situation which confronts Canada to-day with regard to our home market; when we sell at home we get both the goods and the money. It is said by some philosophers and people who study political economy that there are three stages in the life of every nation. The first stage is that of free trade in which the nation trades with other nations further advanced in the arts of commerce. The second stage is that in which the nation promotes manufacturing and transportation and adopts commercial regulations and the third stage is that in which that nation gradually reverts to free trade, to lower duties and the removal of the restrictions on trade. If that is true, Canada is in the second stage, we are trying to protect our manufactures, to build up a home market and our history will show that we have mortgaged our future to advance the transportation of our country. Some one has said that this is an innovation. It is no innovation, some of the most advanced nations of the earth are adopting the policy which we are asking the parliament of this country to adopt. My hon. friend opposite yesterday said that this was a cheap Yankee device brought forth from the fertile mind of the Minister of Finance. Are we governed in Canada by the laws of the Medes and Persians that change not? Political economy is a progressive science and Canada, being a progressive country, requires a progressive political economy. We are the heirs of all the ages, we are the people who observe what other nations are doing and adopt anything that commends itself to us. Then why should we not adopt this method, why should we not adopt something originating in another country? Reference has been made to the fact that the United States has a tariff board. Is that a reason why we should not have one? What are the functions of that board. First to select an article and examine into its sources of supply; (2) to find out the actual cost of production as near as that may be, and (3) to get accurate information of prices at home and abroad, and investigate local and general conditions with regard to foreign competition. That is exactly what we want to do.

Some hon. gentlemen have referred to Germany, Gentlemen within the sound of my voice to-night know the history of Germany, how that country from a few scattered states has become not only one of the greatest martial nations, but one of the greatest commercial nations in the world. Why? Because she adopted the Zollverin and following the system of protection and so welded those states together with free trade between them and protection against the world until we have the Germany of to-day. How is that done? How does Germany make her tariff? Germany is competing in the markets of the world with the most economic nations. How does she make her tariff? Her tariff is revised annually by a commission of experts and further than that the German Emperor who has such a close interest in anything affecting the German Empire, a few years ago created what is called a Commissioneratz or Commercial Council and I have this from a gentleman who has travelled in the German Empire and has observed for himself the conditions there. This is what he says:

> The present German Emperor some years ago adopted the plan of calling this Commercial Council the leading commercial men of the empire, taking representatives from the most important branches of trade and commerce. This council has no political complexion whatever, but is simply an advisory board, who advise the Emperor and the government in regard to all commercial matters, such well known men as Herr Krupp, Count Hinkle Donnismarke, and Herr Tissen, representative ironmasters, were, or are, members of this council; at least this I know that Herr Krupp and Count Donnismarke were members, and I fancy Herr Tissen also now is; other men such as Director Stahl of the Vulcan Iron Works, representing the shipbuilding industry; Herr Balin, the general manager of the Hamburg-American Line, representing the shipping industry; other men recognized as being leaders in the textile trades; the coal and other mining trades; and the leading industries of the country, are also members. The qualification is that they must be eminent in their profession or business and in good commercial repute. Their duties are to advise the Emperor and the government on honour and to the best of their ability in regard to any question on which the Emperor may desire advice, or information, particularly when changes are contemplated in the German tariff, or when any foreign country contemplates or actually makes changes in its tariff which affect the export of the fatherland. The members of the council receive no remuneration whatever. They are given the title of 'Commissioneratz,' and the fact that a man has been

called to the council is the highest possible acknowledgment that he is pre-eminent in the line of business with which he is connected.

Therefore besides having a Board of Experts to advise the government they have this honorary board composed of men eminent in the various lines they have adopted as their life work, and they advise the Emperor and his advisers as to what should be done in any given crisis.

In Austria-Hungary, a great commercial nation, the duties are revised annually by a permanent commission. Hon. gentlemen have objected to the fact that we have a permanent commission but this nation has the same thing.

I heard the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) lauding Belgium to the skies because of the great record she has made in commercial affairs. In Belgium they have a commission of five members who are advised by the Chamber of Commerce and the Bourse and other sources, as to variations in the duties on imports and exports.

France, one of the great protectionist countries in Europe, has a permanent commission which annually makes the variations in her tariff.

In Italy they have a permanent commission composed of officials and representatives of commercial bodies throughout Italy.

In Denmark they have a statistical bureau in connection with the business department, and this bureau fixes the values.

Thus, we say that this is no innovation, we are simply following in the footsteps of some of the most advanced nations in the world to-day and I think that in adopting this particular policy we are doing something for the benefit of Canada. The Conservative party in doing this is only living up to its traditions. The members of that party believe in protecting the home market. They believe in protecting the home market, in protecting the manufacturer not to the point at which he can become a menace through the organization of combines and mergers but to hold that balance which is necessary in a country like ours.

The question as to our fiscal policy has divided the political parties in this country. The Liberals have always wobbled on that question, while the Conservatives have persistently, continuously, and consistently adhered to the policy which was laid down by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878, a policy of moderate protection. And, Mr. Speaker, no greater tribute can be paid to any statesman of any time than the tribute that is paid to the great chieftain of the Conservative party of that day, who foreseeing what Young Canada required in the way of a National Policy had the courage to adopt that National Policy and put it in force; no greaater tribute, I say can be paid to any statesman than to find that that same policy has guided the destinies of this nation for nearly forty years, and is just as strong in the affection of the people to-day as it was when first inaugurated. But, the Liberals of Canada, have they had a continuous fiscal policy? Not at all. Even to-day they have no special policy on the tariff. One of them is a free trader, another is a moderate protectionist, another a protectionist for revenue only, and in the course of twenty years they have as a party advocated in turn unrestricted reciprocity, tariff for revenue only, commercial union, and a sort of theoretical idea of free trade as they have it in England. We know that the distinguished gentleman who leads the great party opposite—the once great party-opposite—was so successful in advocating his ideas of free trade in England, that he was given the Cobden medal. We know that Cobden's policy was nothing short of a Utopian dream, for if Cobden were right, and if Cobden's prophecies came true, to-day all the nations of the world would be free trade. On four successive occasions the right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition appealed successfuly to the people of Canada, and on these four occasions they forgave him and his party many sins. When he asked them to support him in building the Transcontinental railway they unstintedly gave their support, and again, when he asked the people to allow him to finish his work, they gave him a mandate. But the moment that right hon. gentleman and his followers touched the fiscal policy of Canada, that moment the people said: No, and out he went—and I have no doubt he will stay out for a long time. If the election of September 21 taught anything, it taught the one basic fact that the people of Canada are committed to a policy of moderate protection. The right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier came to the conclusion that the people of Canada wanted reciprocity with the United States, and when his policy was announced there was just a slight zephyr of public opinion wafted towards Ottawa in opposition to that scheme. Soon that zephyr became a sort of gale, and the gale became a hurricane, and the hurricane a typhoon that blew the party out of power, and to-day there is nothing but a remnant of them left. Canada is committed to protection, not a high protection, but a moderate protection, and I believe that this commission will assist this government and the people to adjust that protection to our needs. That is why I so enthusiastically support the Bill. This commission is going to assist the government to regulate protection, and in doing

so it will enable our government to outline a policy which will conserve our resources and develop our trade and help to make Canada the great commercial nation she is destined to be.

Mr. THOMAS MACNUTT (Saltcoats). Mr. Speaker, had I spoken earlier in this debate I might have spoken at greater length than I intend to-night, but other hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, especially my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) have dealt so exhaustively with the subject and have so ably placed the views of the people I represent before the House that little remains for me to add. However, I do not wish to give a silent vote on this important matter and I shall briefly state my views. Last summer the Prime Minister made a trip to the west and he was met at almost every point by delegations of farmers who asked him many questions in connection with the tariff and the reply of the right hon. gentleman always was that he intended if elected to appoint a tariff commission for the purpose of ascertaining the facts. That term 'ascertaining the facts' was a favourite expression of his, and the legislation we have before us to-day is evidently an attempt to carry out that promise on his part. Now, with regard to ascertaining facts I say that we have already ascertained many facts which it does not need the services of a commission to investigate. We have ascertained the fact that agricultural implements are very much dearer than they should be and that the tariff is to a large extent responsible for that. We have also ascertained the fact that the manufacturers of Canada are well able to do without the protection they have been getting. We know that they are able to compete successfully with their rivals in other countries, not only in Great Britain, but in South Africa, Australia, The Argentine, I understand too that even in the United States some Canadian agricultural implements have been sent over there, the duty paid, and actually sold at a less price than the articles manufactured in that country. These facts are known to us and I do not see why there is any necessity for an expensive tariff commission to make inquiry into them. Now, when a western man is speaking about the tariff the question of the duty on agricultural implements generally comes up. Every farmer is anxious to develop his land and he cannot do so unless he has the proper implements which are numerous and expensive, especially in the west. I might mention some of these implements that the farmer requires; he needs a breaking plough, a gang plough, a harrow, a drill, a disc harrow, a reaper, a wagon, etc., and the purchase price of these is a very heavy expense to him. It is not to the interests of eastern Canada that the farmer should be restricted in his operations and he certainly cannot farm to the same advantage unless he can get the necessary implements at a reasonable price. I think the very first thing the Tariff Commission should arrange for is that there should be a material reduction on the duties on agricultural implements, but I do not know that we can look for that from any Tariff Commission that will be appointed by a Conservative government.

We heard to-night some of the old protectionist theories that we have been hearing of for many years. We have heard about the benefit of the home market, a market which the people would build up with their own money. After all, we in the west do not find the home market to be a great benefit to us. Take the article of wheat. The quantity of wheat we can consume in Canada is not more than 50,000,000 bushels, and if the production of wheat in Canada were restricted to that quantity, a good many of the manufacturers might close up their businesses; there would not be much smoke coming out of tall chimneys, and there would not be many men employed to create this home market. The prices of most of the products of the west are based, not upon the prices originating in the home market, but on the export prices. This is true of wheat, cattle and other staple articles. I am not going to belittle the benefit of a home market, but at the same time we may pay too dearly for it, and that is what I think the people are doing. I do not think we can entertain any hope that this Tariff Commission will bring about very much change in that regard.

Now, Sir, I do not say that we should not have a tariff at all. A revenue must be raised, and the farmers like everybody else have to pay their share. It is a question, however, whether or not the implements of industry should not be as nearly free as possible. If the people are encouraged to greater production in that way, the revenue will not suffer. They will have more money with which to buy other duty-paying articles such as luxuries, which I think should bear the greater part of the cost of governing the country. That principle is observed in the tariff with respect to some of the professions, because I find that surgical and dental instruments are on the free list. I am not going to object to that. It probably enables surgeons and dentists to procure the most modern instruments, which should of course be encouraged, though I do not know that this will have the effect of reducing the fees. I find that there is no duty on surgical and dental instruments

of metal, surgical needles, X-ray apparatus and parts thereof, surgical operating tables for use in hospitals, and microscopes valued at not less than $50 retail.; also professional and scientific books for the library of any incorporated medical, law, literary, scientific or art association or society. These are really the tools of certain professional men. I do not see why the implements of the farming class should not be dealt with very much on the same line.

Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be much exercised over the manufacturers; they are evidently wedded to their idols. The Tariff Commission is expected to take evidence as to the cost of production, so that the manufacturers can be protected in order that they may make large profits. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not appear to regard it as important to consider the cost of production of what the farmers produce. The cost of agricultural implements enters very largely into that, and the farmer is not in the position of the manufacturer in having a fixed price for his product. He has to have more than that—something that he has not now in the west—transportation to the markets. He has to take what he can get and pay the freight charged upon his product. I do not say that these matters can all be controlled, but some things could be controlled. The cost of the implements he has to use could to a certain extent be controlled, and I think the Tariff Commission—which no doubt will be appointed, though we on this side of the House are opposed to it—should take that into consideration. In order that there may be some chance of the Tariff Commission doing so, I would suggest that at least one western farmer, or at all events some capable person acquainted with the conditions in the west, be appointed upon it. Then we would have some hope of getting fair-play from this commission. Its usefulness will depend largely upon the personnel of its members. In conclusion, I will merely say that I am in favour of the amendment, believing that the government, instead of appointing this commission, should of their own accord bring in a Tariff Bill to reduce the duties very materially, especially on agricultural implements.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Guthrie).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Boivin,	MacNutt,
Bourassa,	McCoig,
Boyer,	McCrea,
Brouillard,	McKenzie,
Buchanan,	Marcile (Bagot),
Carroll,	Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Carvell,	Martin (Regina),
Cash,	Michaud,
Champagne,	Molloy,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Murphy,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Nesbitt,
Cruise,	Neely,
Delisle,	Papineau,
Devlin,	Pacaud,
Fortier,	Power,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Proulx,
Gauvreau,	Reid (Restigouche),
Guthrie,	Robb,
Kay,	Ross,
Knowles,	Sinclair,
Kyte,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Lafortune,	Tobin,
Lanctot,	Verville,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Warnock,
Law,	White (Victoria, Alta.) and
Lemieux,	Wilson (Laval).—52.
Lovell,	

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Achim,	Lavallée,
Aikins,	Lennox,
Alguire,	Lésperance,
Ames,	Lewis,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Macdonell,
Arthurs,	McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Ball,	Marshall,
Beattie,	Meighen,
Bellemare,	Merner,
Bennett (Calgary),	Middlebro,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Monk,
Best,	Morphy,
Blain,	Munson,
Blondin,	Nantel,
Borden,	Nicholson,
Boulay,	Nickle,
Bowman,	Northrup,
Brabazon,	Osler (Sir Edmund),
Bradbury,	Paquet,
Broder,	Paul,
Burnham,	Pelletier,
Burrell,	Perley,
Clare,	Reid (Grenville),
Clark (Bruce),	Robidoux,
Clarke (Wellington),	Roche,
Clements,	Rogers,
Cochrane,	Schaffner,
Coderre,	Sevigny,
Crocket,	Sexsmith,
Cromwell,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Crothers,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Davidson,	Shepherd,
Doherty,	Smith,
Donnelly,	Smyth,
Edwards,	Staples,
Elliott,	Steele,
Elson,	Stevens,
Fisher,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Gauthier (Gaspe),	Sutherland,
Girard,	Taylor,
Goodeve,	Thoburn,
Guilbault,	Thompson (Yukon),
Hartt,	Walker,
Henderson,	Wallace,
Hepburn,	Webster,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),	Weichel,
Jameson,	

Kemp,	White (Leeds),
Kidd,	White (Renfrew),
Lalor,	Wilson
Lamarche,	(Wentworth) and
Lancaster,	Wright.—104.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Hazen,	Emmerson,
Barnard,	Oliver,
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Fowler,	Pugsley,
McCurdy,	McLean,
Rhodes,	Macdonald,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Wilcox,	Clarke (Essex),
Foster (Kings),	Turgeon,
Baker,	McLean (Sunbury),
Barker,	Bickerdike,
Cockshutt,	Douglas,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Loggie,
Rainville,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Barnard,	Oliver,
McKay,	Turriff,
Mondou,	Lapoint (Kamouraska)
Barrette,	Seguin,
Tremain,	McCraney,
Currie,	Lapointe (Montreal),
Porter,	Clarke (Red Deer).

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Progress reported.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. The Grain Bill, and then Public Works estimates.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11,10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 9, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CAR SHORTAGE IN EASTERN ONTARIO.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. PROULX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the government, and especially that of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), to a matter of great importance and urgency. There is a great scarcity of cars to transport the hay crop of eastern Ontario. There are, between Vankleek Hill and Pembroke, at least 7,000 carloads of hay to be shipped and shippers have met with great difficulty in getting cars.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Proulx) is scarcely in order in entering upon a discussion at this stage of the sitting. If he desires to ask a question and simply wishes to make himself understood, he would be in order, but not otherwise.

Mr. PROULX. I do not intend to discuss the matter. I only wish to draw the attention of the government to the situation which exists and I would like the government to bring the matter to the attention of the Railway Commission and have the railway companies try to solve the difficulty. In some parts of my county I know that they have hay awaiting shipment, and if it is not shipped before the spring freshets come on they will not be able to ship it for many months. In other parts of eastern Ontario the situation is the same, and I hope the government will do their utmost to help the farmers and shippers to ship their hay. One of the reasons of the difficulty seems to be that most of the hay is going to the United States; there is a lack of foreign cars and our railway companies are reluctant to send their cars across the border. I hope that the government will take the matter up with the railway companies.

Mr. COCHRANE. This is the first I have heard of the matter excepting what I saw in this morning's paper. No complaint has been laid before me, but now that the matter has been called to my attention I certainly shall be glad to bring it to the notice of the commissioners, and I have no doubt that they will deal with it promptly.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I ask the right hon. leader of the government if he has read the despatch published in yesterday's paper about the international boundary line in British Columbia? I read in the 'Witness' of last night the following despatch:

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY LINE—SENSATION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND WASHINGTON OVER NEW SURVEY.

Vancouver, B.C., Feb. 8.—A story which reached New Westminster this morning from the Canadian side of the international boundary line has aroused tremendous interest here. It states that the boundary line between Canada and the United States, in the coal district, will be shifted two miles south and that two growing towns and coming cities

which are now reckoned without protest from this side of the line to form part of the United States are really part of Canada.

Then the despatch goes on to give further details. Has my right hon. friend learned anything about that?

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). My attention has not been called to the article, and I have heard nothing of the statement except what the hon. gentleman has just mentioned. I shall direct the attention of the proper department to the matter.

VACANT SENATORSHIP.

Mr. MICHAUD. I wish to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) if he has received any correspondence from the French people of the maritime provinces in connection with the appointment of a senator to fill the place left vacant by the late Senator Comeau. There are actually in the maritime provinces about 165,000 French people; they have only one senator and I believe that they are entitled to three or four according to population.

Mr. BORDEN. The appointments to new senatorships are now under consideration.

THE GRAIN ACT.

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

On section 80—Grain shipped from public elevators, re-inspection.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It will be remembered that I proposed to insert after the word 'quality' in subsection 2, the words 'or is manifestly not of the grade called for by the certificate.' This is to provide for what occasionally takes place where a lot of grain turns out to be manifestly of a different grade from that shown on the certificate. There is no recourse so far as the Act is concerned in such a case and this simply proposes that in such a case the grain shall not be regraded but that the inspector shall endorse across the face of the original certificate a statement of the facts as he does in respect of the other two conditions mentioned in the section, where the grain has deteriorated or has gone out of condition.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will agree that there is always grave danger in attempting to provide for special cases by general legislation. The amendment is intended to provide for a case that should not arise. If the inspection and transportation of the grain has been carried on in accordance with the Act the condition would not arise, and this is particularly an instance where general legislation should not be invoked to cover a special case.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We have already tried to cure two special cases by general legislation, the cases of grain going out of condition and deteriorating in quality. These are not normal conditions, they are abnormal, and so they are special cases. If general legislation is invoked to cure two cases like that which do not occur frequently what objection can there be to curing a third condition which occasionally occurs where, through neglect or mistake or any circumstance not referable to the owner of the grain, this condition arises so that the owner of the grain would not be prejudicially affected thereby. There is no regrading, the inspector simply makes a statement of fact upon the certificate as in the two preceding cases.

Mr. OLIVER. The two cases already provided for in the section as it stands arise in the natural course of events and cannot possibly be prevented from arising, but the case now being provided for can only arise through mistake or lapse of some kind for which it is true the owner is not responsible, but for which the interests handling the grain are undoubtedly responsible, and I say that such a case is not a proper one to be met by general legislation. My hon. friend says there is to be no regrading, but as a matter of fact the endorsation by the inspector upon the certificate that the grain is of such and such a character is to all intents and purposes a regrading. It is true that the certificate is not withdrawn and another issued, but across the face of the certificate is written the responsibie statement of the inspector that the grain is of such and such a grade, and I take it that the statement by the inspector is as good as a grade in the world's market; it is for all practical purposes a regrading.

The owner of the grain is not likely to call attention to the fact that it is of less value than when it was graded. That is the situation which is provided for already in the Act. It is where the grain has deteriorated, and the owner of it, to save himself from the consequences of the supposition that it has deteriorated more greatly than it has, calls for an inspection. But in the proposed amendment, it is not a question of the grain having deteriorated, because if it has, the owner is the last man to call attention to it. It is the shipper or the man who is interested in the grain who will draw attention to it. Let me emphasize this point, that in the carriage of the grain from the head of the lakes to the

mill in eastern Canada or to Montreal there are several occasions when bulk is broken, and when there are opportunities to mix the grades, and the provision that my hon. friend proposes to introduce would give the man at the eastern transfer elevator an opportunity to mix the grades to his own satisfaction, and to get the benefit of that mixing. That is objectionable from every point of view. It is true, as my hon. friend says, that the grain is not re-graded. In one way it may be said not to be; but the grain has the inspector's certificate that instead of being No. 2 it is No. 1, and I take it that carries the full weight which the owner of the grain would get the benefit of. The proposed amendment is of a most serious character, and the reasons which have been offered for the change do not appear to me sufficient to warrant a provision which would open the door to mixing, in order to meet a case which in the nature of things cannot arise if every part of the business is transacted as it should be. It does not arise in the course of nature, but only in the course of administration. Deterioration is provided for already. I want the clause left as it is. I think it is the only safe thing. The clause is dangerous as it is, but it goes as far as it is safe to go, and any further change in that direction would be much more dangerous.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend's argument has not convinced me that we are opening the door to any troublesome results in the administration of the Act. The simple case is this. Here is a man in the east who has his car of wheat, and he has paid on the grade at Fort William, we will say No. 2. It comes to him and is about to be delivered. When he opens it and sees it, he says: That is not No. 2; that is No. 3 or No. 4; it is not the grade I bought. He calls in an inspector, and the inspector views the grain, and if he thinks it is manifestly not of the grade certified, he writes that fact. He does not say that it is No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, or No. 4. The Act expressely provides that it cannot be re-graded. He simply writes the fact on the certificate that in his view the grain is manifestly not of the grade it purports to be. What damage is done to anybody or anything by that? But you have made it possible for a man to be relieved and to right himself in the transaction between himself and the original shipper. My hon. friend seems to think that because that is not natural it should not be provided for. The truth is, we do not have to provide so many safeguards against things that are natural as against mistakes that arise out of human fallibility and human frailty. We provide for all the inspection and control that we think is necessary, but these are all instruments that are fallible and may make mistakes, and it is against any case of that kind that we want to provide some sort of direct remedy. This places the man who receives the grain in a position to obtain his rights. How it lends itself to mixing is something I have not been convinced of by my hon. friend's argument.

Mr. TURRIFF. Suppose a cargo is shipped from Fort William as No. 3. It arrives at the eastern elevator and is taken in as No. 3. If it should happen to be a very strong No. 3, would there not be a possibility of an inspector thinking that it should be No. 2?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is not the inspector, but the person interested in the grain, who calls attention to it.

Mr. TURRIFF. The person interested in it might think it was stronger than No. 3, and might easily get a certificate as No. 2. He could go to an inspector at an eastern elevator and point out to him that that was a better wheat than No. 3, that it had been manifestly wrongly graded, and he would secure from the inspector a certificate that it was not No. 3, which would practically make it No. 2.

An hon. MEMBER. He might make it No. 4.

Mr. TURRIFF. He might, but if it were very much out of line so that the owner wanted a change of grade, it would not be at a grade lower.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the object of that amendment anyway?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Representation was made to me by the Dominion Millers' Association in eastern Canada that sometimes lots of grain came down, which were manifestly lower than the grade given before shipment. Two or three concrete instances were given of grain shipments in carload lots which were purchased as No. 2 but which were manifestly lower than No. 2. The purchaser buys a carload of No. 2 at a price but the grain is manifestly not that grade. It is a mixed grain and worthless to him for milling. The buyer calls the attention of the inspector to it, and if the inspector agrees that the grain is obviously not of the grade at which it was sold, he writes that across the certificate. Then the man who bought No. 2 and finds a car at his door which is No. 4 or no grade, has the written statement of the inspector to that effect. I have had this clause looked over by my inspecting officers and they agree that it is a provision which may be helpful in certain special instances and they cannot see that it will lead to any dangerous results.

Mr. STAPLES. Why is it necessary to write across the certificates? Could you not get a declaration from your inspector in writing and not tamper with the certificate?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). In the two preceding instances, where there has been a loss of condition or deterioration in quality, that is the course thought best to adopt, namely, to write on the back of the certificate the facts and have the inspector sign that writing. Then the matter is referable to the chief inspector at Winnipeg, and if necessary samples can be taken and the thing be readjusted.

Mr. STAPLES. The object is simply to protect the buyer? I do not see why that could not be done by calling in an inspector and have him make a declaration of the facts instead of tampering with the certificate. In that way the same protection could be afforded.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The certificate is the document which starts at the source and accompanies the lot until its disposal. It is not quite right to say that the certificate is tampered with because under the law a plain statement is written across it, signed by the inspector. I cannot see that any one can be injured by that.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. As I understand it now, the amendment comes from the suggestion of the millers, and the only thing they contemplated was that the grain would be of a lower grade than mentioned in the certificate. That the grain might be raised from No. 3 to No. 2 did not enter the minds of the millers.

Mr. OLIVER. With all due respect to the milling fraternity—and no one has more respect for them than I—I think it was the other suggestion that occurred to them. I want to bring to the attention of the committee the fact that a principle of the Grain Act has always been that the inspection made at Winnipeg shall be final with the exceptions mentioned, and the proposal of my hon. friend is an absolute departure from that principle. If a miller finds himself defrauded in the grain he receives, there is no necessity to provide a remedy for him in the Grain Act. The law courts are open to him as to any other man. I can see no reason, therefore, why we should in any way tamper with the important principle of the Grain Act to which I have referred. With regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for Macdonald that the inspector should be bound to make a declaration at the demand of the owner of the grain, he must remember that this does not say it is only the owner who will have the right to demand reinspection. Anybody interested can do so. While the miller might not want the grain to be graded higher, the man who sold it might. I want to be very strong on this point that the principle of a single inspection is the very foundation principle of the Grain Act, and the maintenance of standard grades. My hon. friend will notice in going through the Act that there are many places where a little latitude might be given but where it is not, just because it was necessary to stick to that principle. Here is however, a proposal to depart from it, which is most objectionable from every point of view. I notice that these sections are headed 'Eastern inspection division' as though they applied only to the grain grown in that division. But clearly, from what the minister has said, it is intended that these provisions shall apply to grain coming from the west, inspected at Winnipeg as western grain and arriving at the mill in the east. But on the way the bulk is broken at different places where there has been every opportunity to mix the grain. Under this amendment, there would be an open door for the mixer to get the benefit of his work.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) starts out with the statement that the bed rock principle of the Bill is that there shall be the inspection, and that the grades shall not be meddled with after that. And then he immediately makes exceptions.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Why does he make these exceptions?

Mr. OLIVER. Because they were necesary.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Of course, because they were reasonable. But why? For the protection of the buyer. Having made two exceptions to the principle, surely it is not for him to raise an unreasoning outcry against exceptions, but to show where this exception will be disadvantageous. We have shown where it will be helpful in protecting the buyer. Why should a carload of grain, which has been inspected as No. 2 or No. 1, but which by some neglect, change, metamorphosis, turns out to be a car of feed go further under the false grading of No. 1 or No. 2? Are we so blindly attached to a principle that we will not permit the rectification of a wrong to an individual?—and in the case I have mentioned must the wrong be permitted against the whole grading system of a profligate car of feed sailing through a civilized country under the certificate of No. 1 or No. 2? The first opportunity to right the wrong should be availed of, it seems to me. I give my hon. friend credit for his stern adherence to principle; but we do not live long in this world without

knowing that every principle has its exception.

Mr. OLIVER. Whilst we must admit that every rule has its exceptions, and every principle must have exceptions, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster, North Toronto) will agree that the fewer exceptions the better.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Quite so.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that the two exceptions made are no precedent for the exception the hon. gentleman proposes to make, because they arise out of entirely different circumstances. These exceptions arise out of conditions which are unavoidable, while the exception he proposes to make arises out of avoidable conditions. If this grain becomes metamorphosed, if it is changed, as it should not be changed, in its course from the inspection to the consumer, the system of inspection is at fault, or the system of transport is at fault; and if there is a fault, it should be brought to attention and cured as quickly as possible.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. If the miller who receives that grain has to seek redress at law, there is no doubt that attention will be drawn to the fact that the transportation system is not working in accordance with the terms of the Act and means will have to be found to remedy that wrong. But if, when the miller receives the changed grain, all that is necessary is for the inspector to write across the certificate and the miller will suffer no loss, there will be no reason for particular inquiry into the method of transportation and the abuse will go on. Provision is made in the Act to practically sanction, yes to actually sanction, deviation from the terms of the Act. I think that most remarkable legislation, and objectionable in proportion as it is remarkable.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). As war is the last recourse between nations, so law is the last recourse between individuals. If there is any way in getting a wrong righted between individuals without going to law, by all means have it taken advantage of; settle the matter before you get into the hands of the lawyers and before the judges. I see a lawyer on the other side of the House shaking his head. He sees possible advantages disappearing if a theory of that kind be generally acted upon. But I think that the commission generally, including the lawyers, will say that this is right. If you are against mixing, seize the mixed or metamorphosed grain as quickly as you can. Trace the wrong back to its source. If it is a bad officer, chuck him, if a bad method, have it changed. In this case, it would be referred to the chief inspector with a sample of the grain. The chief inspector has means of tracing the matter and quickly detecting where the mixing or wrongdoing took place. But my hon. friend would give his allegiance to principle, and that on a mere basis of numerals,—a principle with two exceptions is all right, but a principle with three exceptions cannot be allowed at all. That does not seem to me reasonable.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is a good deal of force in what the minister (Mr. Foster) has said. But when he comes to handle the men in charge of the terminal elevators and the receiving elevators for a few years, he will find that there is no class of men so well able to take advantage of the leeway that he gives and so get around the main intent of the Act. And they will mix that wheat to their advantage whenever they can get a regrading of it.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They cannot get a regrading; the law absolutely forbids it.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is practically a regrading.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Under no circumstances shall such grain be mixed or regraded.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is practically a regrading.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I take only the common sense view of it and leave my officers to give me the official view of it. I talked over the matter with Mr. Gibbs, our chief inspector, who is present, and I would not have proposed it if it could have been shown me by the opinion of my chief officer where it would work out wrongfully. In fact, if I had been shown to be mistaken in the assertion I make that this would be the means of tracing out and actually preventing mixing or other wrong things, I would not have brought it down.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster, North Toronto) is very insistent on the point that this will not be a regrading. Now he has said that his purpose is to avoid litigation. Speaking of grain that is of a lower grade, it must be assumed from what he has said, that the inspector's notation on the certificate will be a sufficient protection to the receiver or purchaser of that grain.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It will be an evidence.

Mr. OLIVER. Unless it is a sufficient protection it will not avoid litigation. If it is a sufficient protection in the case of degraded grain to avoid litigation, I presume it would be just as sufficient a pro-

tection in the case of grain that was found, at the instance of one of the parties concerned, to be of a higher grade; in other words, that it would for practical purposes be a regrading of that grain. Now, I want to deal with this question of the effect upon the operations of the department as two propositions, one the accepting of the notation of the inspector as a settlement of the question, and the other, the leaving the miller to the recourse of law. In the case of accepting the notation of the inspector as a settlement of the question, whose interest is it to go through the department and the operations of the trade, and find where the fault was? It is nobody's interest. The miller has got what he wants, the inspector has got the trouble off his hands, and the department never hears about it, and the officials of the department are encouraged then to think that the next time such a thing occurs they will get away just as well; whereas, if every man in the department knows that if that grain goes through and is not as it ought to be, the man who receives it is going to take recourse, and the department is going to be informed, and then somebody will lose his head. That is the view I take of the matter. For the sake of the administration of the Act itself it is necessary that that which is a fault on the part of those who are operating under the Act, should not in any way be condoned by the mere notation of the inspector.

Mr. TURRIFF. I wish to ask the minister if a record will be kept of all the wheat that may be changed in that way, and a return made to the department, so that we will know a year afterwards just how it has worked out?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Undoubtedly. My hon. friend said that what he feared was that the department would not be notified, and would not be kept alive to it. To my mind, this is just what will keep the department alive to it. So long as the department is under my charge I intend to know everything that is going on, and if anything goes wrong, whose fault it is.

Mr. TURRIFF. And a report made?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 90,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Section 90 reads as follows:

All grain placed in public or terminal elevators east of Winnipeg in the division shall be subject to inspection both inwards and outwards.

Mr. OLIVER.

The proposal is to drop out the words 'east of Winnipeg.' That leaves no exception in the city of Winnipeg, or in St. Boniface, or anywhere else. All grain in public or terminal elevators is to be subject to inspection, both in and out.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the minister explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is to make the principle of the Act dominant in all cases. At present it is possible to have elevators in Winnipeg or St. Boniface that are not subject to this. There are, I think, two elevators in St. Boniface at the present time, and I see no reason why an elevator in St Boniface, public or terminal, should have privileges otherwise than an elevator which is a mile away, and just outside the district of Winnipeg.

Mr. OLIVER. I presume there is a prohibition of the mixing of grades in all public and terminal elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Grain goes into the elevator in St. Boniface of all grades and all kinds, and it stays there. Then it can be sent out from that to Fort William or Port Arthur, and can be there inspected and given its grades. What takes place in the elevator no man knows.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to know whether there is some specific provision in the Act as it stands that grain stored in a public or terminal elevator shall not be mixed?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is a general clause against mixing.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to read that clause in connection with the proposed amendment. Unless there is a prohibition of mixing, it would be possible, under this amended provision, to put grain of a number of different grades into an elevator, and take out a number of entirely different grades.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). At present that is what is done.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what we wish to avoid and we would not wish to have that done under the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The amendment is to prevent that. In section 126, subsection 8, you have the clause that:

In no case, whether in a terminal elevator in the western inspection division or in a public elevator in the eastern inspection division shall grain of different grades be mixed together while in store.

That takes in all of the western division.

Mr. OLIVER. All the terminal elevators but not the public ones.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). And all the public elevators in the eastern division.

Mr. OLIVER. But the public elevators in the western division are not included in that.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he would prevent the mixing of two grades in the hold of a vessel. Would it prevent running No. 2 and No. 3 wheat simultaneously into a vessel and mixing them?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). When grain is inspected out at Port Arthur into a vessel all grains of the same grade are to be put into one hold unless the owner of the different grades of grains wants them to be put into a hold together. That is his own business, but in that case, he only gets the grade of the mixed grain with the quantities or the weights of each.

Mr. OLIVER. The minister will, perhaps appreciate my curiosity in regard to this section when he reads the first subsection of section 91, where it states that all grain grown west of Winnipeg, shall be inspected at Winnipeg or at a point within the district, and that the inspection shall be final, that is to say that there shall be one inspection. Do the words 'shall be subject to inspection, both inwards and outwards in section 90' mean an inspection to verify the original inspection, or would it be considered possible, to constitute one of these as a reinspection? It would perhaps be just as well, if we are going to stand by the principle contained in subsection 91, to be a little more specific in section 90, in regard to that matter.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Let us see how it reads:

90. All grain placed in public or terminal elevators east of Winnipeg, in the division, shall be subject to inspection both inwards and outwards.

That is plain.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). When it goes into the elevator it is inspected in; when it goes out it is inspected out. Then,

91. All grain produced in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and in the Northwest Territories, passing through the Winnipeg district en route to points to the east thereof shall be inspected at Winnipeg or a point within the district——

The car shall be inspected.

—and, on all grain so inspected, the inspection shall be final as between the western farmer or dealer and the Winnipeg dealer.

Section 90 refers to public and terminal elevators and to grain in passage from the Winnipeg district in cars.

In the case of grain which is shipped east from an elevator in Winnipeg or St. Boniface, the sample for inspection shall not be drawn from any car until the car has been billed for shipment by the railway company.

It goes into the elevator in different grades and it may be kept there for two, three, four, five or six months. They then draw a car up and fill it. They get the bill of lading for that car before it can be inspected; otherwise they might return it to the elevator, but, having the bill of lading, they call for inspection and that car goes forward under that inspection grade. Then, in subsection 4 of section 91, there is another one of these exceptions:

When, owing to extreme pressure of business, the railway company, or other transportation company, finds that cars containing grain are being unduly delayed for inspection purposes in Winnipeg, then the company, upon notification to, and with the consent of, the chief inspector, or, in his absence, the inspector, may remove a special number of cars to Fort William without inspection at Winnipeg.

Arrived at Fort William they have to be inspected there, and a grade given to them. Any grain inspected at Winnipeg, or other western point, may be reinspected at Fort William or other terminal elevator in the division without additional charge. That is to provide for an appeal in case of difference as to the grade. Whilst the car is en route to Fort William, or when it arrives at Fort William a sample may be drawn to be brought back to the inspector at Winnipeg to settle a dispute, and that is done without additional charge. But any grain not inspected west of Fort William shall be inspected at that point, and a certificate shall be issued on payment of the usual fee which catches the last possible residue of grain coming through in these different ways. It looks to be all sealed up.

Mr. OLIVER. Is the inspection of grain out of the elevator a commanding inspection, or a verifying inspection?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). By a verifying inspection my hon. friend means is it to make sure that the same grade goes out as comes in. That is what it is for.

Mr. OLIVER. The words in section 1 hardly express that idea.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is what we understaand them to mean.

Mr. STAPLES. If ten cars were inspected in as No. 1 Hard, and were inpected out on a different grade that would be evidence that there had been mixing going on. Then you would follow and prosecute under the Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I wanted to find out if the two inspections were to prevent mixing.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The second inspection is for the purpose of verifying the first inspection and preventing mixing.

On section 91, inspection,

Mr. OLIVER. Would it not be better to say that the inspection is final, subject to certain provisions of the Act when the intention of the Act is that it shall be absolutely final. The words following the word 'final' in the second last line in the first subsection seem to me to limit the authority of the inspection for no reason.

Section 105,—qualities of grain,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I propose to add the following as subclause (a) :

All changes in the designations or weights of grades made in this section shall only apply and have effect on and after September 1, 1912, and until the said dates the grades of grain shall have effect as previously defined in the Inspection and Sale Act and the Manitoba Grain Act as on January 1, 1912.

That is to prevent any interference with contracts made on the old grades.

Mr. OLIVER. Should there not be some words at the beginning of this section stating that these grades apply only to the eastern inspection division, and not generally?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The inspector states that whilst these have so far been applicable only to the east, it might occur that in the west some of these grades might be grown; and, if so, this clause should be applicable in the west, while the clauses applying to the western section would hold for the west as well.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot understand how this section, worded as it is, will hold with the section regarding western grain. If this section were amended to make it apply generally, with the exception of those provisions relating to western grain, there would be no conflict.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When this matter was under discussion in the House the other day, I referred to section 115 dealing with rejected grain. This section defines rejected grain as follows:

Rejected grain shall comprise all spring wheat for warehousing, but too low in weight or otherwise unfit to be graded as No. 3. This includes seed dirty grain, also screenings from elevators.

I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the importance of regulating the disposal of this rejected grain. One hon. gentleman the other day said he thought it was covered by the Act for the Inspection and Sale of Seeds. I find, on looking over the Act, that it does not cover it. The report of the Minister of Agriculture for 1910 deals particularly with rejected grain, in the following terms:

Noxious weed seeds in ground feeding stuffs and screenings from commercial grain, which are distributed for the purpose of stock feeding, have been the cause for some serious complaints during the past year. Investigation thus far would seem to indicate that the causes for these complaints are restricted quite largely to the province of Ontario, where the screenings from the cereal grains grown in the prairie provinces after being recleaned at the large elevators on Lake Superior and elsewhere are marketed.

Again, in his report for 1911, the Minister of Agriculture alludes to the same cause of complaint, and there states:

I, therefore, instructed my seed commissioner to continue the investigation into the condition of ground feeding stuffs distributed for sale to farmers, and, by collecting and examining samples and by inquiry, to ascertain what practical means, if any, may be adopted to prevent the distribution of vital weed seeds in ground mill feeds. The investigation has shown that, as in previous years bran manufactured by the larger flour mills is comparatively free from weed seeds; but the forty-eight samples of bran collected had an average of two hundred and forty-six weed seeds per pound. Crushed or ground meals were often found to be in a worse condition, sometimes containing more than eighteen hundred weed seeds per pound.

These statements are enough to convince every one of the importance of careful supervision of this rejected grain which is to be dealt with by the commissioners to be appointed under this Bill. The Minister of Agriculture indicates that Ontario is the greatest sufferer from the purchase of this rejected the weed infested grain from western Canada. Even this year, while the field crop of Ontario was not as large as those of previous years, the value of that crop almost equalled the field crop of the three western provinces. These commissioners, dealing as they do with the grading of the grain not only of western Canada, but of the whole of Canada, have, or ought to have, under their control the disposal of noxious weeds that comprise a large portion of many shipments of grain to the elevators. I believe that there are to-day in Ontario farms that are harder to reclaim from the weeds that have taken possession of them than they were when covered by the original forest. The importance of some one in authority having power to deal with this matter cannot, I think, be too strongly impressed on this House. I have not studied the Bill as carefully as no doubt many members from western Canada have done.

But this particular evil has been so patent to every one in Ontario during the past few years that something has to be done. I believe that in the Inland Revenue Act provision is made for looking after the seeds contained in feedstuff by inspectors, but such inspectors are altogether too few in number to attend to this. But there is no provision whatever as far as I can find for preventing the sale or distribution of weed seeds in screenings or unground grains. There is scarcely a town or city in which there are not many people who keep a number of fowl and who buy screenings from the elevators in western Canada. The manure from this source is frequently hauled to the farms and distributed in that way to an extent most people hardly realize. I would, therefore, strongly urge on the hon. minister that some provision be made in this Bill which would enable the commissioners to regulate and control this evil, they are in a better position to do so than anybody else. I am satisfied that the time has arrived when so drastic measure must be adopted in order to prevent this evil from spreading throughout the country.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is no doubt at all about the importance of the subject to which my hon. friend has alluded, but the means of remedying the evil is a little more difficult. I doubt whether the machinery provided by this Bill is the best means for that purpose. I am told that the province of Manitoba absolutely prohibits the sale of these screenings, either from the elevators in the province or the terminal elevators, and has done so the last five years. That would seem to be an effective method of getting rid of the evil in the province of Ontario as well.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What becomes of these screenings?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). 90 to 95 per cent of them go to the American market. They are ground into feed and sold into the United States at from $5 to $12 per ton, and the value of the screenings turned out at the terminals would be from $300,000 to $500,000. They are fed to hogs and stock and poultry.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would not the value of these screenings be largely enhanced by separating the weed seeds from the broken wheat? I think that could be done by putting the screenings through a finer mesh. I have it on good authority that a great many of those weed seeds ground up into bran and shorts are not only unfit for stock but are actually poisonous. I believe that by more careful screening, a larger proportion of these weed seeds could be extracted.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved that the words 'shall weigh not less than 64 pounds to the bushel' be added to the section defining the grade of No. 1 peas.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved that the words 'shall weigh not less than 62 pounds to the bushel be added to the definition of No. 2 peas, so that these clauses shall read as follow:

No. 1 peas shall be white, clean and sound, not worm eaten and free from bugs, and weigh not less than 64 pounds to the bushel.

No. 2 peas shall be reasonably clean and sound, and reasonably free from worm eaten and buggy peas and weigh not less than 62 pounds to the bushel.

No. 3 peas shall be such as are too dirty as to be graded No. 2, or are worm-eaten or buggy, and weigh not less than sixty pounds to the bushel.

Mr. NEELY. Where does the Minister get those weights?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). From the inspectors divisions in Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. NEELY. I do not know why the minister is changing the established standard for the weight of peas.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am not changing the standard; I am putting into an enactment what are now standard grades in the east. That is all.

Mr. NEELY. As a matter of fact, the farmer has been getting the benefit in all grades of peas in the sixty pound bushel. The minister is raising the standard so far as weight is concerned, so that the purchaser of the peas is going to get the advantage of this extra weight. No matter what customs may prevail, no matter what private standards may exist, the legal standard has been 60 pounds to the bushel. It looks to me as if the minister were making a concession to the man who buys and not to the man who raises.

Mr. AIKINS. How will these weights of eastern Canada affect western Canada?

Mr. NEELY. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) as I understand him, is one who deprecates invidious distinctions between east and west. This legislation is for the whole of Canada and not for any particular section. We are to legislate for all Canada and not for any particular part of it, and, even though these weights were applied only in the east, yet, as a member of this House, I am as much interested in the farmers of Ontario as in the farmers of the west.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), is mistaken if he thinks that these grades apply only to the

east; they apply all over Canada, as the minister has said, and it is generally admitted. There are other grades that we shall come to, that apply only to the west.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The minister is well aware that there are few peas to be obtained in the country, in Ontario especially, which used to be the great pea section. What weights are proposed?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). 1, 2 and 3 grades, 64, 62 and 60 pounds respectively. And the inspector says that in all these cases the actual weights are from one to two pounds above that. So, there is plenty of room.

Now, with reference to the question of nomenclature for grades in the western inspection division I proposed to change the name in all these wheat grades from 'Manitoba' to 'Canada.' It will then read 'No. 1, Canada, Hard Wheat.' This is in pursuance of the discussion we had the other day which was pretty full and in which the view was expressed that the name should be broadened from the sectional to the national. It is proposed to carry that through these grades of spring wheat, winter wheat and barley. In reference to flax, I propose instead of the word 'Northwestern' to insert 'Canada.'

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I took exception to this the other day. I was fairly in earnest then, but I am much more in earnest now. I am more in earnest because I was speaking before without opportunity to consult anybody and, as the saying is, off my own bat. But since then I have talked with many men engaged in business, who understand the importance of a trade-mark better than I do, and perhaps better than many other members of this House. It is an exceedingly important matter, this change of the name from 'Manitoba Hard' by which our wheat and flour have been known all over the world, and known as surpassing any grade grown elsewhere. I do not wish to detain the House with a long discussion, but I would like the minister to think that over. I cannot see that this change will be of much advantage to my hon. friends from Saskatchewan and Alberta; I cannot see that it makes much difference to them. Another name is to be adopted which is neither that of Saskatchewan nor Alberta. I do not see any advantage in the making the change that would compensate for the disadvantage incurred. It will take a long time for buyers in Europe to understand that this change is made.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce suggests that we should place in brackets the word 'Manitoba'. Well, that would help us out a little. But I cannot agree to use the word 'Canada' alone in designating this grain. If you are going to change the word from 'Manitoba' to some other name, then make it signify the country in which this grain is grown. It certainly does not grow in eastern Canada. I think the name should be either 'Canada Western' or 'Western Canada' grain. I suggested 'Western Canada' the other day, but I will agree to 'Canada Western'. But I do say there must be some further designation than merely to call it 'Canada' wheat. I would much prefer, and I believe that all commercial men who know the feeling on the English market or wherever our flour or wheat has been sold, would still prefer to retain the name 'Manitoba'. But if we are going to change it, let us take some name that will designate the wheat properly, and leave no doubt that it is grown in western Canada.

Mr. NEELY. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Schaffner) that the name 'Manitoba' should be retained. I think the minister's contention that the broader term should be used is only just and fair to those other provinces of Canada, where wheat is grown similar to the wheat grown in Manitoba. More than that, I think the country generally would derive much more benefit from the production of its grain if the national name of 'Canada' were used. It would have more effect in advertising this country than the designation by which this hard wheat has been known for so many years in the markets of the world. On the other hand, I do agree with the hon. member for Souris when he says that if the change is to be made there should be another word added to the word 'Canada'. We are not a selfish people in the west, we do not claim to be able to grow apples as they can grow them in Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia; but we do claim that our soil and our climatic conditions are the only soil and climatic conditions adapted to the growing of hard wheat, and we are jealous of the reputation of this grain, and of the reputation of that section of the country where the grain is grown. So I consider that the minister might very well add the word 'West' without any detriment whatever to the rest of Canada. We would still use the national name, but would designate that particular section of Canada in which the grain was grown, and which I think is justly entitled to the credit that belongs to that part of the country from any advertisement there may be in the name itself.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I cannot say that I admire the assurance of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Neely) in appropriating to 'Western Canadian' the credit of being the only place where No. 1 Hard wheat can be grown in Canada. I

want to say that in Ontario we can grow No. 1 Hard wheat, that even in competition with wheat from all over the world, at the Paris International Exhibition in 1900 was awarded the gold medal. This wheat was grown in northern Ontario near New Liskeard. I believe that in northern Ontario there is a country that will yet be growing millions and millions of bushels of wheat, therefore, I consider the minister is right in changing the word 'Manitoba' to 'Canadian'. I do not think it should be 'Western Canada.' That distinction should be left out. We are all one people here, we have a country of whose possibilities we have as yet no conception. I may say that in the province of Quebec also there is unoccupied land that will in future years be producing immense quantities of wheat, land, both in northern Quebec and in northern Ontario, that is now being opened up by the Transcontinental railway. There is no finer section of land in Canada than that through which that road passes in northern Ontario. The word 'Canadian' I believe is the proper word to use, because it will do justice to the whole of Canada. It will show that we do not claim that there is only one part of Canada that can grow No. 1 Hard Wheat, and that no other section can. I quite approve the change the minister proposes to make.

Mr. AIKINS. The reason for the change I think is sentimental. If it was going to be productive of any benefit to the wheat producer, then I certainly would support the change. But it is going to be productive of loss to the wheat producer. The Manitoba Wheat has a reputation that has been acquired by years of care and trouble and expense, and if that name is changed, I venture to say that the wheat produced in western Canada will not bring within a few cents at all events the price at which it now sells in the European markets. Therefore, it seems to me we will be getting the benefit of a sentiment at a sacrifice of the price of wheat. The provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta producing the same kind of wheat will get the advantage of the name of 'Manitoba' as well as that province itself; they produce the same class of wheat and they will get the benefit of that trade name. I have known trade names sometimes to be so valuable that they were stolen and the courts had to intervene to prevent it. It seems rather singular that people would be quite willing to give away a trade name that has such advantages as the trade name 'Manitoba Wheat. Neither can I agree with the last speaker (Mr. Sutherland) that we should adopt the name 'Canadian.' If the same class of wheat was produced all over Canada, then perhaps there might be some ground for it. But that wheat is not produced in all parts of Canada, and the name would be misleading; it is produced mainly in western Canada. I do not suppose it is produced in British Columbia, but it is produced in the three wheat growing provinces, and that is an additional reason why it would be better to restrict the name to 'Manitoba Wheat,' than to call it 'Western Canada Wheat,' because to call it 'Western Canada Wheat' would include provinces which do not produce that class of wheat. I would much prefer, therefore, to have the name left as it is. But if the majority insist on a change, I certainly would prefer the words 'Western Canada' to the word 'Canada.'

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not think either the member for Brandon (Mr Aikins), or the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), have very good grounds for the line of argument they have taken. I do not think that dropping the name 'Manitoba' will affect the price of wheat to any considerable extent. It is a very poor compliment to the English wheat buyers, and the Canadian millers to say that they buy wheat on the name instead of on its intrinsic quality. If the wheat is called 'Western Canada Wheat,' and the old designation is bracketed for the next year or two, as suggested by the minister, you will guard against any loss whatever, and you will protect everybody. I am sure my hon. friends from Manitoba will realize that owing to the actual condition of things, of the total amount of wheat produced on the prairies in future, only a very moderate proportion can be produced in the province of Manitoba.

It would not be fair to the other provinces which will be in the future producing the great bulk of the hard wheat, that it should be named for that one province, which is producing the smaller portion of it, especially when you can give it a name that will be fair to Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and yet designate it as wheat produced in the western part of Canada. As to wheat produced in British Columbia, there will never be any considerable quantity grown there. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), there will no greater objection to calling the wheat 'Western Canadian' than calling it, as it is at the present time 'Manitoba Hard.' There has been no objection from the wheat growers in Ontario or Quebec to the name 'Manitoba Hard.' They do not produce Manitoba Hard wheat or wheat of the quality of 'Manitoba Hard.' I do not doubt that in some portions of the northern part of Ontario and Quebec they might grow a little wheat of that quality, this has

only reference to the western provinces of Canada, and there should be no injustice done to anybody. I am, therefore, in favour of the adoption of the name suggested by the minister, but adding to it the word 'western.'

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the position taken by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). I think the name should be 'Canada.' If there have been any people in the House who have been chastising those who live in the east for making a division between the east and west, it has been our friends from the west on both sides of the House. It seems to me that the minister has taken a very wise course, in proposing to stamp the name 'Canada' on our wheat to make us one Canada, not an eastern or a western Canada, but one united country. That has been the tendency of the eastern people who are producing different classes of goods. The manufacturers of Ontario have adopted the phrase to be stamped upon their manufactured goods 'Made in Canada,' not 'Made in Ontario,' or 'Made in Quebec,' with the view of impressing upon the purchasing world that these goods were manufactured in the Dominion of Canada, without any specification as to whether it was in the east, or in the west. If any part of Canada has any complaint, I think that complaint would naturally come from the province of Ontario. I do not think that the west would be injured in any way. I do not think it would interfere with the west in any form and I would not want to say anything that would interfere with the splendid position that the people of Manitoba have given to the Canadian people generally, by the production of wheat. But, we are putting through a Bill, which is likely to remain on the statute-book for many years, it is successful and operates well, and therefore, it seems to me that this is the proper time to obliterate all those divisions and put into it simply the phrase 'Canada,' instead of 'east' or 'west.'

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I move that it be amended to read 'Canada Western.'

Mr. OLIVER. I second the motion. I would think that the purpose of a name is to express an idea or to state a fact and, whether there are questions of sentiment or questions of business, when we are legislating we should think that it is a part of our business, and an important part of our business, to see that our legislation expresses a correct idea and states a fact. There is no doubt that the use of the word 'Manitoba' as describing wheat that is raised in the western provinces, is not a correct or adequate description. It does not convey an idea, it is not a statement of fact; it is contrary to the fact, indeed. For that reason there clearly should be some name that would be descriptive and common to all the western country which raises a particular kind of grain. The whole western country, possessing similar soil and a similar climate, naturally has similar products; differing in quality, because of varying soil and climatic conditions, from like products raised in other parts of Canada. Therefore, it is only reasonable and right, when we have varying products, that we should give them a name that would be descriptive. As to the name 'Canada' or the like, the matter strikes me in this way: We are giving a name to a grain described in a certain section of this Act as being raised in a certain section of Canada. If that were the only grain raised in Canada then it would be all right to call it 'Canada' grain. There is no misstatement of fact or difficulty of idea in speaking of Canadian grapes, or Canadian peaches, but when you speak of Canadian apples there is a great difference between the apples in Nova Scotia, Ontario and British Columbia, and it is only fair and right that these different classes of apples should be described so as to set out their differences such as they may be. So I say in regard to grain. While wheat, barley and oats are raised throughout Canada, there is a certain distinctive character to the wheat and the oats particularly, and there is in some degree, I believe, also to the barley that is raised in these prairie provinces. For business reasons, as well as other reasons, which I have already stated, it is desirable that the grains of these prairie provinces should be distinguished by name from grains of like variety raised in other parts of the country. If you use the word 'Canada' alone as describing western wheat there is no reason why wheat raised in Ontario should not also go forward as 'Canada' wheat. It is 'Canada' wheat as a matter of fact, and all the legislation we can put on the statute-book will not prevent it from being Canadian wheat, and the people who are dealing with that wheat, if it is to their advantage, are entitled to use that advantage and we cannot prevent them. Now, I think that under these circumstances there is a business reason, from the standpoint of the trade of the country, as well as the sentimental standpoint, why there should be a distinction in name between grain raised in eastern Canada and grain raised in western Canada If it were all of the same kind and character there would be no reason for a distinction in the name, but the wheat raised in the prairie provinces, being of a distinctive character from the wheat raised in the rest of the country, it is in the interest of business that there should be a distinctive name. While the name suggested by the hon.

member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) is not as short as would be desirable it is certainly absolutely descriptive. There could be no question about the wheat that is labelled 'Canada West' or 'Canada Western' being properly described and no question about identifying wheat by that name.

The objection that the name is a little long for use might be overcome by providing that the initials should be used as a contraction and should be a sufficient identification. This would be a solution of what is now really a business difficulty as well as an infringement on reasonable sentiment.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think the time is opportune for abandoning the name 'Manitoba.' We are changing the name from the Manitoba Grain Act to The Canada Grain Act. If we want simply a name descriptive of the wheat, then the word 'Manitoba' does not fulfil that requirement. It is a small part of the wheat growing country in the west, it was at one time the only part. I do not share the view that 'Canada West' should be used. That term at one time was applied to western Ontario, and while it might apply to the grain growing section now, in a few years it might mean British Columbia or the Yukon. We hope that in a very few years the prairie country will be spoken of as the main part of Canada as we think to-day, in our modesty, it is. If the people in eastern Canada get any benefit from the use of the word 'Canada' we do not begrudge it. We are keeping the rest of Canada anyway and if our name is going to help them it is only a small thing to us. I am in favour of having the word 'Canada' without the adjective 'west.'

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I feel very strongly that the name should be left as it is at present. Manitoba was the pioneer province of western Canada, it opened the way for the rest of your children who come further west and why should you wish to change your old father's name? The fact remains that in southern Manitoba is grown the best wheat in Canada to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no. Nonsense.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). You may say nonsense, but analysis will tell you that the best bread-making wheat comes from southern Manitoba. The trade mark of 'Manitoba' has become established in relation to our grain and I am strongly in favour of leaving the name as it is now.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If I thought the substitution of Canada for Manitoba would degrade the quality or lessen the price of the wheat I would hesitate before even advocating the change, but after taking the best advice I could get it does not seem to me it can possibly affect the price. Wheat is bought on its quality and the price will be according to its quality, and although the trade-mark has become familiar as an indication of quality, it is, after all, nothing more than an indication of quality. While there might be disturbance of trade by a sudden change in the name we guard against that by arranging that it shall not come into effect until next season and on the certificate we place after 'Canada,' 'Manitoba.' Commission houses and grain men all over the world are alive to that, information spreads rapidly, and I think that by the first of September of next year no grain buyer in the world would have any confusion in his mind on account of the change in name. The national idea appealed to me to a certain extent on the ground of sentiment. The use of the word Canada could not degrade the quality or value of the grain, but it would be a distinctive name which would take in a larger area than Manitoba. So it would tend to the general advantage of our producers.

There are some here who want the word 'Manitoba' and nothing else; there are others who want the name 'Canada' and nothing else. To my mind those who prefer the name 'Canada' stand on the strongest ground and on the widest platform. Those who want 'Manitoba' want it because of their love of old associations as well as may be a lingering fear that some confusion may arise. There are others who argue that the word 'Western' should be put in, and that suggested the term 'Canada Western'. I said when I came down with this Bill to the House that I was not bigoted about non-essentials, and that I wanted to make it the result of consultation with both sides of the House, always with the understanding that the government would be responsible for the Bill when it became an Act. For my part I have no objection to adopting, as a compromise, the term 'Canada Western'; so that we should have Canada Western No. 1 Hard wheat, and so on. I would commend that as a half-way step. Hitherto we have given everything to our friends from the west. I suppose we must look on them as spoiled children and treat them very kindly.

Mr. STAPLES. I wish again to raise my protest against dropping the name 'Manitoba', not because we are so jealous of it that we are not prepared to do what is for the general advantage of Canada; but that name has a commercial value in the

markets of the world. If you are going to adopt the name 'Canada', I think you could get a better term than 'Western' to put with it. Why not use the term 'Canada Prairie Wheat'? All of that part of Canada west of Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains and for some distance east of Winnipeg is known as the prairie west, on which this superior quality of hard wheat is produced. I think the term 'Prairie' is a better term than 'Western.'

Mr. BLAIN. A similar question to the present one was pretty fully discussed in the House in connection with the Fruit Marks Act. The question arose as to which part of Canada produced the best apples. Some claimed that it was Nova Scotia, some British Columbia, and some the province of Ontario. There was a demand on the part of members from Nova Scotia to continue the words 'Nova Scotia', and to stamp that name on the barrels of apples which came from that province. It was finally decided to put in the Act the provision that every package found to be fairly and properly packed the inspector was to brand 'No. 1, Inspected Canadian Apples', 'No. 2, Inspected Canadian Apples', and so on. The names of all the provinces were left out, and all the apples for export were to be stamped as inspected Canadian apples. That is an example of the former administration adopting a Canadian policy, and for my part I think it is only fair that the same policy should be carried out with respect to wheat, as suggested by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and that it should be branded as Canadian and not with the name of any section of Canada.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How about the commercial value of those apples from different sections of Canada?

Mr. BLAIN. I am bound to give to Manitoba the credit of having gained for our wheat the prominence that it has; but our policy is to do away with the lines of demarcation between the east and the west, and for my part I support the suggestion of the hon. minister.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not a resident of Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta, but I think we shall make a mistake if we drop the name 'Manitoba Hard'. There are other countries in the world that produce hard wheat. If I mistake not, The Argentine produces hard wheat, and I think there is hard wheat produced in Russia. Ladoga wheat, which is produced in many parts of the northwest, originally came from Russia

Mr. OLIVER. It was a soft wheat when it came, and a very poor one.

Mr. HENDERSON. We hardened it after we grew it in the northwest. My point is that in the British market there is a well-founded meaning of the term 'Manitoba Hard', and I think we shall make a mistake if we change that name to any other, whether it is 'Western' or even the larger name 'Canada.' I think we shall lose something in the market that we have now and that we shall not get back for ten or twelve years. The people of Great Britain are very jealous. The sacks will go forward labelled 'Manitoba Hard' or 'Canada Hard'. When they are put upon the market in Great Britain, and the baker is asked to buy a sack of flour called 'Canada Hard', he will say, 'That is not what I want at all; I want Manitoba Hard, and I will take no other.' You could not make him believe in ten years that 'Canada Hard' was the same thing as 'Manitoba Hard'. In England people are accustomed to speak of Canadian cheese as American cheese, and if we labelled our cheese Canadian, I think we would lose much. The name 'Manitoba Hard' is to my mind simply a name. I do not think it belongs to Manitoba any more than to Saskatchewan or to Alberta. Manitoba Hard can be grown in any one of those provinces, although perhaps it can be grown to greater perfection in Manitoba. I say to the people of the west on behalf of the people of the east that I think we shall make a tremendous mistake if we change its name. Our millers in the east want Manitoba Hard.

They may be told that Canada Hard is the same thing, but they will say: Manitoba Hard is what we want, it is what we are accustomed to, and we are not going to buy any other. Therefore, I would urge that we should go slow and not give away the good thing we have, and we have a good thing in that name. It is worth millions to the people of Canada and the people of the northwest. If you change the name to 'Western' or 'Canada' it will not bring the same amount of money as if you left the name as it is. I would be sorry to see any change; but if there is to be any change, I would rather simply call it 'hard wheat,' instead of changing the name to 'Canada' or 'Western.' But I would prefer that we should still cling to the name Manitoba Hard. Let us keep the advantages we have gained throughout a long series of years. If we change the name, the people of the northwest will be the ones to suffer most, but the people in the east will suffer as well, because they will scarcely know what they are buying. Whether the wheat was raised in the northern or southern regions we want to know that we are buying the kind of wheat known as Manitoba Hard. I hope that the promoter of this Bill will be conservative enough to hold it to the good old name of Manitoba Hard

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to add a word in support of what has been so well said by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). I entirely agree in every word he has said with regard to this matter. I can see no good purpose than can be served by making a change. If it could be shown that any advantage could be had by making the change proposed, I would be willing to agree to it, but I cannot see any. As has been well said by my hon. friend, we would be liable to create a wrong impression and thereby do a large amount of injury and serve no good purpose. It is undoubted that Manitoba Hard wheat has established its value on the markets of the world. That brand Manitoba Hard, was given in the early days when Manitoba was the pioneer territory producing this hard wheat, and we have from that day until now, endeavoured by our laws, rules and practice to preserve the identity of that wheat in the markets the world over. In those markets it is known as Manitoba Hard, and I do not see what advantage can be gained by changing that name. I do not sav this with a view of attempting to reflect on the wheat grown in Saskatchewan and Alberta, but it nevertheless is a fact that the wheat grown in the Red River Valley of Manitoba is undoubtedly the best milling wheat grown anywhere to-day. If you change the name, you will not bring any benefit to the people of Saskatchewan or Alberta; on the contrary, the further west you go the softer is the wheat, and therefore, you will create a distinction and a difference in the high standard of Manitoba No. 1 Hard, which is recognized the world over, and if you make that change, you will do exactly what my hon. friend from Halton has pointed out. You will bring about a loss to the people of western Canada and serve no good purpose in any other respect.

Mr. TURRIFF. I cannot allow the statement of the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) to go unchallenged that southern Manitoba grows the finest wheat raised in the west. I have heard millers, dozens of them, say that the wheat grown as far west in southern Saskatchewan as wheat is grown—that is right up into the Dirt Hills and to a large extent now in the Dirt Hills—right through southern Alberta and around the great plains of Weyburn, which is one of the largest shipping points in Canada to-day—the wheat grown in that portion of Saskatchewan and Alberta is fully equal to that grown in southern Manitoba or any other part of the country, and I have no doubt that many other parts of Saskatchewan further north grow an equally good variety of wheat.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). If my hon. friend will go to Dr. Saunders at the Experimental farm and see the tests of the different wheats grown throughout the whole of Canada, he will find that the highest tested wheat in the world is that grown in southern Manitoba. I wish to move in amendment to the amendment that the name remain as it is in the Bill at present, namely Manitoba Hard.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for Macdonald has raised the only objection that could be validly urged against the use of the word Canada Western, namely, that it would include British Columbia, and to that extent the name would not be accurately descriptive, because the wheat raised in British Columbia is not of the same character as that raised on the prairies. But British Columbia is not a country, and in all human probability never will be, which exports wheat, so that the wheat raised in British Columbia does not come into the argument at all. With regard to the use of the word 'Manitoba' and the effect which would follow the dropping of that word out of the grades of wheat, I have before me the Manitoba 'Free Press' of February 7, giving a list of the market prices for wheat. The prices are given for fifteen of the grades of wheat on the Winnipeg market, and in none of those grades will be found the description 'Manitoba,' showing conclusively that, as a matter of actual practice in grading wheat, the use of the word 'Manitoba' is not significant to any serious extent.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). In the province itself?

Mr. OLIVER. The wheat is sold as Northern and not as Manitoba wheat. The word 'Manitoba' is not used generally speaking in the market report. I am quite aware that there are some brands of flour which use the word 'Manitoba,' but as a descriptive term for a particular class of export wheat produced in the prairie provinces it has practically no significance at this time, if the market reports found in the public journals are any guide of value in describing wheat. I give you here seventeen different grades of prairie wheat, in none of which is the word 'Manitoba' used. When we come to oats, the description is 'Canada Western,' in the contracted form of 'C.W.' When we come to winter wheat the words 'Alberta Red' are used. So, I think it is clear that, as a descriptive term 'Canada Western' comes closest to giving a description that will be in accordance with the facts and will be absolutely intelligible to the business world and avoid confusion in business transactions.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) drop the word 'Alberta.'?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, what I want to get at is a term that will be descriptive of and common to all the grain that is raised in the prairie provinces. In 'Canada Western' we have a name that is accurately descriptive, is not cumbersome, can be easily contracted and its use, on the evidence of the market reports, will not seriously clash with the terms used in the market quotations.

Mr. STAPLES. Why not adopt the word 'prairie'?

Mr. OLIVER. The word 'prairie' is more thoroughly descriptive than any of them, and if there were any considerable willingness in the House to take that word, I would agree.

Mr. STAPLES. I would only suggest that if the House is bound to defeat the word 'Manitoba.'

Mr. OLIVER. I am quite willing to accept the word 'prairie'; but, as the minister has expressed his willingness to accept the name 'Canada Western,' then, to follow a form of expression of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), even if the minister does agree with that view, I still think it right.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). The parallel of the case of fruit suggested by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) is no parallel at all. The same kind of fruit is grown all over Canada, but that is not the case with regard to wheat and other grain.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? He knows that there are no apples grown in Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAIN. Hon. members should wait until I finish my sentence, I say there are no apples grown in Manitoba, Alberta or Saskatchewan for the export trade that I know anything about.

Mr. KYTE. There are none grown in Canada so good as those grown in Nova Scotia.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I do not think the explanation of the hon. member (Mr. Blain) shows that there is a parallel between the case of fruit and that of wheat. It is true, some places in Canada do not ship apples, but the apples that are shipped from all over Canada are designated in the one way; and, while there may be differences, and while the representative of each district contends that the product of his district is the best——

Mr. BLAIN. Does not that apply to wheat?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). No, by this very Bill you enact that it shall not apply to wheat, for those grades apply only to the western inspection division. With regard to the word 'Manitoba,' while I sympathize with my hon. friends from that province who do not like the name changed, yet, outside of the sentiment of the thing, I do not think the change will amount to much. I agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) that if he inserts 'Manitoba' in brackets, it will be needed only for the time. I am growing wheat in the western country, but I am not a bit alarmed about the change of name, even if we do not insert the word 'Manitoba' in brackets. I expect to sell my wheat according to quality and not according to name, and I shall not lose a cent a bushel—or even part of a cent a bushel—because it is not called 'Manitoba,' I do not care what you call it——

Mr. STAPLES. How do you like the word 'prairie'?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I do not think we had better bring up fresh names; we have enough. Now, as to the claim of the Manitoba people that they market a superior wheat, I think they should produce more evidence before they claim that our wheat is inferior to their own, which is practically what they claim. The Thousand-dollar prize in Chicago went to Northern Saskatchewan wheat, and I think we can do it again.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not wish to go on with this Bill after six o'clock, so I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Between now and the time when we take this Bill up again, we can think about the names of wheat.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

SECOND READING.

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

SUPPLY—PAIRS IN VOTE ON TARIFF COMMISSION.

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

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

SUPPLY.

Mr. MONK. There was an item reserved in Harbours and Rivers generally, an item for Quebec.

Quebec—harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $60,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) if the breakwater at Anse-au-Canard, Gaspé, for which an amount was voted in the estimates, will be built. I understand that tenders were invited some months ago for the construction of that breakwater and that, as appears by an answer given by the hon. gentleman to a question which I put some weeks ago, the tenderer had not made the necessary deposit, the tenders were, of course cancelled, new tenders were invited and on that second occasion the tender was considered too high for the department. Since that time nothing has been done. I received a letter to-day from a merchant of Newport, county of Gaspé, because Anse-au-Canard is one of the coves of Newport, and he states that he has learned on good authority that the work will not be proceeded with. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if any decision has been reached by the department in regard to that work. This is one of the public works in the county of Gaspé. I take an interest in those works because I have been somewhat associated with that county for fifteen years. There is another work in the county of Gaspé which does not appear in the list of items. I refer to the Gaspé landing pier. My hon. friend will remember that some three years ago a large amount was provided in the estimates for the construction of that pier, a contract was entered into with the firm of Dussault of Lévis or Quebec, I am not sure which. The work has been started and not seeing anything in the main estimates perhaps the hon. gentleman would let me know if it is his intention to place something in the supplementary estimates for this year? I may tell my hon. friend that Gaspé is the terminus of the Gaspé railway, better known as the Atlantic, Quebec and Western. The Atlantic Quebec and Western railway was started a few years ago. It runs from Paspebiac, or New Carlisle, for a distance of about 105 miles to Gaspé Basin. It is a first-class railway. It has been built at a cost to the company of a sum that is nearer $5,000,000 than $4,500,000. The company, in order to settle the railway position in the peninsula of Gaspé, has acquired the other railway, well known as the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway, so that to-day you have a continuous railway running from Metapedia on the Intercolonial railway as far as Gaspé Basin a distance of over 200 miles. The new company has made very substantial repairs to the old road and this coming year more repairs are provided for in its estimates. It has been the aim of the company from the beginning, and the hope of the people of Gaspé, to have a direct ocean connection between Gaspé and Liverpool or some port in Ireland. Steamers, if they were running between Liverpool and Gaspe, would, notwithstanding the claims of St. John, Halifax and Quebec, run by the shortest route, and, as regards the carriage of the mails, could afford a much better service to Canada than that which is at present provided. However, that is only for the future; let us see if, for the present, the government intends to build the landing pier at Gaspé. A large amount was provided for the construction of the landing pier. The Gaspé company intends to run its trains as far as the water's edge. Though I have no more political interest in my old constituency I yet look upon that work as a national work, at least as far as my native province is concerned. The peninsula of Gaspé is probably the first land that was sighted by the discoverers of Canada when first they came to the St. Lawrence river; in fact, looking at the archives the other day, I read a description of a trip made into the Bay of Gaspé by no less a traveller than Jacques Cartier himself. He called at a place well known in the country as Fontenelle. There he planted a cross and took possession of the soil in the name of God and the King of France. But this peninsula, although exceedingly wealthy in all sorts of resources, rich in timber, in minerals and in agriculture, has been tremendously neglected. That was due not so much to the fault of the governments of the day, although they were partly responsible for the state of affairs there, as to the existence of a company well known in the maritime provinces and on the coast of the Labradors. I refer to the Robin firm of Jersey.

This is a great company, which may in some respects be compared to the Hudson's Bay Company. The Hudson's Bay Company were engaged in the pursuit of fur-bearing animals while the Robins were engaged in the fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. They have established in the gulf I do not know how many agencies. The oldest establishments are situated in the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure. During the last 150 years they have extended considerably and now their stores and establishments are dotting the shores of the St. Lawrence river and the gulf. The Robins were anxious to keep the people to the fishing industry and they knew that the construction of a railway would perhaps induce the fishermen to go abroad and they have bitterly opposed, during half a century, the construction of any railway on that coast. I do not say that in disparagement of the

business methods of the Robins firm. They were, I suppose, working for No. 1. At the same time they prevented the people of Gaspé from getting their due in whatever government grants were given at the time for the expansion of the country. Gaspé is a very rich peninsula, and the construction of this railway will give the county an enormous development. The object of the company was undoubtedly to keep the people there and not allow them to go into any lumbering operations outside of the peninsula, in fact I do not think it is too strong to say they desired to keep them in a state of semi-slavery. In fact in 1896 when I was first elected for Gaspé, I travelled for many days along the 200 miles of coast in that county, and I found in many little places, in the little coves bordering the coast, old men and young men who had never seen the colour of a red cent in their lives. They were fishing and selling the fish to the Robin firm, receiving in return merchandise or goods. I obtained from the government of the day the establishment of a steamer service running between Montreal, Quebec and these various ports on the coast, in order to give a little more competition to the merchants in that far-away district. The result was most beneficial, but it was only the beginning. It was only when the construction of the railway was started that a new era dawned on the coast of Gaspé. The railway after many vicissitudes has been completed. It took about ten years of hard work on the part of the then member for the county of Gaspé to secure the completion of that road through federal and local subsidies.

My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), decided upon a landing pier at the point called Sandy Beach. With his knowledge of the conditions in that section of the maritime provinces, he could appreciate the value and importance of that new feeder to the Intercolonial railway. In fact, the railway at Gaspé will, in the near future I am quite sure, through its connections with the Intercolonial railway, and at the boundary line with railways in the State of Maine, be an excellent railway for Canada and that section of the country as it will bring it into close touch with the United States, New Brunswick, and that part of the province of Quebec which is near the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This landing pier was decided upon at the terminus of the railway, the contract was given, a large amount was voted, but the pier is not completed, and I see nothing in the estimates to complete it. I hope, however, that in the supplementary estimates the hon. gentleman will put in an amount sufficient to complete it. As I have said, I have no political affiliations with the county, I have only my reminiscences to connect me with it, and they are of the happiest nature. Although I was defeated at the last general election, I bear no illwill to the electors of that constituency which supported me during 15 years. But I am very much interested in the completion of that railway, and I see in the completion of the landing pier, the termination of a work which I do not hesitate to qualify as one of national importance.

Mr. BRODER. What is the length of the branch?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is over 200 miles. It connects with the Intercolonial railway at Metapedia, at the point where the Intercolonial railway crosses the Restigouche river into Quebec. The first 100 miles were built many years ago, and the railroad was well known as the Baie des Chaleurs railway. Later, it passed to another company, and took the name of the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway. It was built as far as Paspebiac. The charter of the company gave it the right to build as far as Gaspé basin, 102 miles further, but as that first company at that time, was almost insolvent, I asked parliament to grant another charter to another company, which was known as the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway company. This company built from the terminus of the old company, New Carlyle to Gaspé basin, has merged with the old, and it is now one trunk line running between Metapedia and Gaspé basin. The company has had many vicissitudes and for some time it was feared that it would stop its operations.

But fortunately the company is now in the hands of a strong organization in London, having at its head Lord Ranfurly, ex-Governor of New Zealand, who came to Canada and inspected the road, and did not hesitate to take charge of the whole system. The company even this winter has been able to operate except for a few days, and I know, from the reports of the engineers in the Department of Railway and Canals, that it is a first-class railway. It was built by English engineers, and the only reproach to offer in regard to it is that it was built perhaps in a little too costly a way. At all events, it awaits only the completion of the landing pier at Sandy Beach in order to be fully equipped. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if he has come to a decision in the matter, and if we may expect that there will be in the supplementary estimates an amount sufficient to complete the work.

Mr. MONK. I am anxious to give my hon. friend all the information possible in regard to the two questions he has put. The first has reference to the breakwater at Anse-au-Canard. The second question

has reference to the landing pier at Gaspé Basin at the terminus of the railway to which he has referred. Of course, it is more easy to explain the items for which credits are asked than to explain the reasons why the estimates submitted do not contain further items. However, I believe that my hon. friend has correctly stated what happened at Anse-au-Canard. Tenders were called for, and they were found to be too high. Other tenders have been called for, and I believe that the amounts of the tenders exceeded the amount claimed originally by the government for the execution of the work. A number of works were projected, regarding which some calculations were made under the late government which are not to be found in these estimates. Naturally a new government coming in to exercise power under different circumstances and perhaps with a different view as to these different works, could not be expected to see absolutely eye to eye with the previous government in regard to each and every one of these works. I have mentioned on more than one occasion to the committee that we found ourselves confronted with I think larger demands than have ever been made in the past with respect to our principal shipping ports, our national ports, which were referred to at length in the reports of the Transportation Commission, dating back to 1903, and it has become to me evident, and it seems so to the government, that we must take steps without any delay to equip those national ports to meet present requirements. We are behind the times. We are far behind our American neighbours, in the equipment of our ports, and unless we make speedy preparation to secure the amount of trade to which we are legitimately entitled, we shall see that trade go gradually to the United States. We have found ourselves this year under the necessity of equipping with as great speed as possible our Atlantic ports, and the prospective opening of the Panama canal has made it necessary for us to prepare for considerable expenditure on our Pacific ports.

Nevertheless, in spite of these rather pressing requirements, the government is anxious to provide for local necessities as well, as far as that may be possible. As regards the peninsula of Gaspé, what my hon. friend has stated is perfectly true; and I may say that the hon. member who now represents the county of Gaspé, and who is I believe domiciled there, has brought to my attention on many occasions the needs of that county, which was to a certain extent unnecessary in my case, because I have had occasion to visit that important territory, and have become convinced by personal inspection and by much that has been written of extreme interest with regard to its possibilities. There is room, we are told, within the Gaspé peninsula for over 50 thriving settlements still to be founded and developed; there are immense fisheries all around it; it has lumber wealth, mineral wealth, oil, and wealth of every other kind. The railway along the coast to which my hon. friend has referred will at least contribute to open up that peninsula. There is still the interior to be developed, however. The port of Gaspé is an important port, and there are other ports along that coast which it is claimed could be kept open all winter. The landing pier at Gaspé Basin has certainly received the attention of the government, and I hope and expect to be able in the supplementary estimates to provide for the final execution of what work remains to be done. That will depend on what will be placed at the disposal of the department for the completion of those very important works which we desire to carry out as soon as practicable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is due to the committee that some explanation should be given why there is no item in the estimates for the purpose of completing this work, because a contract was let by myself as Minister of Public Works pursuant to the authority of parliament, a portion of the work has been done, and the contractor will be entitled to go on with the work and receive his pay. My hon. friend is aware that in these main estimates provision was made for all works which were under way, I think without exception.

My hon. friend's attention was called to one or two when these estimates were under consideration before, and he says that if they had been omitted through an oversight he would restore them in the supplementary estimates. In the estimates which he brought down, and which had been prepared by the late government, for the year ending 31st March, he included an amount of $87,500 for this wharf. Surely he ought to be able to tell us why that amount was left out, whether intentionally or by mistake. He has told us that the hon. member for Gaspé had called his attention frequently to the necessity of completing this wharf. Then why did he omit this item? As this work was under contract, he must recognize that the committee is entitled to some explanation.

Mr. MONK. If the facts are as my hon. friend has stated them, it is a case of omission, and will be provided for in the supplementaries. My hon. friend will admit, I suppose, that it is possible to make some omissions. In all cases of works under contract, my instructions were that they must be provided for.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The committee have some reason to complain with regard to the information the hon. minister is giving us concerning items that have been dropped from the estimates. I can quite understand that he cannot be prepared to give reasons why certain new works, that were never projected up to the present, are not provided for. But in the case of works which have been examined and reported on, and for the construction of which provision was made last year, we are entitled to some explanation. In my own province about two thirds of the whole estimates of last year have disappeared altogether from the present estimates. The House committed itself to the expenditure on these works on two several occasions. The late government laid these items before the House and got five-twelfths voted. Then the incoming government laid the same items before the House last December, and got the remaining seven-twelfths voted. In some cases tenders had been called for, but when we come now to examine the main estimates, brought down after recess, we find a great many of these items have disappeared altogether, and the minister does not appear to know why. I drew his attention on two occasions to the item of the extension of a breakwater at New Harbour in my own constituency, and have not yet been able to get any reason why that item was dropped. I have no doubt that if the hon. minister would look into the reports and examine what his own engineers have said, he would not agree that this should have been struck from the estimates. That breakwater was started a great many years ago, it was built a part of the way out into the harbour. It became too small for the requirements of the people, the number of boats now fishing there could not be sheltered by the breakwater as it stands to-day, and an expenditure of $10,000 was voted last year for the purpose of extending that work. It is a very urgent work in my county. I have been asked by the people for some explanation why the item has been dropped, but have not been able to get any. In Nova Scotia out of $1,300,000, voted last year, two thirds of the whole has disappeared, and the minister does not explain why.

Mr. CURRIE. Is not the hon. gentleman losing sight of the fact that although these items appeared in the estimates last year they were not voted by this House? There were 400 docks in Nova Scotia which the House refused to vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These items I refer to were absolutely voted, all of them.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is an old parliamentarian, and I would call his attention to the fact that we are slightly outside the subject under discussion We did not reserve any item from Quebec. We did reserve an item in Ontario for harbours and rivers in order to allow the members from that province to offer any observations they might judge fit. When the question was put with regard to Gaspé basin I thought it better to answer it, but the question which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has put to me I have answered very often.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think the hon. gentleman has answered it at all. He has given no reason why that item was struck from the estimates.

Mr. MONK. It seemed to me I have answered in the only way possible. It is not an argument to say that a public work has been reported on favourably by the departmental officer, that all the preliminaries have been gone through and that the previous parliament voted an amount for the execution of that work. Parliament may approve of an appropriation, but if nothing was done with it, the new parliament can consider it as not having been utilized and can set aside that appropriation and vote another one. When the present government came into power there were a number of works in the estimates, five-twelfths of the amount for which had been voted, and the House will remember that the whole of the previous year's estimates were passed by parliament. That, however, did not entail on this government the necessity of carrying out these works. Every year amounts are voted by parliament that are not expended, and those votes pass out of existence. It is absurd to pretend that at present the government is obliged to justify the leaving out of these works, the moneys for which had been voted but never expended. What answer could I give my hon. friend. I could not explain to him what occurred in council when these particular items came up for discussion, if they were discussed at all. I can only give reasons for the appropriations that are submitted. It is quite open for any hon. member to criticize these estimates by comparison.

I submit that there is no special duty upon me at this stage to explain why previous appropriations that do not appear again in the estimates have been left out. That would be an impossible task. A number of these appropriations being considered by the government, were set aside. New estimates have been placed before the House for other works deemed more necessary and urgent. While I am willing to give all the information at my command, I have not come here to explain why public works for which no appropriations are asked are not in the programme of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) does not quite recognize the rights of parliament in this matter. He seems to assume that whatever the government does is right.

Mr. MONK. By no means; I am too old in this business to have any such opinion as that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. See the extraordinary position in which the hon. gentleman places parliament. In the estimates which he submitted to this parliament, he asked for an appropriation for Nova Scotia of $1,309,166. Hon. members may have voted for other public works throughout Canada, having in view that justice was being done by that province. (Because, after all, in endeavouring to discharge one's duty in connection with the estimates, one must have regard to the necessities and claims of the different provinces). The hon. minister will remember that, when he asked for the part of this vote of $1,309,166 not already voted, I called his attention to the fact that these were substantially the same items as had been submitted to parliament by the late government. He agreed. I said: We take it for granted that, speaking in the main, the government, in asking parliament for this vote, intends to go on with these works—of course, is not bound to go on with every item if subsequent reports should show that it was not necessary. We voted the estimates on that understanding. That was the pledge made to parliament. Now he comes and, without rhyme or reason, reduces the vote for Nova Scotia from $1,309,166 to $445,000—leaves out two-thirds of the amount for which he solemnly asked.

It looks like trifling with the House. Parliament would not have voted these amounts if it had supposed that the government had no intention of going on with the work, or if it had supposed that he was going to discriminate against Nova Scotia —and the same remark applies to my own province of New Brunswick, whose vote under this head is cut down from $800,000 to a little over $200,000, the total appropriations, including those on capital and on revenue account being reduced from $1,800,000 to $1,200,000. Has the hon. gentleman discovered that these works are unnecessary? Has he examined the reports of the engineers? It seems to me he is not discharging the duties he took upon himself when he said that the government recognized the utility of these works, and would proceed with them, and parliament voted the money.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Pugsley) memory I think is at fault. Those who were present at the time the seven-twelfths estimates were put through, will remember that they were put through without explanation, merely the balance of the year's estimates, and there was scarcely any discussion. But even if matters were as the hon. gentleman has presented them, yet, the discussion of one year's estimates is entirely different from that of the following year. When these estimates were being prepared, the government was called upon to formulate its policy, if I may use that expression, with regard to each of these public works. I may say to my hon. friend, that if there have been any heart-burnings or omissions, the supplementary estimates will be found to be as satisfactory as possible.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to have some better explanation from the Minister of Public Works than he has given. I am asked by the people in my county for an explanation of the omission of this item, and I have not been able to give it. I have to tell the people that the former government agreed to make that expenditure, also that the principle was agreed to by this parliament by voting the seven-twelfths of the appropriation last December; but when I ask the minister why he has dropped the matter, I am only told that I must not ask such an absurd question. I hope the minister does not seriously mean that I am to tell the people that it is an absurd thing for me to ask why important items like this have been dropped. If I could persuade him to read the papers and go into the matter seriously, I would leave it to his own judgment whether he should not go on to complete these works. We have spent some $27,000 in connection with the protection of that harbour. It is in an exposed part of the coast and the completion of that harbour is much needed. If it is the policy of my hon. friend to build no public works in counties represented by Liberals, of course, there is no help for it, the work will have to remain unfinished. But I hope that when the supplementary estimates come down, we shall find that he has given consideration to the matter. But I would like him to give to-night some more satisfactory explanation than that which he has given.

Mr. MONK. There is not a single harbour in the country where the work is finally completed. The government is endeavouring to complete work in all the harbours as soon as possible. In the case to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) refers, the government has not seen its way clear to continue that work at the present moment. The reason that he supposes—that the counties represented by a member who is not friendly to the government are discriminated against has never entered my consideration.

But it happens, as my hon. friend knows, that appropriations are made for several years and are not used. In cases where the

works were actually begun, we are continuing them. Where contracts were made we are keeping faith with the contractor.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Does the hon. gentleman say that if a different result had happened in Guysborough, and a supporter of the government had been sent here, he would have struck that item out of the estimates?

Mr. MONK. I can tell my hon. friend that at the present moment members on this side of the House are complaining that we have struck a number of items out of the estimates which concern their counties, and which were in previous estimates.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may tell my hon. friend that not only will there be one railway having its terminus at Gaspé, but there is another railway which is now under construction, partly in the county of Rimouski, and partly in the county of Gaspé. There is a railway which was started a few years ago at St. Flavie, and has now reached Matane in the county of Rimouski, and from Matane I understand it is the intention of the company, a very substantial company, to build to the village of Cap Chats, and as far as Gaspé Basin. I think it is the intention of the company to have a port at Mont Louis which at all times of the year is an open harbour, according to statements made by navigators of experience. Then from Mont Louis this railway would join the main line of the Atlantic, Quebec and Lake Superior, using the Atlantic pier as a terminus. The port of Gaspé is an open port at least nine months and a half during the year. In seven seasons out of ten Gaspé is open the whole year round, practically it is open all winter. I do not know what is the case this year, but I have known ships sailing to and fro from the port of Gaspé several months after December. I wish also to refer to another matter connected with the terminus. The late government had granted a certain amount for the construction of a road leading towards the terminus on the coast. If my hon. friend will look at the map of Gaspé he will see that the coast is indented, and the largest indentation is at Gaspé where the arm of the sea practically divides the peninsula in two. Now this bras de mer prevents the people on the other side from reaching the railway, and they have to go a long distance before they reach the landing pier. The population on that side of the peninsula is not so large as on the other side, but it is quite large. The road which was provided by the ex-Minister of Public Works gave to the people of that section of the peninsula a commodious route, which enabled them to reach the landing pier. I understand that work was started some months ago. I know the sentiments of my colleague from Gaspé on that subject, and I specially commended this work to his care after the election. I hope my hon. friend will take note of that fact. The road which starts at Ste. Majorique, and goes towards its terminus, is of great importance to the people there, and one might say that it is part and parcel of the terminus.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend the sitting member for that constituency has pointed out to me the necessity for terminating these works, and has done so with so much insistence that I am afraid that, out of sheer exhaustion, I shall have to give way.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). From the discussion we have had, and the explanations the minister has given on these items in the estimates prepared by the late government and afterwards approved by this government, but which he has dropped, it would seem to be a fair inference that the present government were not disposed to give any promise of the performance of these works at a later date. But the minister has held out a hope that when the supplementary estimates come down a great many of these appropriations asked for at the present time, and that were in the estimates last year, will likely re-appear. But he has not explained why these items were allowed to drop after receiving the approval of this parliament some months ago. If it were not proper that these appropriations should have been made, then when the minister prepared his estimates he should have had before him information which would justify him in dropping such as were not retained, and he should have had the reports of his engineers as to the works that were of a pressing character. I can understand that in the old estimates, there were votes for new works of which, under the circumstances, he might feel constrained to delay the construction until a later period. But where these appropriations were for repairs, for works begun but not completed, and he had his reports to that effect, and the man who prepared the estimates for him saw the necessity of going on with these works, as is evidenced by the fact that they appeared in his estimates, I say it is up to the minister to explain why he dropped them. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has suggested that if the minister would take the House more freely into his confidence, and would tell us which of these dropped in the estimates last year he proposed to have in the supplementaries, then we would be able to get along much faster.

A great deal of the discussion could be avoided and time saved, if the minister would tell us what he proposes to do with regard to these works. In the county which

I have the honour to represent, there are over a dozen works, for which appropriations were made in last year's estimates, in some cases for the maintenance of works already constructed and in others for slight extensions to make the works of service to the community. All of these items, with the exception of two, have been dropped. They are not new works. There are a number of other works that I asked the department to have attended to, which are new works. The minister could very well say that these could not be attended to this year. But these works, to which I refer, were provided for in the estimates last year, and they were approved of by members on the other side of the House, when they agreed to vote seven-twelfths of the amounts appropriated for them a couple of months ago when last year's estimates were voted on. If the minister would explain that he intends to bring down these items in the supplementary estimates the grievance would be remedied. When last this matter was up for consideration, I asked him if these items would be in the estimates, but he evaded my question. I think that my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is quite right in stating that we have not yet been able to get from the minister such information as we are entitled to. The minister states that to reply to our question would necessitate him telling us what took place in council. Surely he does not mean to tell us that in council, when these items were up for consideration, he was told: You will have to cut out these items in Nova Scotia in order that the national ports shall receive proper treatment. Surely he is not going to confess that he was weak enough to surrender and leave out these items which are of such vital interest to the fishermen and other residents of the county which I represent. The Minister of Militia can get all the appropriations he wants. I observe that he finds no difficulty in getting the large appropriations which he demands. Yet, these little works in the province of Nova Scotia are neglected. To some hon. gentlemen on the other side these may seem of very little importance. It is quite right that the national ports should be attended to, but look at the conditions along the shores of Nova Scotia. A great many of these places are distant from the railway, from 20 to 50 miles, the means of communication they have is by water, and they require these little wharfs and breakwaters along the shore which some of our friends opposite have in the past minimized. I remember that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), used to have a set of photographs, of works in the maritime provinces. I do not know where they came from, but, they were supposed to represent some of the harbours and coves down in Nova Scotia. Most of them were the figments of his own imagination, I have no doubt. He held them up to ridicule, but these hon. gentlemen opposite minimize the importance of these works along the shores of Nova Scotia, because they were trifling in cost. Is that a reason why the minister should drop them or fail to see that they are provided for? Thirty-four thousand dollars was voted the year before last for works in the county which I have the honour to represent, a good many of which items were revotes of the year before that. It is only a very trifling amount, yet it covers a dozen different places and it means convenience and accommodation for hundreds and hundreds of people, a great many of whom are engaged in the fishing industry and it accommodates others who have to use these ports for the purpose of transportation. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the minister should frankly answer the question which had been put to him. I read a list of places when this matter was up the last time, for which appropriations are desired and he promised to take the matter into his consideration and give me an answer.

I have heard nothing since. My hon. friend from Guysborough has done likewise. If the minister would tell us frankly that these items are dropped because he did not want to allow the late government to get credit in the country for providing these works and that he intended to provide for them later on when the supplementary estimates came on so that somebody else might get the credit for having secured these works a great deal of our anxiety will have been ended.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend offers a very great temptation. If I can tell him that I have provided for the public works of his county in the supplementary estimates the work of the committee will be much shortened. I know what that means but I am afraid I must resist the temptation. I cannot at this moment tell my hon. friend what provisions will be made in the supplementary estimates. Nor is it relevant to the present discussion. I could not do it under any circumstances. I have told my hon. friend also several times since these estimates were under consideration, when I was asked in regard to leaving out public works in the county of Inverness, that my hon. friend refused to name a superintendent of works. I have a memorandum in my office which I will bring here for a number of these works where the district engineer reported that, although the amount had been voted by parliament, and he had applied to the sitting member for a superintendent of works, he had refused to give any answer.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). It is not the county of Inverness that I have the honour to represent. It is a much better county—the county of Antigonish.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend will pardon me; I am not as familiar with Nova Scotia as he is There are several instances where the district engineer thought the sitting member did not find the work important enough to indicate to him a superintendent of works. I give that as an instance why the minister might naturally conclude that the work is not necessary.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I think the minister has got the two counties confounded. As far as Antigonish is concerned you cannot produce any evidence from the district engineer or anybody else of the fact that I refused to name a foreman.

Mr. MONK. I think it is Mr. Bernasconi who is the district engineer.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). No, he is at North Sydney, Cape Breton. Mr. Millidge is the district engineer there.

Mr. MONK. I will look up the memorandum. I was under the impression that although he had applied for a superintendent of these works he had received no nomination. However, that is not the main point at issue. Where works were begun, where there was any contract, where there was an obligation upon the government to carry out the engagements of the previous administration, these works have been provided for, or they will be in the supplementary estimates. They have to be provided for because the government is not free; it has to keep faith. But, where the whole matter was open, I submit to the committee that the government was free to prepare its estimates as it thought fit, just the same as the government is free to prepare its estimates without reference to the estimates of the year before. The government is perfectly at liberty to follow the estimates of the previous year or to change them. It is a new operation every year. The minister must be prepared to justify those items for which he asks a credit from parliament. It must be evident that the whole discussion of a previous debate cannot be reopened at this stage.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). The minister has conveyed the impression that the failure in going ahead with these works was due to my neglect in not complying with the request to name a clerk of works. I give that information which he has received the most emphatic contra diction. In no case did I refuse to name a clerk of works with perhaps one exception. He referred the other evening to the McAra's Creek work and said that the engineer had asked me to name a clerk of works. Perhaps that is correct, but the reason was that only five-twelfths of the money was available and it would be useless to start the work with only five-twelfths of the amount required on hand. The work would be stopped when the money was exhausted and the five-twelfths might be wasted. I refused to name a foreman, in that particular case, and that case alone. Then too it was on the eve of an election, and I did not think it was the right thing to start these works then, it would be said they were being use for election purposes, and the county of Antigonish is not susceptible to that kind of influence, and cannot be brought to support the government by the refusal of public works. The people are not built that way, they are too independent for that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) is not here to-night, and he wished to speak upon a work in Ontario. Could it be arranged that on any item an hon. member might be allowed to speak about this Ontario work?

Mr. MONK. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. I wrote a note to the minister informing him that I desired information about a number of small works in my county. The minister has just said that he is not very familiar with the geography of Nova Scotia. The county which I represent has not a large population, but it has a tremendous coast line, perhaps as as long as any other county in Canada, so we have quite a number of small works such as wharfs and breakwaters. The first section of the coast extends from the head of East bay to the Grand Narrows, and then you follow along the sea coast to North Sydney. On the other side of the Bras d'Or lakes there is another 75 miles of sea coast, all in my county. There is a large island in the centre of the Bras-d'Or lakes with a coast line of 70 miles, and there is the regular Atlantic sea coast of 150 miles. All of these stretches of sea coast are fishing grounds, and all are more or less exposed to the terrors of the Atlantic ocean. The minister will thus understand why we seek the opening of larger harbours to enable our people to go out and fish and return to shore with some degree of safety. Breakwaters have been built during the last 15 years at a number of places along the shore. Before their construction the only boat the fishermen could use was such a boat as could be hauled up over the beach away from the surf in the evening, shoved out in the morning and reballasted. Since the construction of the breakwaters they have been able to use fairly good sized

schooners, and in many instances gasolene boats which take shelter in some of the little harbours we have made, or behind the breakwaters. I am sorry that I have the same complaint as other members from Nova Scotia that many works which have been started are dropped out altogether. For instance the wharf at East bay, which is almost finished, built by day work and to cost only $4,000, cannot be utilized as it requires a little further work. Then at Rose Point an old wharf built under the Macdonald government requires repairs, the material was on the ground, but it has been left out of the estimates. I cannot believe that Mr. Bernasconi, the chief engineer in that part of the country, would report that works which were halfway finished should be dropped.

I picked out the items for which the money was voted in the estimates of last year, and I sent the list to the minister on the 6th of February, and I will ask that the attention of himself and of his officials be given to these works, and that he will at least proceed with those which have already been begun. The most important work on my list is the opening of the harbour at Aspey bay. That is in a section of the country where there is no available harbour at present. There is what is called a harbour, but the water is not deep enough. It is a magnificent fishing place in a good agricultural section of the country, which is within easy reach of the large markets at Sydney, North Sydney and Sydney Mines; and if the people could only get in touch with the steamer which passes their doors every day but cannot go in, it would be a great benefit to them. For the last 30 years there has been an agitation for the opening of this harbour. This could be accomplished simply by cutting through the bar, which would enable the steamer to go to a splendid harbour inside, 6 miles long and a mile and a half wide. At low water there is at present sometimes not more than 6 feet, and it is impossible for steamers to go in. Last year I prevailed on the late Minister of Public Works to put $50,000 in the estimates to make a start on this work; everything was in readiness for the calling of tenders, and I was told that tenders were called; but I was afterwards informed that some slight changes in the plans were necessary before the work could be put under contract. I find that this work has been dropped altogether from the present estimates. If nothing else were done in my county, I would ask the hon. minister to give some consideration to that work, as it is of the most vital importance to that section of the country. His officials will tell him that it is supported by all the influences which both sides of politics in the county could bring to bear; every public body in the county has sent petitions for it, which are on file in the department. Therefore, I hope that when the supplementary estimates are brought down something will be provided for that work. Even if I had to sacrifice every dollar for other public works in the county, I would be to a certain extent pleased if provision were made for the opening of that harbour.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to a few very necessary public works in my county, in the hope that he will provide for them when he makes up the supplementary estimates. The first is the extension of the breakwater at Charlos' Cove. The breakwater there has been partly built, but it is not long enough to be a proper shelter for boats as it stands at present. It requires to be extended about 150 feet or more. A considerable sum of money has been spent upon it, and it is a very important work in that locality. Another work is the dredging of the Tittle at Canso. This is a narrow channel connecting Chedabucto Bay with Canso harbour. It makes a short cut for the fishermen in stormy weather, but it requires some dredging. Orders were given, I understand, last year that this should be done, but owing to the confusion connected with the election and the difficulty of finding any one to undertake the work, it was not carried out. It would only require a very small expenditure. Then, there is an application for the dredging of St. Mary's river, which my hon. friend will find on the files of the department. This is a very important river, as it the only means of communication with the sea for a large district. It is a lumber district, and the logs are floated down the river and are sawn at Sherbrooke; but the river is not deep enough to enable steamers to come up. Some dredging has been done in the river in the last few years, and there is urgent need that it should be continued. Also the breakwater at Lower Half Island Cove on Chedabucto bay is another important work. The dredging of Guysborough harbour is another. There is a bar at the mouth of the harbour, and it is filling up to some extent, and something will have to be done to make the harbour suitable for the purpose of navigation. My hon. friend will remember that the branch railway that was to be built in that county was struck off, in the slaughter which was made in the estimates, and unless we can get these harbours dredged so as to afford some communication with the sea, it will be very difficult for our people to carry on their business at all. There should also be a small appropriation for cutting a channel at Port Shoreham to

enable the fishermen to get shelter. A few hundred dollars would be sufficient for that. If the minister will examine the applications for these works which he will find on his files and deal with them when he brings down the supplementary estimates, I shall be very much obliged.

Mr. KYTE. I desire to call the attention of the minister to some works which are similarly situated in the county I represent. For the breakwater at Little Anse, provision was made at the last session of parliament, and tenders were called for, and the contract awarded during the month of September last. I would like to call the attention of the minister to that item particularly as the timber has been purchased by the contractor, and I hope he will not lose sight of it when he comes to prepare the supplementary estimates. There were also provided for breakwaters at Port Richmond and Charlos Forest Cove, a wharf at Louisdale and a wharf at Forchu. Tenders were called last year for the construction of these works, but I am informed that contracts have not been entered into up to the present time.

These works are all equally important and I would urge on the hon. minister that he should give attention to them in his supplementary estimates. There are repairs to breakwater at Petit de Grat which are urgently required. This is an important public work which was built years ago, but it is to-day in such a condition as to make the expenditure of public money on it absolutely necessary. The same remark applies to the wharf at Poulamond, which is in very bad condition indeed, and for which an appropriation of $1,600 was voted last session. The objection which the hon. minister raised in connection with the public work asked for by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm), namely, that he refused to recommend a clerk of works, does not apply in this instance. A clerk of works was appointed a year ago, and I trust that these repairs will be made at the earliest possible opportunity. If the hon. minister will look at the estimates voted in the beginning of the session, he will observe that amounts were appropriated for other public works in my county which I shall not now enumerate, but I would ask that he would give some attention to these in his supplementary estimates, so that the people living in these localities may reasonably expect that in the not distant future these very necessary works will be constructed. I desire to impress upon him the fact that these expenditures are asked for solely because they are absolutely required and because the works in question are very important. If he will refer to the reports of his district engineer, he will learn that he has testified to the urgency and necessity of these works being carried out.

Mr. CLARK (North Bruce). I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite do not imagine for a moment that they have a monopoly of grievances against the Minister of Public Works and the government generally with regard to public works in the various constituencies. I hope they do not imagine that items have been struck from the estimates of the Public Works Department merely because the counties interested happen to have returned members supporting the opposition. Hon. gentlemen on this side, myself among the number, have grievances of a similar nature against the minister and the government. I do not think we are making complaints; but if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to file their orders for items in the supplementary estimates, then hon. gentlemen on this side should do the same. We have had the hon. gentlemen rising and filing their claims in this public way on the Minister of Public Works and insisting that he shall place these claims in the supplementaries; and if he is going to do that for his opponents, I insist that he should also do it for his friends.

Mr. KYTE. I shall be very glad to think that he draws no distinction between his friends and his opponents in the matter of appropriations for public works.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is rather a new departure to find hon. gentlemen opposite taking that line. I wonder if my hon. friend remembers how the Minister of Public Works in the late government (Mr. Pugsley) acted when he met with demands for public works from those who were not in sympathy with him in his public policy. I remember when he was quite ready to give a public building to a county adjoining mine in a place not very important and where the population was small, but absolutely refused to spend a dollar in the adjoining constituency.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What about Aylmer?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is not in the county of Halton. I am speaking for my own county, and I remember well the ground the hon. gentleman took in the last session of parliament when he refused any explanation in the county I represent. I then told him that the people of my county were not beggars, that the Liberal party was not going to remain in power for all time, and that we were willing to wait. I did not know that I was such a good prophet, but we did wait and I hope that my representations will have a little more effect on the present Minister of Public Works than they had on the previous one. At any rate it will not be my fault if I do not succeed. I was pleased to hear the

hon. gentleman who spoke before me saying that he wanted the government to give their attention to both sides indiscriminately, but that is a new policy for the Liberal party.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I wish to say a few words to press on the Minister of Public Works the claims of the county I represent. I think it is the duty of hon. members to place before the government the requirements of their various counties, and in my opinion any one who fails to do so is not performing, as he should, his duty to his constituency. I do not think that anybody in this House has a right to hold his tongue in such matters. I perhaps have been doing a little too much of that during the last two or three years, and I now propose, when I have something to submit to the government, to urge it openly in committee. I may say that I have implicit faith in the desire of the hon. minister to treat every county properly; and now that he is preparing his supplementaries, I have some suggestions to submit to him with regard to requirements in my county which no doubt will receive fair treatment. There are several works in the county of Inverness which I would like to see provided for, if possible, in the supplementaries. They were all provided for in the supplementaries of last year. I wish briefly to enumerate these works. I shall take first the work at Tory Harbour. That is an artificial harbour, which was provided for in the supplementaries of last year. It is an important harbour, intended to afford shelter for perhaps some 40 or 50 fishing boats. There are some forty or fifty families depending on the fishing industry here. If the hon minister will look over the reports of his engineer, he will see that the expenditure on this harbour is one which the engineer declares absolutely necessary and urgently called for. Then there is Long Point wharf. That wharf was built five or six years ago, but is now practically of no use as it is almost covered with sand, and it is necessary to extend it out some 200 feet if it is to be of any benefit to the people. I need not enumerate the various reasons why these works should be attended to, as the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has gone over that ground already and the same conditions obtain in my county as in his. Then there is Crignish where a wharf is urgently needed. The lumber has already been bought for this work, and I am sure, from what the hon. minister has told us, he will see that the necessary amount will be provided in the supplementary estimates to carry on this work. I now come to Mabou Harbour which is another important work, as the hon. minister will see if he looks up the engineer's report. It is the only harbour in that part of the county, which is very prosperous and has large exports, and where this channel protection and dredging is urgently required. At Finlay Point, there is another wharf which is now practically of no use. That wharf requires to be extended some 200 feet, as the minister will see by the report in his department. Then there is Margaree Harbour where a sheer dam is required, and I would lay particular stress on the importance of this work, because that is the only harbour in the stretch of country some 40 miles in extent with a population of some 17,000 or 18,000 people. $10,000 was appropriated last year for the purpose of building a sheer dam there.

The minister will see, by reference to the report of the engineer, the importance of this work, and will understand that it should be continued as soon as possible. Then, there is a little harbour, the Friar's Head harbour, which is for fishing boats. It was partly built four or five years ago. The amount necessary to finish this harbour is not large, and I am sure that when the hon. minister knows the number of fishermen there, he will see the importance of completing it. There are over 50 fishermen depending on this harbour for boat protection. Then we come to Cheticamp Point. When I tell the minister that from this point over two hundred fishermen go out to the fishing grounds, and that a settlement of something like three hundred families depend for a living here on the fishing industry, which is depending upon the shelter of this breakwater, he will see the importance of it. I might spend half an hour enumerating the various necessities for this work, but it is not necessary, as the hon. minister has the report of the engineer before him. There is a work at Pleasant Bay, also, an extension of the wharf that is there now. The wharf is of no use unless extended by building another breakwater to the northeast. There is a thriving settlement here of over 40 families who depend on fishing for a livelihood and this wharf is the only protection the fishermen have. Then we come to Marble Mountain. The minister has a report on this work and he will see thereby the importance of this work also. I simply place the demands of the county before the minister that he may provide for them in the supplementary estimates. I have always found the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), courteous, and I hope he will see his way to grant our reasonable demands. All these grants are contained in last year's estimates.

Mr. MONK. I am glad to hear suggestions; but I corroborate what has been said by hon. members on this side, that it is a great mistake to imagine that claims and complaints come only from the other side. I have had quite a number of complaints

on this side of the House. I may say we have a heavy budget, I suppose $30,000,000 when all is considered, but four or five hundreds of millions would not suffice to build all the public works asked for of the department. The hon. gentleman must not forget that during all the years we were in opposition we got very little from the government. I was fifteen years a member of the House and never got a single public work, except on one occasion, when I asked the Minister of Public Works of that time for a small wharf. He said he would give the wharf, provided I would not speak about it in the House. I do not say that that is the right way to obtain public works, but you might try it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I was struck with the faith of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) who said that he had no idea that counties would be discriminated against that were represented by opponents of the government. In reply to what has been said by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), I might say that the experience of which they spoke was that of my own county during eighteen years of Conservative rule, with the exception of four years when the county was represented by a Conservative. During those four years a few public works were built along the coast. It was not that the requirements of the county were not brought before the government, because Mr. John A. Kirk and Mr. D. C. Fraser, who represented the county, urged the government year after year to do something about the coast of that county. But during fourteen years, the name of the county, or any place in the county, does not appear, I venture to say, in the estimates. On one occasion a Minister of Public Works came to the shire town of my county and told the people in plain language that the only way for them to get appropriations for the county was to vote Tory—'support the government and you will get something.' That was the doctrine. I hope we have improved since then. I could give many instances to show that under the late government that did not prevail. For example, the late government was asked to do something for the construction of branch lines in eastern Nova Scotia. They looked over the ground and found a hundred and fifty miles of that country without a railway. Half was in the county of Halifax, represented at that time by the leader of the present government and Mr. Crosby, two Conservatives, and the other half was in Guysborough, represented by myself. They laid down two branches of railway one for each county and put about $1,000,000 for each in the estimates. And what did the present government do? When they came into power they struck the pen through the appropriation for Guysborough and left the appropriation for the county of Halifax. That leads me to fear that my hon. friend behind me has too much faith in the present administration, and also that the hope expressed by my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) may not be realized. But you cannot starve or drive the people of Guysborough into supporting the Tory party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SINCLAIR. You may try it, but you cannot do it. During fourteen years when the Conservatives ruled before, it was tried and it did not work and it will not work now. I should like to feel that this was not going to be the policy of the present administration. But, apparently it is to be their policy. They are doing the same in the case of officials, cutting off heads everywhere in order to give jobs to their friends. They are even cancelling mail contracts, taking advantage of a clause in each contract which enables them to cancel. We know that the prices will go up for the carrying of mails. Owing to the greater expense of living, the higher price of horses, &c., it is certain that when they let the mail contracts they will have to pay for them. But they are cancelling these contracts merely to give them to their friends.

Mr. CURRIE. Did the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) really take seriously the votes for his county in the estimates last year, made on the eve of an election? Did the hon. gentleman really think that the government were going to spend that million dollars in his riding?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I don't think there is any necessity to answer a question like that. My hon. friend knows very well that the late government always took these matters seriously. They not only put items in the estimates, but they spent them. If the present government will carry out the policy of the late government, it will be the best thing they can do for themselves and for the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how his county fared during the régime of the Liberal party?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Fairly well.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, tell us all about it. My impression is that the hon. gentleman has got so much that there is scarcely any room for any thing more. Where would he put any more public works in his county after fifteen years expenditure by the government he was supporting?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The hon. gentleman is quite right, the late government treated

my county much better than ever it was treated before. But the great requirement in my constituency for its development was a branch railway, and it was a great disappointment to the people when the present government was returned to power, because they felt that this important work that had been started by the late government might be stopped, and that fear has been realized.

Mr. CURRIE. It is a well-known fact that this branch railway in the hon. gentleman's riding always appeared during the régime of the Liberal party just on the eve of an election, and it has never been built yet. I am sure that if the Liberal party were in office again, every time an election came round there would be an item in the estimates for this railway down in Guysborough. The hon. gentleman should have grafted the plum tree with the plums on it, he should have had that railway built before there was any chance of an election.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the question of branch lines was only decided on last year, and there was no time lost after the government committed themselves to the policy of building branch lines to the Intercolonial. Immediately on that announcement being made, the supplementary estimates were brought down with a million dollars for Guysborough county, and engineers were placed at once on the work to get ready for construction. There was not a day lost by the late government in regard to that matter. The statement of my hon. friend that this road has been used by the Liberal party for election purposes I absolutely deny. The people in my constituency have been endeavouring for many years to get the government committed to this work before they were finally successful. The contracts that were made with the different companies were not made at the time of an election, but between elections. Hon. gentlemen opposite had better not talk too much about election promises. Let me remind them that their leader, when he went out west last summer promised the people everything that was in sight, promised to give them back their natural resources, to give them back their mines, their lands; and coming down to the head of Lake Superior, he promised terminal elevators at the public expense, promised chilled meat refrigerators out in the west when there appeared to be no public demand for them. I need not go over them all. On the very eve of the local election in Prince Edward Island he sent a telegram down to the Conservative party in Prince Edward Island, saying that he was going to build a car ferry across the strait, and to widen the gauge of the road, in order to help them to win the local elections. Why, Sir, on the eve of the election he issued a manifesto to the fishermen of the maritime provinces promising that he would give them free medicine. There was nothing he could think of that he did not promise in order to get votes. There was never anything known like it in the history of Canada. Hon. gentleman had better not talk too much about pre-election promises.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I am a little surprised at hearing the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) complain that estimates brought down by the late government previous to the elections have not been renewed. As a matter of fact it is known to every person in the province of Nova Scotia that, during the last fifteen years, public works have always been dangled before the constituencies just on the eve of an election. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) made a similar complaint a little while ago. He knows very well that his county has always been promised some great public work just previous to an election, and after the election was over no more was heard of it. The federal government and the provincial government, in 1904, started to build a bridge across the Lennox Passage, a necessary work, just previous to the election, but after the election nothing more was heard of it. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Guysborough assert that the branch line in his county had not been used for election purposes by the late government. As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman from Guysborough, owes his election on more than one occasion, to promises to build this very road. The hon. gentleman himself was a member of a provincial legislature for some years, which, just previous to the general elections, made a declaration that this road was going to be built; I went through his county in 1905 and I found that men were actually at work with wheelbarrows, building that road. As a matter of fact, it has only been used as a kite to amuse and attract the people of his constituency. Everybody in his constituency, everybody in Nova Scotia, knew that when this branch line was proposed, it was only as a vote catcher, and that as soon as the Liberal government were returned, nothing more would be heard of it for another five years. But now we have a business government in power, and something will be done. I think the policy pursued by the hon. gentleman, his bickerings and objectionable language, would, in my judgment, deter any government from taking any interest in his constituency.

Mr. KYTE. As the hon. gentleman has spoken of my constituency, it is only fair

that I should not take his observation with silence. The statement that he made in respect to public works in the county of Richmond only being commenced on the eve of an election is absolutely untrue——

Some hon MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. KYTE. I profess to have more knowledge of the facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. KYTE. I am quite willing to withdraw the statement and say that the hon. member for Annapolis is not as familiar with the conditions in that county as I am.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I know something about the Lennox passage bridge.

Mr. KYTE. The Lennox passage bridge was an incident merely between the provincial government and the municipal council. The municipal council of Richmond passed a resolution in 1903 by which they undertook to contribute $25,000 towards a bridge across Lennox passage if the provincial government would spend $25,000 as well. The provincial government accepted that proposition and made all reasonable speed in the preparations for the construction of that bridge. After the work had been commenced the municipal council met and rescinded their resolution. When they did that the local government felt that they were absolved from carrying out their part of the undertaking and the work lapsed. So much for my hon. friend's story. The hon. gentleman has been drawing a distinction between the conduct of the Liberal government and the Conservative party in the matter of public works. I remember that in 1891, upon the eve of an election, the then Minister of Public Works in the Conservative government, went into the county of Guysborough and, speaking in the shire town, told them in plain language that unless Guysborough returned a Conservative to the House of Commons, there would be no public money spent in that constituency.

With respect to public works in my county, I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the late Mackenzie government, in 1877, constructed a breakwater in the district of L'Ardoise at a cost of $30,000. In the course of time repairs were needed upon that breakwater, but the county was represented by a Liberal and the Conservative government absolutely refused to spend one dollar for repairing the breakwater much less to expend money upon new public works. The consequence was that in the course of years continued storms so destroyed the breakwater that instead of it being a protection to the fishermen it became a menace to them and it was not until the breakwater had been absolutely destroyed that an appropriation was finally made to renew it and it cost the late Liberal government twice as much to rebuild that breakwater as it would have cost if the late Conservative government had spent a reasonable amount each year in maintaining it. The hon. member for Annapolis is perhaps not conversant with these facts, and I would suggest to him that before he undertakes to discuss matters in my county again he should inform himself of the facts and not take up the time of the House in making observations that are not consistent with the actual facts as they exist.

Mr. DAVIDSON. The hon. gentleman claims that I am not conversant with the facts on which I pretend to speak. These facts I am conversant with and I propose to make them known to this committee: In the year 1905, two weeks before an election, work was begun upon the Lennox passage bridge. My hon. friend, who now represents the county of Richmond, came to Ottawa some time previously. He was paid a fat sum by the municipal council of Richmond for the purpose and it was supposed that he came to get the assistance of the federal government in the undertaking. He went back to Richmond and made it appear to the electorate there that the federal and local governments were assisting the municipal council in the construction of this bridge. Work was begun on this bridge two weeks before the election, two days after the election it was discontinued and nothing has been done since. There are the plain, unvarnished facts.

Mr. KYTE. I state that the résumé of alleged facts indulged in by my hon. friend is not in accordance with the actual conditions. What election took place in the county of Richmond in 1905?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Well, it was in 1904.

Mr. KYTE. Then my hon. friend is not as familiar with these things as he professes to be. There was no election in 1905 and I repeat again that the work was not continued because the municipal council met in the meantime and passed a resolution withdrawing the offer which they had made towards the construction of that bridge. No federal assistance was promised then or at any other time. The people of Richmond are quite competent to deal with all these matters without any assistance from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I wish you would permit me to answer what the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) said in regard to the commencement of the construction of a railway line in my con-

stituency for political purposes. His statement is not in accordance with the facts. I took the opportunity on one other occasion to explain this matter, and I think my hon. friend knows what the facts are. He is repeating an old story about wheelbarrows that some one told him and from which he seems to have got an incorrect impression. I would like to tell the committee that this company that was using the wheelbarrows on this road was composed of his own political associates, his own friends, and for their own purposes. A company was formed to build a line of railway in my constituency and one of its principal members was Mr. Fitzpatrick, a Conservative local member in Nova Scotia. Associated with him were my late friend Mr. George McCormick of Parry Sound, Ontario, and Mr. McLeod who, I think, represented North Ontario in this House. Three leading Conservatives of this country were associated with one or two other gentlemen and formed the company that was organized for the building of this line of railway. They got two years in which to commence the work and about the time that the two years' period was expiring they asked an extension from the local government of Nova Scotia. The local government at that time were not inclined to give that extension, but the contract contained a clause that if they commenced work on the line before the expiration of two years it would hold the contract until they could float the company and secure the capital. That is the explanation. Failing to get the consent of the local government these gentlemen, consisting of the leading Conservatives in this country, started with their wheelbarrows to build a short piece of the railway. They built about half a mile of the railway and Conservatives have since that time thrown that up to the Liberal party as if the Liberal party had something to do with it. It was done without the consent of the local government of Nova Scotia, or of the Liberal party, and it was done by a company consisting of leading Conservatives for the purpose of holding their contract and for no other purpose. When the hon. gentleman comes here and misrepresents questions of this kind in the House and tries to make members of this House believe that that piece of road was built for political purposes by the Liberal party he is going very far astray and I do not think that I should remain in my seat without endeavouring to put a few of those wheelbarrows right down his throat.

Manitoba—harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $10,000.

Mr. STAPLES. I would ask the minister to send an engineer to inquire into an expenditure at St. Lorette on Lake Manitoba. The expenditure was made by the late government for political purposes, but it has been left in such a condition that after spending $15,000 of the people's money it is of absolutely no value.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand that my hon. friend is asking that we should repair all the errors of the late government? An ocean of money would be insufficient for such a task. Within the limits mentioned, we will be glad to see if something cannot be done to remedy the state of affairs he has mentioned.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) is claiming that while the work is a useful public work more money ought to have been expended on it. The information was reported to me that the work was completed so far as the public needs require. The request now made is a reasonable one that the minister should send an engineer to look into the matter and I hope he will look into it carefully, and not spend more money than is needed. That is the conclusion we came to from the reports of our engineers.

Mr. STAPLES. When the ex-minister says it was completed, he is not stating what is consistent with the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is quite parliamentary.

Mr. STAPLES. It was thrown up there for political purposes in 1904, and the day before the election the men engaged went off for a jollification, they went to the polls and voted, and there has not been a dollar spent on that work since, although in every session I brought it to the attention of the ex-minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The report of the engineer was very clear that that work was completed so far as was in the public interest.

Mr. STAPLES. That is information I could not get out of the ex-minister all the time he was in office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why is the item for the Winnipeg beach breakwater dropped? That was advertised for; tenders were received and the contract was let. Has that important work been completed?

Mr. MONK. I do not think any contract was completed for that work, or it would have been provided for in these estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think a contract was given to Messrs. Dunn, of Winnipeg.

Athabaska river, removing boulders and deepening channel through sand and gravel bars, $12,000.

Mr. OLIVER. What part of the Athabaska river is it intended to improve?

Mr. MONK. At Grand Rapids, amongst other smaller rapids. The work was started in 1911-12, blasting rock in an endeavour to improve navigation. The amount of rock blasted it is impossible to estimate as much of the work was done through the ice, and the measurement could not be taken. River pilots claim great improvements in the rapids this spring, but a large number of rocks still need to be removed.

Mr. OLIVER. The amount asked for the coming year is somewhat less than for the current year. I want to impress the importance of the improvement of the Athabasca river and the amount of good that may be done by a moderate expenditure for that whole northern country. The whole country that constitutes the basin of the Mackenzie river, 1,500 miles from north to south, by about 500 from east to west, nearly one sixth the total area of Canada, is available to the navigation of this river and its tributaries. River navigation is reached at Athabasca Landing by a branch of the Canadian Northern now about completed. There is then river navigation from that point to the Arctic ocean with the exception of the rapids of which my friend has spoken, and another serious rapid at Fort Smith. It would be impossible to improve the rapid at Fort Smith, but the Grand and a succession of rapids below are quite capable of improvement to such a degree as to permit navigation by loaded scows down stream very freely.

My criticism would be that the amount asked by the minister is small for the purpose, and that a moderate expenditure there would be of immense benefit in developing that northern country. Until these recent improvements were made at Grand Rapids, all scows going down the river had to be unloaded and the goods had to be portaged from the head to the foot of the rapids, the scows being taken down light through the rapids or brought out of the water and carried on a tramway. By the improvement already made it is possible to run the loaded scows through the rapids, without portaging, but there still remains a great deal to be done to make it reasonably safe.

It is now possible, but it is not safe, and a reasonable further expenditure would make the rapid, while not absolutely safe, so improved that there would be no extra charge on the goods by reason of their being taken over the Grand Rapids, whereas at present the extra charge amounts to something like 50 cents per hundred pounds. Below the Grand Rapids is a succession of rapids extending to Fort McMurray. In a distance of about 80 miles there are six or eight rapids, each one of which requires some improvement to make it safe for the passage of scows. Scows do run down now without discharging except at the Big Cascade. In low water they have to discharge part of their cargo, which adds greatly to the cost of freight and the risk of navigation. I am informed that it is practical to improve both the Big and the Little Cascades, so that the scows can run through full at low water. I would urge the minister to make additional provision in the supplementary estimates to carry on the work which has already been begun.

The reason why it is more desirable now to push these improvements than it was before, is because, rail communication having been established with the navigation of the river, the great impediment that formerly existed to the transport of heavy machinery and supplies is done away with. Until the railway was built to the Landing all goods had to be transported by wagon or sleigh, and only comparatively small pieces could be taken; but now the largest and heaviest machinery can be taken. A great deal of money is being invested in the attempt to develop petroleum wells on the Athabasca below these rapids, a very large quantity of machinery was taken down last summer, and there is no doubt a great deal more will go down in future years, particularly if a successful strike is made. The expenditure already made has been of great advantage, but I would urge the hon. minister to increase the amount so that substantial work can be done that will afford an open channel for loaded scows down these rapids, so that they can carry the heaviest machinery necessary for the development of the mines and the wells without unloading at the rapids and without danger of destruction.

Edmonton—wharf, $10,000.

Mr. OLIVER. I see that this is a revote of a similar amount which was in the estimates of last year. May I ask what the prospects are of translating the promise into performance?

Mr. MONK. It is intended to carry out this work, which was asked for by my hon. friend. Plans have been prepared, and we will proceed as soon as these estimates are passed.

Dredging—Maritime Provinces, $500,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has my hon. friend outlined his division of money yet?

Mr. MONK. Not yet. As my hon. friend will see, there has been considerable reduction in the amounts appropriated for dredging generally from last year, but I think it will be necessary to restore a large proportion of these in the supplementaries. Perhaps I shall be able to give some details when we come to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The same remark will apply to Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Grand river bridge at York, Ontario, repairs, painting, &c., $500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a provincial bridge, entirely within the province, why should we repair it?

Mr. MONK. This is a bridge that was built by the federal government years ago, and we have always maintained it. These are urgent repairs.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember that my attention was ever called to that bridge. Over what river is it?

Mr. MONK. Over the Grand River. It is in York county, Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When was it built?

Mr. MONK. Long before the late government came into power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend get the information before we come to concurrence? He will remember a discussion in the past as to the responsibility of the different governments for building these wholly provincial bridges. My hon. friend had something to say on that question. Perhaps he would get the information before we come to concurrence?

Cape Breton—new telegraph lines, 13, $12,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it the intention to go on with these lines which have been started in the county of Inverness between Nyanza and Rossville, and also between Ferry Landing in the county of Victoria, and Peters Point in the same county? There are some other lines in Cape Breton partly under way, and I would like to know if it is the intention of the government to complete them?

Mr. MONK. It is the intention of the government to complete lines which were projected and commenced.

Improvement of repair service, province of Quebec, $3,000; new telegraph line and repairs and renewals to existing lines, $1,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to know what are the rates charged on those telegraph lines

Mr. MONK. I think they are the same, if not lower than the rates generally charged.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Department of Public Works has a land line on the Magdalen Islands to connect the several islands together, and that telegraph line connects with the mainline at Meat Cove, N.S., by a cable. The islands are closed from November until April each year when there is no navigation. I urged some years ago the establishment of a Marconi station at Birds' Rock, which would be of very great service to navigation because that is the first land sighted by the steamers when navigation opens. A Marconi station there would be a great advantage to the business interests of Montreal, Toronto and elsewhere.

But, it seems to me that the people of the Magdalen Islands, being shut off from communication for several months each year, are entitled to low rates. I made an arrangement with the department of Public Works some years ago, under which the people of the Islands might send a letter on the telegraph lines to Meat Cove in Cape Breton, and the operator there would post the letter so telegraphed, and for this service the rate was very low—I do not recall the figure exactly. The reason for this was that the merchants of the Magdalen Islands are very anxious to know the condition of the fish market. Commercially speaking, the Islands depend chiefly, if not wholly, on Halifax and Pictou, their business connections being mainly with those places. Does not the minister think that the low rate to which I have referred should be reinstated? The government telegraph is not a paying institution, being mainly for the use of the government itself. Surely, the government can afford to give the people on the Islands facilities for communication which are given to other parts of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman knows that some years ago we built, at considerable expense, the line from British Columbia to Yukon. The Magdalen Islands, I think, supply a larger population than that of Dawson. The last census showed a population in the Islands of about 6,000 people. They are well-to-do people, very brave and very industrious. I think they are abundantly entitled to the concessions I suggest.

Mr. MONK. I will make a note of the hon. gentleman's observations. I do not remember having heard, since becoming Minister of Public Works, of any complaint regarding the rates. Certainly, in that instance, the rates should be as low as possible.

Mr. McKENZIE. Meat Cove is in the county I have the honour to represent. The telegraph extends through the county in connection with the cable that lands there. The fishing towns along the coast of the county are connected with the line which is an immense advantage to them. There is one exception—White Point, a fishing village which has grown up about ten miles off the course of the line. It would be a great advantage to this village to share the privileges in this respect of other towns, as it would bring them in touch with the markets of the

world. It is only a matter of extending the line nine or ten miles. White Point has about fifty or sixty fishermen, and growing all the time. The expense of construction would not be heavy considering the number of people who would be served. I have been bringing this to the notice of the department for some time and I had an understanding with them that the work should be done. But it has not been done yet. I hope the minister will direct inquiries to be made and that he will give to this village of White Point the same facilities that are given to other places.

Mr. MONK. I will call the attention of the superintendent of telegraphs to what my hon. friend has said.

Telegraph lines—Saskatchewan and Alberta—Athabaska Landing—Peace River—landing line—extension to Grand Prairie, $5,000.

Mr. OLIVER. Is this amount believed to be sufficient to complete the line to Grand Prairie, and will it be completed during the coming summer?

Mr. MONK. That is what we expect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is entirely a revote.

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Construction of line from Athabaska Landing to Fort McMurray, $21,000.

Mr. OLIVER. Has any work been done on this line? If so, what route is it intended to follow?

Mr. MONK. I do not think that is quite decided. But, if not, it will be decided before the supplementary estimates are put through and I can give the information to my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to the line from Edmonton to Fort McMurray, I wish to place before the minister the alternative routes. One plan is that the line shall follow the Athabaska river either actually or approximately, from Athabaska Landing to Fort McMurray.

The other proposition is that the line shall follow the trail to Lac La Biche. and from there directly to Fort McMurray, and through the interior without any regard to the river. There are advantages by either route. The advantage of having the line follow the river would be that if the line were made a telephone line with telephones at different points, it would be a vast convenience to the river navigation in the summer time. An immense amount of freight necessarily follows the river in summer. So if the line followed the river it would be of great advantage during the summer navigation. In the case of oil development for which prospecting is being carried on, the telephone line along the river would also be of great advantage. On the other hand, the winter trail is by way of Lac La Biche, and the line similarly would be of advantage during the winter. The Lac La Biche line would have the advantage during the winter that the river line would not have, because there is practically no travel by way of the river during winter. For my part, I have always held that the weight of material advantage in assisting the development of the country is in the river line, and that it should be a telephone line so that telephones could be put in at different places where there is permanent settlement on the river, and would be of advantage to the navigation of the river, and to the mineral development that is now going on.

Mr. MONK. I am not familiar with the locality, but I note what my hon. friend has said. There has been difficulty with these telegraph lines, as there has been with other branches of the service, in the preparation of the estimates. I will see that my hon. friend's observations are brought to the notice of the superintendent of construction.

For the construction of a loop extension of the telegraph line from a point near Moose to Durlingville, $3,570.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria). Has there been any work done on that loop line? I see the revote is $3,570, and in the 1912-13 estimates it was $6,650. I would like to know if any of the money has been spent?

Mr. MONK. I think it has all been expended, the work has been progressing.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria). Last year when the late government decided to extend that line to Durlingville, the people expected it would be extended on to Cold lake. There is a large settlement at Cold lake, but there is no railway, and no means of communication with the outside world. Coal lake would be about 100 miles from the Canadian Northern railway. It is quite a large settlement, and a telephone line would be of great advantage to the people in case of sickness, or other necessity. I understand that a telegraph line costs only about $150 a mile, and there is plenty of timber in that country for poles. I think the government might well expend that amount of money to afford telegraphic communication, until such time as a railway is built in order to bring these people into communication with the outside world. They are very anxious about it; sometimes they have to travel 100 miles on matters of business, so one can easily understand that in the winter time especially telegraphic communication would be of great advantage to them. I have received a petition from the people asking for an extension of the Athabaska line to Lac La Biche. They are in a similar position, they are 40

miles distant from railway communication, and it is a long distance to travel. I think it would cost between $150 and $200 a mile to build a telegraph line to meet the needs of these people. There is no immediate prospect of a railway, and it may be two or three years before they get a railway. I would like the minister to give consideration to this matter, and try to give the people the relief they need.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend's request seems to be very reasonable, and I will endeavour to meet it. Perhaps my hon. friend might confer with the superintendent on that particular point, as he is much more familiar with the locality and with what has been done.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria). I have conferred with the district superintendent with regard to Cold lake. He resides in Edmonton, and he thought that if application was made to the government, with proper representations, the government would possibly extend the line.

Mr. MONK. Who is the local officer?

Mr. WHITE (Victoria). Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. MONK. Has he made some report?

Mr. WHITE (Victoria). I do not know whether he has made a report. He is the man who made the estimate for the line from Moose Station to Durlingville. I took the matter up with him about the extension, and he thought it was really needed.

Moosejaw—Wood Mountain Telegraph Line—renewals and reconstruction, $11,900.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) is not here, and I would ask the minister what explanation there may be with regard to this work, what has been done, and what is it intended to do?

Mr. MONK. I could not give precise information this evening, but I can get a report of what is to be done and give it to the member for Moosejaw.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the government put in telephone lines as well as telegraph lines?

Mr. MONK. In some instances I think they do.

Mr. McKENZIE. In the part of the country I come from, the government telegraph lines are serving useful purposes. If they could be exchanged for telephone lines they would be of infinitely greater service.

Peace River—telegraph line—office building, $2,900.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps the minister would be good enough in this case, as in regard to the Moosejaw line, to furnish a memorandum at a later date, in regard to the office buildings on the Peace River line, that is in the constituency of Edmonton. If my hon. friend will give me a memorandum showing where the buildings are to be, those which have been completed, and what is to be done with regard to the others, I would be very glad.

Mr. MONK. I will do so.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention of the government to grant the privilege of stringing telephone lines on telegraph poles ?

Mr. MONK. I believe that has been done.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). What are the conditions under which it is done?

Mr. MONK. I do not think there has been any rule laid down. Sometimes the privilege has been granted to telephone companies who wish to extend their line to some other point. The matter is discussed and then some agreement is arrived at.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Will the department be in favour of granting the privilege, say, to a private company of placing their lines on the government telegraph poles. I have now in view a certain section of country supplied with telegraph lines and where I know the telephone company would be pleased if they should be permitted to put telephone lines on the telegraph poles. Of course, it is quite an expensive matter to erect telegraph poles, but if such companies could have the privilege of placing telephone lines on telegraph poles a large section of country that I have in view would be served with telephone communication.

Mr. MONK. I should think that would be reasonable. Of course, it would be a matter for discussion and arrangement, but I think that in most cases the thing might be done under conditions which would protect us against loss.

Telegraph line from North Battleford to Isle la Crosse—loop line to Nesta, $13,000.

Mr. OLIVER. This is in the constituency of the hon. member for Battleford (Mr. Champagne) who does not appear to be in the House, and I am sure that he would be very glad if the minister would give the information now, or, if he cannot do it now, at some future time, as to what has been spent on this project and how far it is intended to carry it. It would seem there has been some expenditure or that it is not intended to carry out the project much further.

Mr. MONK. I have not the information under my hand. I think some work has been done, but if the hon. member for Battleford requires the information I can give it to him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would not my hon. friend have a note of it? There will have been an expenditure of $26,000 by the 31st March. There must have been a great deal of work done.

Mr. MONK. There has been a great deal of work done but I have no note of the information.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend would take a note of it and have a memorandum prepared by the officers of the department and let the hon. member for Battleford know, I am sure it would be satisfactory.

Mr. MONK. I will see that he gets it.

Monument to the memory of the late Hon. George Brown, $10,000.
Monument to the memory of the late Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee, $10,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has the hon. gentleman located the site upon which the statue to Thos. D'Arcy McGee is to be erected? I see that there is at Ottawa quite a quarrel about the statue to D'Arcy McGee. I read in the papers the other day a protest against the suggested intention of the government to place the statue on the Plaza in front of the post office. The correspondent stated that the Plaza was a site which should be kept for the statue of the late King Edward. Has my hon. friend made up his mind where that statue is going to be placed?

Mr. MONK. No, I have not, I confess, given the matter a thought since the last time it was mentioned en passant, in the House. I believe it was to have found its place on the Plaza, wherever that is, but nothing has been determined whatever. The statue is not finished. I have no doubt a suitable place will be found for all our great men without exception when we get their statues ready.

Monument to the memory of the late Sir L. H. Lafontaine, and the late Hon. Robert Baldwin, $17,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the site of the Lafontaine-Baldwin statue? Has that been decided?

Mr. MONK. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is a monumental statue.

Mr. MONK. I must confess that I have not given much attention to these statues. I have been so busy with wharfs and breakwaters. I thought that these were mostly under contract.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I saw the other day the statues of McGee and George Brown in Montreal. But, I am speaking about the sites. This Lafontaine-Baldwin statue is a very considerable monument, and I thought that perhaps my hon. friend had made up his mind about the site.

Mr. MONK. No, that remains still undecided.

Monument to Madeleine de Verchères, to be erected at Verchères, $25,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This statue to Madeleine de Verchères is, I suppose, carrying out the idea suggested by the late Governor General, Lord Grey to the Laurier government. I am very glad that the present government has thought it proper to include an amount for the erection of this monument. It is a splendid idea.

Last summer an incident took place at Vercheres, which I might perhaps recall to the memory of the minister. The government of the day, and especially the Postmaster General were taken to task because, forsooth, the Postmaster General did not furnish to the postmasters of Quebec signs for their post offices in the French language. The Postmaster General is not obliged to furnish signs in paper or in enamel, or in wood to any of the postmasters, yet there was great excitement in the province of Quebec, the Postmaster General was a very bad man indeed, he was a traitor to his language because he did not furnish to the postmasters of Quebec signs in French to distribute all over the post offices. But a very ingenious priest from Verchères, who was more engaged in politics than in the duties of his office, began writing letters and making an agitation against the Postmaster General. He had a sign artistically painted and sent his bill to my department for payment of same. He was very patriotic, but at the expense of the country. He wanted the Postmaster General to pay $25 or $30 for that sign, and when I refused him very courteously, stating that the Post Office Department did not provide signs to the 15,000 post offices in the country, he immediately started an agitation, and one day he gathered the school boys and the young girls from the convent, he organized a procession, and there and then installed the sign 'Bureau de Poste' on the post office. It was a triumph for the French language in the village of Verchères, and of course the Postmaster General was roundly abused by that lover of the French language. I am glad to see, in view of the abuse that was heaped upon the late government by the Rev. Father Baillargé, that the reverend gentleman will have within his parish a splendid statue of Madeleine de Verchères, the great

heroine of New France. This is the answer of the Laurier government to the Nationalist agitation of the Rev. Father Baillargé.

Mr. MONK. This is all very interesting, but it is perhaps not quite relevant to the vote under discussion. We are very greatly indebted to Lord Grey for the idea of having a statue erected to Madeleine de Vercheres, not perhaps known throughout the country, but a very heroic character indeed, in our early history of New France. The work has been entrusted to one of our artists. It has not yet been completed, but I have seen the model, and although I do not claim to be a very good judge in matters of art, it will be, I think, an admirable statue, and everybody will feel grateful to all those who had a part in securing this commemoration when it will be erected in the old historical place of Verchères which was the theatre of her indomitable courage and womanly perseverance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want to have a hand in this, I think I am entitled to a very considerable amount of credit in connection with this monument.

Mr. MONK. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was I who had the honour to submit to my colleagues the proposal that we should erect a monument on the Verchères bluff in memory of this young lady, whose name stands out in history as one of the most courageous of Canadian women. It gave me very great pleasure to ask my colleagues for the very handsome sum of $15,000 for the purpose of erecting this monument.

Mr. MONK. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It gave me great pleasure to direct the officials of my department to enter into a contract with Mr. Philippe Hebert for the doing of the work, and I desire to bear testimony to the good judgment which my hon. friend has shown in putting that amount in the estimates for the purpose of completing the good work which we began.

National Art Gallery, Ottawa, $35,000.

Mr. OLIVER. I was always curious about this item even when I was a member of the government. As a member of the government, I was forbidden to ask too many questions, but now I am relieved of the responsibility, I am going to ask what is done with this sum, and who does it.

Mr. MONK. I think it is a most praiseworthy effort whoever started it, of giving us some beginnings of an art gallery here at the National Capital. An advisory board was organized by the late government; composed at present of Sir Byron Edmund Walker, Dr. Shepherd, of Montreal, a man of a great deal of taste in artistic matters, and the Hon. Mr. Boyer. These gentlemen give their time and a great deal of care and attention to the expenditure of this small sum of $35,000 which we vote each year, for the purpose of purchasing paintings and objects of art, as much as possible, from our own Canadian artists. In the last volume of the department's report my hon. friend will find a list of the purchases, which have been made so far. These paintings and works of art, are installed in the Victoria Museum in this city. Some time before we came into office, Sir Byron Edmund Walker and his colleagues secured the services of a curator on trial. Mr. Eric Brown has been found by the advisory board to be a competent man, and I expect in the supplementary estimates to ask the House for an additional sum to provide for a larger expenditure next year on these works of art, and a more complete installation in the Royal Victoria Museum. It is a very modest beginning, but the men who are acting on our advisory board, give it a great deal of time and attention without any remuneration and we are doing our best in a very small way, as my hon. friend may see, to do something towards establishing art in this country, developing artistic tastes and encouraging our young artists. The amounts expended for the purchase of works of art are small, varying from $500 to $1,500. I have not had time since I have been in office, to visit the gallery, but I am told it is well worthy of inspection, and certainly I hope the House will encourage this movement in a very proper direction.

Mr. BENNETT (East Simcoe). When is the gallery to be opened?

Mr. MONK. It is expected that it will be inaugurated in March or April. A couple of days ago I saw Sir Edmund Walker, who is taking a great deal of pains to have a suitable catalogue prepared and in other ways. We expect to have a rather good opening in the early spring. We hope to have the presence of their Royal Highnesses and to draw the attention of the public to the efforts we are making to establish an art gallery.

Mr. STAPLES. Is it the intention to have all Canadian artists of note represented in that gallery?

Mr. MONK. It is, I understand from the Advisory Board, the intention to encourage as much as possible, our own artists. I only saw one painting in the list that was not the production of a Canadian artist, that was one by Sir Joshua Reynolds, for which $3,000 or $4,000 was paid —and it must have been a bargain at that price.

Mr. STAPLES. Then I desire to call the attention of the minister to a Canadian artist, of the name of Mrs. Hamilton, whose family happens to come from my constituency. She had an exhibit at Wilson's here a couple of weeks ago. Her paintings have been on exhibition in Paris, and she has been recognized there and all through Europe. She has also been recognized in Canada to the extent that the Duchess of Connaught has purchased several of her paintings. Therefore, I think that this government should see that her work is represented in the National Gallery, and also somewhere in these buildings. There is no doubt about her ability and the splendid work she has done. I ask the minister to investigate her work and give her the place to which she is entitled as a Canadian artist.

Mr. MONK. I certainly will do so. I am glad my hon. friend has called my attention to her work, and I will bring his observations to the attention of the Advisory Board.

Mr. CURRIE. Will the minister tell us who the Advisory Board are?

Mr. MONK. Sir Edmund Walker, president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce; Dr. Shepherd of Montreal, who is quite an authority on matters of art, and the Hon. Senator Boyer.

Construction of water storage dams and regulation works on the upper Ottawa river and tributaries, $200,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend inform the committee how this will be expended?

Mr. MONK. For the continuation of the works already undertaken—the Timiskaming dam, the Quinze dam and the Kipawa dam.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the condition of the work on the Timiskaming dam?

Mr. MONK. The department is continuing the work by day labour under careful supervision.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason I ask the question is this. I have noticed in some of the Conservative newspapers reports of information supposed to have been given to them by the commission which this government has appointed—I refer to the commission of which Mr. Morine is the chairman, and the other members of which are Mr. Lake and Mr. Ducharme; a commission which is sometimes spoken of as an impartial commission, consisting of two defeated Conservative candidates, and the president of 'Le Devoir,' a strong partisan newspaper. Now, I object very strongly to this commission giving out partial information with regard to any matter they are investigating, until all the evidence has been heard, and all the facts can be submitted to the public. I have read what purports to be a statement which they must have given out to the Conservative press in which these allegations are made: That, in the first place, the work was let without tender; that it was changed to a concrete dam; that no tenders were called for the concrete work; that afterwards the contract was again changed and the contractors received great favours. One might infer from these statements that the contractors were still going on with the work and were to receive the sum of $350,000. Now, I can imagine nothing more unfair than for these one-sided statements to go to the public. I have no objection whatever to all the facts connected with any public work with which I as minister had anything to do, being made public; but what I do object to is that a commission shall give to a section of the press, to the newspapers supporting the government, a one-sided story, and not all the facts of the case. With regard to the Timiskaming dam, the facts are simply these. Tenders were called some years ago for a dam to be built partly of timber and partly of concrete. After the tenders were received it was decided to make a change in the plans and construct the dam entirely of concrete. Members of the committee know that during the last few years there has been a great change in the views of engineers as to the desirability of constructing works of this character as far as possible wholly of concrete. Concrete is rapidly taking the place of timber in the construction of dams as well as many other works. So far from the contractors not being the lowest tender on concrete, they were the lowest. The tenders were called on the unit plan, so much per cubic foot for timber work, and so much per cubic foot for concrete work. They happened to be the lowest tenderers as the matter was figured out by the engineers of the department. When it was decided to change the work and make it wholly of concrete, the work was given to the contractors, who were the lowest on concrete work as well as on the dam as originally planned.

It is not from newspaper reports supposed to be given out by the commissioners that I am speaking. Not one step was taken except upon the report of the responsible engineers of the department. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has very properly born testimony himself to the very great experience, good judgment and the devotion to the public interest of these gentlemen. Not a step was taken by me in connection with the Timiskaming dam except upon the report of the responsible engineers of the department. When

it was suggested to make the work entirely of concrete, the contract was given to the lowest tenderers and they proceeded with the work. I believe a change was made in the site of the dam. Hon. gentlemen know that there is no more difficult work coming within the purview of engineers than subaqueous work, as it is difficult to ascertain with accuracy the nature of the soil under water. A slight change was made in the location, with the result that there was a vast deal more unwatering to be done than had been figured up by the engineers. After that was brought to the attention of the engineers and myself as minister it was decided that, under all the circumstances, it would be reasonable to allow the contractors the actual cost of unwatering, doing it on the force system—that is adding 15 per cent to the actual cost and paying that to the contractors. Subsequently there was an unprecedented pressure owing to the spring freshets and the coffer dam, which the contractors had built, at great expense, was carried away. That gave rise to a dispute between the contractors and the department. The contractors contended that by reason of the change of site, they had encountered quicksand and there were enormous difficulties which they had not anticipated. The matter was gone into fully by the engineers. On more than one occasion Mr. Coutlee, who has charge of the work, was sent to make a careful examination, and the result of his inquiry was that the engineers recommended it would be better for the department to release the contractors, to take the work out of their hands, and proceed to complete it by day labour; and it was agreed that the contractors should be paid exactly what they had expended on the work—not one dollar more. They were not to be allowed any profits but simply their actual outlay, the amount to be determined by the experts of the department. That was done, the department proceeded by daywork, and the government of the day has carried out that plan. That is the whole story with respect to the Timiskaming dam. Yet these commissioners have allowed to go out to the public the impression that some great fraud has been committed on the public by the contractors with the connivance of the department. I thought it my duty to state the facts, and I took occasion some time ago to move for the papers, and I shall be glad if any hon. member will take the trouble to go through the papers, which will verify every word I have said. This matter gave me great anxiety. I was careful to take no step except after the most careful examination by the engineers of the department, in whose judgment, integrity and regard for the public interest I had the greatest confidence after four years experience; and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, after his experience of four months in the work they are carrying on, has the same confidence in these gentlemen which my four years experience taught me to place in them. I wish to repeat that I took no step of any kind or description in the matter, and gave no order except upon their recommendation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) expects any justice from these hon. gentlemen he will be sadly disappointed. As regards the personnel of the commission, I know very well our late colleague Mr. Lake. I know that he was a very bitter partisan when he sat in this House, but he is certainly a gentleman. As regards Mr. Morine, I know nothing about him except that he was a defeated Conservative candidate twice, I think, in the maritime provinces. But I happen to know Mr. Ducharme by reputation. He is a citizen of Montreal, and one of the bitterest opponents of the late government that one could find in that city and district. He is president of the company, which publishes 'Le Devoir,' the organ of the Minister of Public Works. He is also president of the company which publishes 'Le Nationaliste,' a Sunday paper, which has been condemned, I do not know how many times, by our courts for libel, not only against private citizens but against the judiciary. Two of the editors of that paper were sent to jail for their gross libels against the judiciary of the province of Quebec. While Mr. Ducharme of course found at all times the means of avoiding costs and responsibility, we know that he is the financial backer of those who are publishing that sheet. If I were to be investigated officially as head of a department by Mr. Ducharme, I would strongly object for many reasons which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows very well. Mr. Ducharme, besides being strongly biased politically, has had a very notorious career in Montreal. My hon. friend knows that for a few weeks he was president of La Banque Provinciale and was forced to resign because the shareholders would not have him any longer as president, and he has ceased to be a member of the board of directors.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Was he a defaulter, and what reasons does the hon. gentleman assign for making these very serious charges that will go out to the public against this gentleman who is not here to defend himself?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall bring shortly before the House the facts in connection with that case. Mr. Ducharme was obliged to resign as president of La Banque Provin-

ciale, a position he occupied for a few weeks only.

He was also secretary of the municipality of Ste. Cunegonde, a suburb of Montreal, for some years. People know what has been his success in that capacity. I say he has a very notorious reputation in Montreal, and the country surrounding Montreal; and I would certainly refuse to be investigated by Mr. Ducharme. I think he rather needs investigating himself than to be engaged in investigating others. I repeat to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that he cannot expect justice from Mr. Ducharme. He is there as a party man to render services to his party. to do the muckraking work and nothing else.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). He is likely to find plenty of muck to go into.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Perhaps, if he could go into my hon. friend's (Mr. Bennett) constituency, he might find lots of muck.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). He will find lots of it in that riding in the acts of friends of the late government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman has only to denounce them and bring them to the bar of the House, or if they are in this House to name them. I am not afraid to tell Mr. Ducharme that I would refuse to be judged by him, for he has been judged by the citizens of Montreal, by the shareholders of La Banque Provinciale and by the people of Ste. Cunegonde, who know what he is.

Mr. MONK. Nobody will find fault with the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) for claiming that his own administration of the department was a proper one. But I am surprised to hear a man of his experience attribute to members of the commission reports published in the papers, which I am perfectly sure could not have emanated from any of these commissioners. How these things get into the papers we do not know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That report which I saw, stated that this was information which the commissioners had discovered.

Mr. MONK. It cannot be. Nor is there ground, very often, unfortunately, for the statements made by newspapers. It is quite conceivable that newspapermen may have had access to the report of the Auditor General, which report if I am not mistaken, went at length into this Timiskaming dam matter. I remember, long before this government came into power, correspondence given at some length, with comments of the Auditor General, in the report of the officer in regard to these contracts and the way the works were carried on. There alone, so far as I know, the newspapermen could have found information. I do not think my hon. friend has any justification for the aspersions he has cast upon this commission. The commission is composed of honourable men of high position, chosen amongst many by the government, not for the purpose of discovering anything against ex-ministers, but to endeavour to place all our departments upon a proper footing and to make suggestions which would enable the government to improve many branches of the public service that are now defective. I take the responsibility as a member of the government, of having insisted that the appointment of this commission was necessary for that purpose, and I asked particularly that it should enlighten me with suggestions for the best administration of my own department, a most important one. Was there no room for improvement? Will my hon. friend, or will any man who has looked into the system, say that our dredging as it has been carried on, is not susceptible of improvement? — without thereby reflecting on any officer of the department or anybody else. Short though the time is during which I have had charge of the department, it has been long enough for me to learn that not only in the branch of dredging, but in other branches as well, improvements are possible and desirable. I have great hopes that when these men, who have leisure, who have business ability, have looked through my own department, they will be able to make most useful suggestions.

My hon friend (Mr. Lemieux) finds fault with the nomination of Mr. Ducharme. I very much regret this. Not that I feel it necessary to defend Mr. Ducharme in any way, I can assure the committee of that, his name not being as well known outside of my native province as it is there. I took the responsibility of suggesting his name as a man who has worked his way up in life and bears an honourable name where he is known. A man of wide means, a capitalist and a man of great business ability, I felt that if our province was represented on that commission—which I thought advisable—it should be properly represented by a not only able, but honest man, one holding a high financial position as a man of business. I am confident that, if his health—he is a man of weak health—enables him to remain there, he will amply fulfil the expectations I have formed. The hon. member for Rouville says that he is a director of a newspaper, 'Le Devoir.' Why, I am interested myself in that newspaper. A number of us in Montreal have contributed, as far as we could, each according to his own limited means—Mr. Ducharme more than myself, because he has more means—towards the foundation of a newspaper, utterly, absolutely inde-

pendent, not under the control of anybody but its editor. That newspaper has rendered service in our municipal elections. It is not, so far as I know, affiliated with any party.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Except the Tory party.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman is very much mistaken. He must see evidence of absence of such affiliation in the paper every day I think the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is mistaken in the view he has taken of the commission. It is not a muck-raking commission, though it may, in its investigations, find out things that are not commendable. The prime object of its creation was to look through the departments and find out what improvements could be brought about. We have had several commissions which have produced good results. There was one of which Mr. Fyshe was president. Another was that of Judge Cassells. And I am convinced that the present commission also will produce good results. I think it would be better for the ex-Minister of Public Works not to anticipate what the conclusion will be. These commissioners are not charged with a partisan investigation. They are going to look into the administrative departments, and I do not see what reason there is to find fault with them beforehand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I saw in the papers did not profess to be what was contained in the Auditor General's Report. I have no objection to every word stated in that report being published.

What this professed to state was certain discoveries which this commission had made; it professed to be information coming directly from the commission.

What I object to is that partial information, one-sided information, half the truth mixed with considerable falsehood, should go to the public as being the true facts of the case. The public naturally look to a commission, particularly that portion of the public which does not know the partisan character of this commission, for the true facts in the case.

Mr. MONK. Has my hon. friend any evidence that these statements were made by the commissioners to newspaper men, because I am sure they were not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I simply judge from what I saw in reputable Conservative newspapers, which gave the impression that these were discoveries which the commissioners had made. Now I do not complain, notwithstanding the character of these commissioners, of a full and complete investigation of the department while I had the honour to preside over it, and I suppose my hon. friend would not complain of a full investigation of the department while he presides over it. But would not my hon. friend expect to be treated fairly in such an investigation; would he not expect a full and complete investigation, before any facts should be given to the public with respect to any particular case? No one reading what I saw in the newspapers purporting to come from these commissioners, would imagine for a moment that this work, under the circumstances I have indicated, was taken off the hands of the contractors on the recommendation of the engineers of the department. Their reports are all on file, but you would not imagine from reading this newspaper report that these commissioners had been able to find a single report of the engineers.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would it not be better to let that item stand until there is a larger attendance of members of the committee?

Mr. MONK. I have waited patiently to get the remaining estimates for my department through, and I expect to be extremely busy next week with preparing the supplementaries.

Mr. McKENZIE. The hon. Minister of Public Works must not expect to escape criticism as to the character of the commission he has appointed. He says he expects to put his department on a better working foundation, and to establish a better system of bookkeeping in the department, inside and outside. If that is to be brought about, it cannot be brought about by novices who know nothing about that business. If there is to be an improvement in dredging, for instance, we want a man who has some knowledge of mechanics, who has some knowledge of building and operating dredges, engines and machinery generally. I submit that there is no qualification along any of those lines in the gentlemen of this commission. Mr. Morine and another gentleman who was at one time a member of this House, have no qualifications along those lines. Mr. Morine is a very estimable lawyer, a very clever lawyer, and if the Minister of Public Works wanted anything along the line of the profession of that gentleman, it would be well done. But when he asks him, who is only a lawyer, to take in hand the establishment of a new system of bookkeeping for instance, he is taking a man who does not know the first thing about double entry bookkeeping, a man who could not close a system of books to save his life.

Mr. MONK. I would suggest to my hon. friend that there will be an item in the supplementary estimates for the expenses of this commission, and perhaps it would be better to defer criticism until then.

Mr. McKENZIE. I have nothing to say against these gentlemen along their own lines. But when he asks us to provide money to pay this commission, we would expect them to be men with a reputation in the direction of the purpose for which he has appointed them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Public Works has mentioned to-night what he has said before during the session, that he expects these men to give him some idea how to improve the dredging system now in vogue. Is my hon. friend serious in that? Are there more than two ways in in which you can do dredging, one by contract by the cubic yard by scow measurement, the other by cubic yard in situ? Will the hon. gentleman suggest any other way except those two ways in which to make improvement?

Mr. MONK. I would ask my hon. friend not to insist upon such an explanation at this moment. He has mentioned a measurement in place and a scow measurement. Without going further than that, does he think that the scow measurement that has prevailed in the past on our dredging contracts, instead of the place measurement, has been productive of good results? Does he advocate a continuance of the system of scow measurement as it exists to-day? I would ask the hon. gentleman not to enter upon that chapter this evening, because the hour is late. When the expenses of this commission come up at a later day, we will have an estimate for dredging in the supplementaries, and I will be prepared to go fully into that question, and to prove to the hon. gentleman that there are advantageous changes to be made in our dredging system.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Where are the commissioners sitting at present?

Mr MONK. I believe they are sitting in the Canada Life Building at the present moment. They have merely begun their labours, I do not think they have investigated any branch fully.

Mr. LEMIEUX Will their central office be in Montreal or Ottawa?

Mr. MONK. In Ottawa.

Mr. LEMIEUX I ask, because I have seen Mr. Ducharme lobbying in the House, and I thought he had an office in this building.

Mr. MONK. I suppose a man may come up to the parliament building for other purposes than lobbying.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why does my hon. friend think that Mr. Morine, a lawyer formerly of Newfoundland, and latterly of Toronto, could give him any assistance in dredging? Does he think that Mr. Lake, a gentleman who came out from England, and engaged in farming at Qu'Appelle, in Saskatchewan, could give him any assistance in dredging? Does he think Mr. Ducharme——

Mr. MONK. Surely my hon. friend is joking.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely it is the engineers of the department who can tell my hon. friend best how to let these contracts for dredging. Of course, when contractors are guilty of fraud and inspectors lie in with them and try to defraud the government that is something that has to be carefully watched. But, my hon. friend does not require Mr. Morine, or Mr. Lake, or Mr. Ducharme to tell him that. My hon. friend knows that he has to employ honest officials and honest engineers. There are only two ways in which you can give out dredging work, one being to measure in the scow, and the other to measure in situ. It depends upon circumstances as to which is the better way to let the work. In some places, like canals, you can better let it by the contents in situ. In harbours, where you cannot get at the quantity very well in situ, you must let it by the quantity as per scow measurement. If my hon. friend will be good enough to bring down the papers relating to the Timiskaming dam before the supplementary estimates are brought down it will answer all my purposes.

Mr. MONK. Yes, they will be brought down at once. I cannot allow to go unchallenged what my hon. friend has said as to whether a lawyer is a proper judge of dredging. Of course a commission of that kind has the power of hearing not only engineers of experience but men who are absolutely conversant with the dredging business. Had this commission not been constituted I intended inviting to an examination of this branch of my department the well known firm of Price, Waterhouse & Co. who have looked into these transactions, and have an immense experience of them. It is not the fact that Mr. Morine is a lawyer, or Mr. Lake, a former English civil engineer, and now a farmer, or Mr. Ducharme, a financial agent, that impairs in any way their judgment when they have conducted their investigation in a proper way and looked into these transactions. But, we will have this matter up for discussion again.

Quebec harbour—improvements at mouth of River St. Charles estuary—to complete contract, $66,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would my hon. friend explain that item?

Mr. MONK. These are the large wharfs that are being built at present. Mr. Dussault has the contract.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it not for damming the St. Lawrence?

Mr. MONK. No, it is for building the large piers in the estuary of the river.

Quebec harbour—River St. Charles—improvements to navigation, $500,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is that for?

Mr. MONK. This is a revote. We have not decided exactly the character of these improvements. The matter will be taken up as soon as parliament has adopted the estimates. I think the plan which consists in providing a dam and lock at that point is the one which seems to commend itself most to the people of Quebec. It is at present under the consideration of the engineer. Nothing has been determined.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it the intention of the government to have some of the large ports declared to be national ports? I know it was a very eloquent theme of my hon. friend when he was on this side of the House. I thought that as his estimates were coming up he would refresh his memory by the report of the commission which was appointed and which was presided over by Mr. Reford. The conclusions of that report were that a bold and aggressive policy should be adopted by the government, that national ports should be declared and associated with that recommendation was the suggestion that such ports as St. John, Halifax, Montreal and Quebec should be declared to be free ports. I think I went so far as to suggest that Gaspé be a national port, but at all events my hon. friend was very sanguine about it, and on several occasions in the House he advocated that as being a sound policy. Would my hon. friend say now, or later on, whether he is going to take a decision this year or wait until another year about declaring national ports?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend recalls a position which I took and which I maintain to the present day. I think that the report to which my hon. friend has alluded is the ablest report we have had on the transportation question since the matter has been under study in this country. The conclusions were admirable. National ports were recommended on the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Great Lakes and these ports really exist at the present time. They do not require my weak voice to proclaim them national ports. They are national ports. They require our attention and I think my hon. friend sees in these estimates some evidence that they are receiving recognition. We are approaching a realization of the dreams that I dreamed when in opposition.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But my hon. friend does not say which are free national ports.

Mr. MONK. Paris was not built in a day.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know that; nor Rome.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does calling a port a national port mean that it shall be a free port?

Mr. MONK. I think it ought to mean that, but it is not yet accomplished.

Mr. McKENZIE. A national port is a good sounding name and we have lots of excellent ports on the Atlantic. I would like to know the rule by which the government decides that a certain port is a national port.

Mr. MONK. There is no strict meaning, we have used that expression since the report of Mr. Reford and his colleagues, because in that report they recommend that certain of our ports be declared national and free ports and treated as such, national in this sense that the country shall undertake all the necessary expenditure to equip them. There were I think 11, Vancouver, Victoria, Prince Rupert, the Great Lake ports, Depot Harbour, Midland, Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax. They were to be not only national ports but free ports as much as possible. My hon. friend knows that Antwerp and Liverpool and Bristol are national in that sense but they are not absolutely free ports. The commission was of the opinion that they should be made absolutely free. Whether we will be able to realize that or not I cannot say.

Mr. LEMIEUX. For the present the hon. gentleman is simply following the footsteps of his predecessor. He has not initiated any new policy.

Mr. MONK. Oh yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In what respect?

Mr. MONK. We are making a start at giving greater development as far as our present resources will allow to these free ports mentioned in the report of the commission. I believe myself that we are 25 years behind the time in the equipment of our ports. If we made a loan of $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 and got our ports on a proper footing we would be in a better position to compete with the American and other great ports of the world. To-day on the Pacific, we are asking for a paltry half-million in Vancouver and Victoria, while in Seattle they are spending $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 and in Buenos Ayres they are spending £10,000,000 sterling for the equipment of that port. My hon. friend knows the immense sums spent in great European ports, never less than $50,000,000 or $60,000,000. We are behind the times and ought to carry out improvements with rather a more generous hand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend was rather taking credit for doing something that we had not done, claiming that the government were making a new departure. Let us see how. He speaks of national ports at Port Arthur and Fort William. We appropriated for these ports last year $1,050,000 while my hon. friend is this year asking only $1,000,000.

Mr. MONK. Wait till you see our supplementaries.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then take Quebec harbour, we asked $625,000 and there is only $500,000 this year, and all of that is a revote.

Mr. MONK. You did nothing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes we spent $625,000 last year.

Mr. MONK. Does he say that some real improvements were carried out in Quebec on any fixed plan?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we built a pier, 1,450 feet long, right along the shore of the St. Lawrence, where we have 40 feet of water, large enough to accommodate steamers bigger than any now on the Atlantic. We built a 'T' for that wharf, and we were making improvements inside on the St Charles' river, doing a lot of dredging and giving very great additional accommodation. My hon. friend is simply carrying out improvements started by the late government. The only increase of any consequence, is in the cases of Victoria and Vancouver, where he is putting in $500,000. We were doing this out of the dredging vote, but he is treating them as national harbours, and changing the amounts to capital account instead of paying them out of consolidated revenue.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend forgets that in the race for business, the harbour of Montreal defeated her great rival New York during several seasons.

Mr. MONK. In what business?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the grain trade and butter and cheese.

Mr. MONK. The figures would be edifying.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is due to the excellent adminstration of the harbour of Montreal by the three commissioners, who, fortunately, were not under the thumb of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MONK. I must take exception to that statement. These men are friends of mine, and I would not like that statement to go abroad.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He said they were not under your thumb.

Mr. MONK. And I never pretended they were.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are under the direction of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and it is due to their ability and efforts that the harbour of Montreal has been made such a great success. When my hon. friend said that our harbours are not equipped, surely he does not speak for Montreal.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman say Montreal is properly equipped now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. As far as circumstances allow it is as well equipped as any other port in the world. Of course we are proceeding now to spend a large amount. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is introducing legislation to lend more money to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, I expect that within a short time the harbour of Montreal will be unexcelled on the continent of America. So far it has been so well administered and equipped, that we have been able in two or three years, in succession, to beat the record of New York.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. MONK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. MONK. The Grain Bill and the other government Bills, and then Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.43 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 12, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster) moved the adoption of the first report of the Select Standing Committee to supervise the debates of the House, which reads as follows:

Your committee have had under consideration the subject of the organization of the office of the official reporters, and, with a view to promoting efficiency and economy, would recommend:—

(1) That the official heretofore styled the chief reporter be henceforth designated editor of debates, and be given the direction and supervision of the reporting and of all other matters connected with the preparation and publication of the official report other than the translating; and that he be exempted from the work of reporting except in cases of emergency.

(2) That one of the reporters be designated associate editor of debates, and, in the absence of the editor, discharge his duties and

have his authority, but when not so acting continue as at present to take his turn at reporting.

(3) That the official, at present styled assistant to the chief reporter, be designated assistant editor.

(4) That, to enable this arrangement to be carried out, it is advisable that an additional English reporter be appointed.

(5) That, with a view of attaining greater efficiency in connection with the reporting, the proper authorities be requested to give effect to the application of two members of the reporting staff who are applying for superannuation.

(6) That the analytical index to the English and French editions of the official report of the debates of this House be discontinued forthwith.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to have a word of explanation on this report.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are three recommendations in this report. The first deals with the organization of the 'Hansard' staff and it is precisely the same as contained in a report presented to this House last year by the Debates Committee and which stood over because exception was taken to it in that the committee thought fit to recommend certain of the reporters by name, it being considered that in that respect the committee was exceeding its authority. The report is presented again this year and there is omitted from it anything that seemed to be in excess of the authority of the committee. The first recommendation is that the chief reporter, as he has been called, shall be relieved from duty on the floor of the House and assigned to duty in the 'Hansard' office as editor and controller of 'Hansard.'

The next recommendation is that another member of the staff shall be known as associate editor, who will take the place of the editor in case the latter is absent; the associate editor to do duty as usual on the floor of the House. In place of the editor an additional member is to be added to the reporting staff. The next division of the report deals with the application for superannuation made by two very old members of the 'Hansard' staff who have rendered faithful service in their time. They were the very best men in the country, but they are no longer equal to the arduous duties imposed on them, and after long years of service they ask to be retired. The committee recommends that the proper authority should give effect to these two applications for superannuation. The last section of the report deals with what is known as the analytical index. This index was discussed in the House not long ago by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who stated he had examined it and found it was of no use. He appealed to the Minister of Finance for an opinion and Mr. Fielding replied as reported in 'Hansard': 'If it is not held against me, I must say that I have never seen it.' Upon inquiry we have found that this analytical index is some years behind and that the last copy for the session before last was only delivered in the office of the King's Printer in January of this year. The fact that no person has noticed that the index is two years behind seems to show that no interest whatever is taken in it. Upon finding that this index cost $4,600 last year to prepare and print, the committee thought they were performing their duty in recommending that the index be discontinued. Summarized, the report recommends: the superannuation of two reporters well entitled to superannuation, the addition of one member to the staff and the abolishing of the index which cost $4,600 a year and which is of no use.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. May I ask the hon. gentleman who are the reporters who are recommended for superannuation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Duggan and Mr. Abbott.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think nobody will object to the superannuation of Mr. Abbott and Mr. Duggan. They were very good reporters, as everybody knows, and the House will regret that they have been obliged to ask for superannuation, but of course, as with everybody else, the years of service have told upon them, and they feel they are no longer equal to the arduous task of reporting on the floor of this House. May I ask, if the analytical index is discontinued, whose services will be dispensed with?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry to say that I cannot tell upon whom this will fall, because, as nearly as I understand it, the persons who have done the work are not the persons to whom the cheques issue. I think I can tell the persons who have done the work, but I do not know in whose name the cheques issue.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert). May I ask a question with regard to the appointment of officials upon the 'Hansard' staff. As I understand it there are now some vacancies, and I noticed in the last issue of the 'Gazette' an advertisement to which I would call the attention of the House. It is headed 'Civil Service Commission' and it gives notice to the public that there are vacancies on the 'Hansard' staff, and it states the requirements for the position of a 'Hansard' reporter. Some of it is rather amusing. In the first place I had always supposed that vacancies on the 'Hansard' staff were to be filled from class 'B' of the second division, which includes the gentlemen who are now acting as reporters for the various

committees of the House. There are three gentlemen acting in that capacity, and they are very competent. I think any person who has had experience in the committees of this House for a number of years will bear me out in saying that these gentlemen are most competent. I always supposed that the reporting of the committees was a sort of training school for reporting on the floor of the House, but I find that the Civil Service Commission has advertised far and wide throughout the country for persons to come forward and pass the examination. There is no doubt but that some of the questions specified by the Civil Service Commission are necessary, and perhaps the one to which I am going to call attention is necessary too, but it does seem to me that the Civil Service Commission might have been more sparing of the feelings of the members of the House and left this requirement out:

4. Sufficient literary skill to reconstruct in correct and concise form, with proper paragraphing and punctuation, passages containing awkward or ungrammatical expressions, or words inaccurately used.

The Civil Service Commission possibly from practical experience in listening to the debates in this House, seem to think it necessary that a high degree of skill along the lines of reconstruction of sentences should be possessed by any person appointed a 'Hansard' reporter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. However much the Civil Service Commission may be impressed by that idea, it would perhaps have been just as well to have said nothing about it in the advertisement, but to have examined the candidates upon it when they presented themselves for examination.

There are many other things in connection with these examinations which seem peculiar. It is all very well to pass these examinations, and you may ask what objection would the gentlemen who are now in Subdivision 'B' have to presenting themselves for examination for promotion to Subdivision 'A' as 'Hansard' reporters, but when one comes to look over the list of subjects of which a knowledge must be possessed by candidates, one is not surprised that these gentlemen would rather not present themselves for examination, however well equipped for the general duties of 'Hansard' reporters they might be. For instance here are some of the subjects: They are to write an essay on: 'The Follies of Fashion.' Now what in the world that has to do with any qualification for a 'Hansard' reporter I do not know. Some of the members of the 'Hansard' staff we know are of the 'glass of fashion, and the mould of form.' I have one in my mind's eye at the present time, but I think we can leave that to the individual preference of the gentleman himself rather than ask him to be proficient and efficient along those lines. Then also they are to write an essay on the 'Boy Scouts' or 'My Favourite Recreation', whether that be at the Golf Club or at the bar, or where. Bicycling is another subject. The great snow storm is another. I suppose, as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries suggests, that was on the 21st of September. The 'First Money I Ever Earned' is another that the examiners may see whether or not the candidate is economical in his business affairs.

It does seem to me that this promotion should be by merit and should be made from the service. I am sure I will be supported by every member of this House who has knowledge of the subject in the statement that the gentlemen who now occupy the positions in Subdivision 'B' are thoroughly competent and efficient in every way and they have had experience as 'Hansard' reporters. I think it might very well be left to the chief of the 'Hansard' staff to say whether or not these gentlemen are competent. He would be a better judge of the subject than would be the Civil Service Commission, because he has had a far greater practical experience along these lines than has any gentleman who is an examiner for the Civil Service Commission. The gentlemen now in Class 'B' have had the very best possible experience to qualify them as 'Hansard' reporters. They have sat for years in the press gallery of this House. They have gone around the country reporting the speeches of members and the long experience they have had has given them an insight into the political history of this country which it is most essential to any 'Hansard' reporter to have in order that he may do his work correctly, intelligently and well. It is important, I suppose, that the 'Hansard' reporters should have the ability to reconstruct sentences because many of us are apt to make errors in hasty extempore speech, but the great essential, it seems to me, is to have a close and intimate knowledge of the political history of the country. I hope that the government who have charge of this matter will allow these examinations to go on as the Civil Service Commission have advertised them, but that they will be for men to take the place of the gentlemen now in Subdivision 'B', who will be promoted to Subdivision 'A'.

Mr. LENNOX. I noticed this advertisement in the 'Gazette,' and my attention was brought to this matter in another way. Without wishing to at all interfere with the functions of the Board of Civil Service Commissioners, I must say that, to my

mind, an examination such as appears to be aimed at there, is not the best means of getting the proper men to discharge the important duties of 'Hansard' reporters for this House. I realize, as probably most of the older members realize, that our sentences at times require to be reconstructed, and that a mere slavish report of the proceedings of the House would be very unsatisfactory, particularly to the members who have been guilty of the utterances, and for that reason, I think that a mere competitive examination is not the best means of securing just the men we require as 'Hansard' reporters. I have a good deal of experience with the three gentlemen who have already been alluded to, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Matthews and Mr. Blue. I know that one or two of these gentlemen received a very bad early education upon 'The Globe' reporting staff, but I had experience of them since, and I have great pleasure in certifying to the splendid character of the work they do in the committees where they report. With the experience they have had, I would be very sorry indeed, to see them passed over at this time, when we have an opportunity of placing them upon our regular 'Hansard' staff. I believe that the training in the press gallery here, a practical experience of these inaccuracies committed by some of the other members, I am not speaking of myself, and their experience of public life, fit them in the highest degree for 'Hansard' work, and I believe that we will be wise in getting from the ranks of those who report our speeches in the gallery, the men to report them on the floor of the House. We have had a happy experience of the appointment of men from the press gallery to the 'Hansard' staff, the men thus recruited to that staff have been most efficient reporters, and the three gentlemen to whom I have alluded, are men of that class. I think I am expressing the feeling of a good many members, when I say that I hope no system will be pursued which will compel men who have had that amount of experience and have given such proof of efficiency as they have given, to enter the lists upon a competitive examination, which may be a fairly good test of rapidity and slavish exactitude, but which is not a test of the editorial skill and judgment which is required in a 'Hansard' reporter.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am sorry to hear that the committee have decided to discontinue the analytical index. I have found the index very useful myself. It gives a short synopsis of the speeches.

And it is much easier to refer to it than wade through so many volumes of 'Hansard'. I was surprised to find, on looking through the index, that there were only three or four years in which the English edition was printed at all. I thought at first that it was continued right from the time the analytical index started, but I find that the English edition was printed one or two years, then discontinued, then started again and kept up a couple of years and then again discontinued. I do not know what other hon. gentlemen may think, but I have found the analytical index very useful, and I trust that it will be continued. I would suggest therefore that the committee should reconsider their report. I think it would be well worth their while to devote some further consideration to this matter, look over it again before coming to the conclusion that this index should be abolished.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). I have before me a copy of the analytical index, and I must say it is a most useful compendium of the proceedings of the House. For my part I shall certainly be at a loss in hunting up statements made by ministers and others should this recommendation to abolish the index be adopted. Take, for instance, the second session in 1906 when the policy of constructing the National Transcontinental was being discussed and when the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) had, as was naturally to be expected to answer a great many questions, how could one turn up any of these without this index? Do away with it and if you want to refer to any statement made on any subject, you will have to look through three or four volumes of 'Hansard'. Why should any hon. gentleman be obliged to attempt this if he wanted to find out what was said on any particular occasion or subject? With the aid of an analytical index however he can find without any trouble the particular page where the statement is printed to which he wishes to refer. Take again the naval policy of the late government. The right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) answered a great many queries on that subject, which are to be found scattered through hundreds of pages of 'Hansard'. Without the aid of this index, it would be impossible to discover any particular one of these without going to the almost impossible labour of wading through every page of the reports. This index costs about $4,000, and possibly that cost might be cut down by judicious condensation and some of the time be saved that is now taken in making it, but I think the expenditure serves a most useful purpose. If any hon. gentleman wishes to refresh his memory at any time in regard to any debate, he has in the analytical index the most ready adjunct for that purpose. As regards the filling of vacancies on the reporting staff, I think it would be grossly unfair to the gentlemen who are now on the reporting staff of the House of Commons that they should not be given the preference and

the promotion to which they are entitled. Messrs. Dickson, Matthews and Blue have had long experience in this House, they are well known to the members of this House, and have proved themselves most competent at their work. Every hon. gentlemen, particularly from the province of Ontario, who has had anything to do with politics in the past 20 years will know that these gentlemen have attended all the large political meetings in that province and consequently should be more at home in reporting the debates than any new man could possibly be.

I hope the committee will be pleased to withdraw their report, consider the matter and bring down another report, leaving the matter as it was, namely, that the Debates Committee shall consider any applications submitted to them, and then let the House adopt that report as they see fit, and leave out the recommendation to do away with the analytical index.

Mr. SPEAKER. That portion of the notice in the official 'Gazette,' which deals with the examination of candidates for the position vacant on the 'Hansard' staff, has nothing to do with the report of the Debates Committee at all. The Civil Service law provides that these vacancies have to be filled in a certain way. In pursuance of that law, I asked the commission to find three men competent to do the work, leaving the competition open to all. Names have been mentioned, no doubt, from their experience as newspaper men and as reporting the proceedings of this House and its committees, they will be more likely to distance their competitors. I have simply taken that which the Act provides should be taken. As regards the other portion of the report, that is altogether another matter with which the Civil Service Commission have nothing to do, but which is entirely in the hands of this House.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to give the opinion to the House of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), and the late Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), with reference to the utility of this analytical index. Discussing that subject in the session of 1907-8, the Minister of Trade and Commerce used these words:

> If there is one useless thing that comes to a member after it is two years old, it is that analytical index to 'Hansard,' which is almost as large as 'Hansard' itself. I do not know whether anybody ever looks at it. I have looked at it only to wonder how the ingenuity of man could devise anything that could possibly be so useless. You open it and think you are going to get something, but you get a mere fragment, and you have to go to the 'Hansard.' But it comes out some two years after 'Hansard' and is of no earthly use. It is a large volume, pretty nearly as large as the Trade and Navigation reports. What it pretends to do is to give a digest of what everybody says on every subject, and as it is impossible to do that to any extent or with any accuracy, it defeats the very purpose for which it was intended. It is a perfectly useless piece of mechanism, and I do not see why it is kept on. Other members may find some use for it, but it has never been of any earthly use to me. Might I ask the Minister of Finance if he ever used it?

Mr. Fielding then said:

> If it could not be held up against me, I have never seen it.

I have taken the trouble to inquire of hon. members around me, and have not found one who would say that he had ever used this analytical index. Some of them have never seen it. I certainly never did, and it seems to me perfectly useless that we should spend $4,000 a year on something that nobody ever makes any use of.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask the chairman of the committee to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and withdraw the report for the present. The analytical index is certainly a most valuable adjunct to 'Hansard.' In reply to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Middlebro), it seems to me, speaking from memory, that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), on the occasion to which the hon. gentleman refers, afterwards corrected his opinion and withdrew his opposition to the continuation of this index. I speak of course, subject to correction. Now with regard to the appointments on the reporting staff, the Civil Service Commissioners have only followed the law. These appointments have to be made, under the law, by the members of the Civil Service Commission. I think, however, the commissioners would have shown better judgment if they had asked competitors to write an essay on folly and fashion, and how I earned my first money, or a snowstorm, than have asked them to give us something of the contemporary history of Canada. Messrs. Dickson, Blue and Matthews, who are at present in the employ of the House on the reporting staff of the committee, are very competent men. They are quite familiar with the political history of Canada, and I think they should come out ahead of anybody else in any competition as regards fitness for work of this kind.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I would suggest that it might be advisable to adopt all of this report except the paragraph relating to the analytical index. As regards the new appointments, the Civil Service Commissioners have to follow the law and cannot take any other course. I entirely concur in the

opinion that the gentlemen on the staff of the committees have been doing excellent work, and should have every consideration possible.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to say that the Debates Committee are entirely in the hands of the House. We had no other idea except to serve the purpose of the House in procuring an efficient report of the debates and in eliminating what we thought to be entirely useless.

We attempted last year to influence the course of things so far as the appointment of the staff is concerned, and found to our regret that we had no power in that connection. It was only because we felt that we would be exceeding our power that we did not make any suggestion this year as to the persons who should be appointed to the debates staff. Speaking for myself, I know very well the three gentlemen mentioned and should be pleased indeed to have authority to recommend their appointment, because I do not think we could get three better men. However, as to the portion of the report which deals with the analytical index, I am quite sure that no member of the Debates Committee wishes to force that on the attention of the House; therefore, with the permission of the House, and in deference to the wishes of the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I ask permission to withdraw that recommendation.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that that report be concurred in, with the exception of paragraph 6, which deals with the analytical index?

Report, amended as proposed, concurred in.

AID AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) for the aid and encouragement of agriculture. He said:

Mr. Speaker, in asking leave to introduce the Bill which stands in my name I trust the House will permit a reference to matters which, though not directly explanatory of the Bill, do in a very real sense refer to the reason for introducing a measure of such a character. It will be recalled that in the speech from the Throne the following passage occurred:

> It is essential to recognize that, in a country possessing so great an area of fertile land as that with which this Dominion is happily endowed, the great basic industry is agriculture. My advisers are convinced that the time has come when greater aid and encouragement should be given to those who are engaged in the cultivation of the land. To this end, a measure will be introduced under which it is hoped that there may be co-operation between the Dominion and the various provinces, for the purpose of assisting and encouraging our farmers to secure the best results in production, and at the same time preserve the fertility of the soil.

This paragraph may be instanced as an implementing of the promise made during the recent elections by the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the House.

Since assuming office as Minister of Agriculture, I have endeavoured to give the question of aid to agriculture in Canada the serious consideration which the importance of the matter warrants. The more closely the subject was studied, however, the more clear it became that a policy of co-operation with the provinces for the betterment of agricultural conditions throughout Canada could not be worked out in any intelligent or satisfactory manner without a thorough examination of the actual agricultural conditions of the country and exhaustive survey of the work being performed by the governments of the various provinces, and without a definite conception of the aims of the provinces along the lines of agricultural expansion.

Co-operation means something more than mere expenditure of money by federal or provincial authorities. It is true that criticism, perhaps not altogether undeserved, has been directed at governments in this country for not spending enough money in aid of agriculture. It is not always easy to get the money for such a purpose and we shall agree that, even when obtained, it is not less difficult to spend it wisely. Financial assistance given to provinces, associations or individuals, which results in the tendency to look entirely for external help in the solution of agricultural problems, is certainly not wise assistance. The only justification for increased governmental aid—the very meaning of the word co-operation—is that assistance, while making for the healthy expansion of agriculture, should stimulate individual energy and better enable provinces, associations and individuals to help themselves.

We have been faced with the same difficulties in Canada that have faced the people of other countries. Many of those countries have revolutionized their agricultural methods in recent years and have organized their Departments of Agriculture in such a way that all branches are directly related to, or closely associated with, this industry.

Co-operation in its broadest sense has been fairly systematized, working along lines of co-ordination of work with the provinces and with the associations. This is not the time to touch that phase of the subject which is concerned with agricultural co-operative societies though it might be said in passing that the principle has been

adopted to an increasing extent in Europe, and that to-day in Germany alone there is an imperial federation of co-operative societies, which represents externally and officially the interests of more than 19,000 co-operative societies, comprising nearly two million members. There is much to learn from other nations. We are young. The potentialities of our country are of a magnitude not yet grasped by any of us. We have already accomplished much, and if mistakes have been made, or injudicious courses embarked on, there is ample time to rectify the mistakes and direct our energies to better purpose.

As there has been a lack of full co-ordination of practical agricultural work in the past in this country, between the provincial and federal governments, so also there has been a lack of legislative co-ordination. The British North America Act, article 95, states as follows:

> In each province the legislature may make laws in relation to agriculture in the province and to immigration into the province, and it is hereby declared that the parliament of Canada may, from time to time, make laws in relation to agriculture in all or any of the provinces, and in relation to immigration into all or any of the provinces, and any law of the legislature of a province relative to agriculture or immigration shall have effect in and for the province as long as and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the parliament of Canada.

In respect to this, Lord Carnarvon in a debate in the House of Lords at the time when the British North America Act was passed remarked:

> The real object which we have in view is to give to the central government those high functions and almost sovereign power by which general principles and uniformity of legislation may be secured in these questions that are of common import to all the provinces, and at the same time to retain for each province so ample a measure of municipal liberty and self-government as will allow, and indeed compel them, to exercise those legal powers which they could exercise with great advantage to the community.

He further pointed out that:

> There is concurrent power of legislation to be exercised by the central and the local parliaments. It extends over three separate subjects—immigration, agriculture and public works. Of these the two first will in most cases probably be treated by the provincial authorities. They are subjects which in their ordinary character are local, but it is possible that they may have under the changed circumstances of a young country a more general power and therefore a discretionary power of interference is wisely reserved to the central parliament.

Now, Sir, it was having in view these matters which I have touched upon that I became more and more convinced that legislation this session designed to embody provisions which would make for a maximum of harmonious co-operation and a minimum of friction between the various parts of Canada was impossible. It seemed clear that it was the duty of the government to lay a sound foundation for any permanent constructive legislation. Various ways suggested themselves. It might be done—imperfectly I think—through the ordinary channels of the department, involving correspondence with the different provinces. It might be done, also I think imperfectly, by conferences with the various governments of the country. It appeared to me, however, that the purpose the government had in view might better be accomplished by securing the services, if possible, of a man whose practical experience with agricultural problems, and whose broad grasp of agricultural questions should specially qualify him for the performance of this work. It would be his duty to become thoroughly conversant with the conditions, and with the methods carried on in the different provinces; to find out on what lines the educative, legislative and practical agricultural work was being conducted, and thus put the government in a position which would make for action of a truly co-operative and stimulative character, and which would tend to the excision of unnecessary duplication, and promote efficiency and progress all round. It was not easy to find such a man, but we believe we have done so, and arrangements are being made by which Mr. C. C. James of Toronto will devote homself to the task, the nature of which I have outlined. I need hardly state what the House well knows that Mr. James has qualifications peculiarly fitting him for this work; he has been for more than a quarter of a century the deputy Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Ontario—in that capacity he has had much to do with the notable advance that Ontario has made in agriculture; his reputation is more than a provincial one, and I think that the House will agree that substantial benefit will accrue to the country as a result of appointing Mr. James as a special commissioner for this work.

This, of course, will involve a severance of Mr. James' relations with the Ontario government, and here I may read to the House what Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture, says of Mr. James:

> I repeat that you could not do better from the standpoint of Canadian agriculture than to secure the services of Mr. James, and I trust the plan you will evolve will redound very largely to the benefit of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to come directly to the present Bill, it has been felt by the government that, though the general policy in respect to co-operation with the provin-

ces cannot well be worked out under the present conditions, yet it would only be keeping faith to do at least something in the way of aid this year. Accordingly, although I do not want to be understood as necessarily accepting the principle of cash contributions for this purpose as a permanent policy, the Bill which I am asking leave to introduce provides for powers to assist the provinces by means of direct grants of money under agreement between this government and the provincial governments, it being understood, of course, that such moneys will be expended purely for agricultural purposes

The principle upon which grants will be apportioned will be that of division based on population, the census of 1911 governing. The government has given a good deal of consideration to this phase of the matter, and has arrived at the conclusion that the population basis is one which is open to the fewest objections. The question of whether aid of this kind should be given to agriculture need hardly, I think, be debated. We are expending, and have expended, large sums in various public works; we have always liberally assisted railways, have given large subsidies to shipping companies and in various ways contributed financial assistance to the industries of the country. An attempt by more generous financial support to place our great agricultural industry on a better footing is one that I believe will have the cordial support of this House. I may add that there is no desire in this matter to favour this or that of the various provincial governments. We recognize that in every province a government has been placed there by the people, and I am voicing the sentiments of the Prime Minister and his colleagues in saying that the sole purport of this measure is to do what the title declares it is designed for, viz.: to aid and encourage agriculture.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the report in the morning press that a commission is to be appointed to investigate the Farmers' Bank, is correct. Might I ask whether or not the Prime Minister is in a position to make an announcement to the House on the question?

Mr. BORDEN. Not in a position to-day; probably to-morrow.

OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT ELEVATORS.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether any decision has been reached to place a sum in the supplementary estimates for the securing of elevators by lease, purchase, or expropriation.

Mr. BORDEN. That question has not yet been formally considered. An announcement will be made in connection with the supplementary estimates.

Mr. KNOWLES. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman if he sent the following telegram to Mr. F. W. G. Haultain:—

F. W. G. Haultain,
Regina.

Telegram received. The statement you bring to my attention is utterly untrue. Bill now before the House includes power for purchase, lease or expropriation of terminal elevators; an appropriation to be placed in the supplementary estimates for this purpose.
(Sgd.) R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, I sent that, but it is quite true that the supplementary estimates have not yet been formally considered, and that an announcement to the House will be made when that takes place.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Bank of Saskatchewan.—Mr. Knowles.

PATENTS OF THOMAS WADGE.

House in committee on Bill (No. 16) respecting patents of Thomas Wadge.—Mr. Aikins.

Mr. CURRIE. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed further with this Bill, I desire to say that this is a measure of very great importance to the public, and especially to the farming community. Unfortunately, I am not a member of the Private Bills Committee, but perhaps some members of the committee who are here can enlighten the House as to the merits of the proposal contained in this Bill. I understand that this Bill deals with a patent on windstackers, that the patent is about to expire and that the Bill is for the purpose of renewing the patent for a further term of years. I would like to know if that is so, because, if it is, it will add about $100 to the cost of every thresher that our western farmers and our Ontario farmers buy. I understand that every manufacturer of threshing machines in Canada is now making these windstackers, and if we put this Bill through, royalties will continue to be collected to the extent of from $50 to $100 on every thresher, which does not seem to be desirable. I may be wrong, but I am given to understand that such is the case. I would like some enlightment from a member of the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Under the circumstances mentioned by the hon. member for Sim-

coe (Mr. Currie), and particularly in the absence of the hon. promoter of the Bill, (Mr. Aikins), I think it well that this Bill should stand.

Progress reported.

PATENTS OF THOMAS D. RAMBAUT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 84) respecting certain patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—Mr. Ames.

Mr. NESBITT. What are the patents on?

Mr. ROGERS. As the member promoting the Bill (Mr. Ames), is not here, you might let it stand.

Progress reported.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

JUDGES OF CIRCUIT COURT, MONTREAL.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it the intention of the honourable the Minister of Justice to introduce legislation during the present session with a view to add to the number of judges in the circuit court of Montreal?
2. Has the minister received petitions from the Montreal Bar on the subject?

Mr. DOHERTY. The matter is under consideration. Different communications have been interchanged between the minister and representatives of the Montreal Bar with regard to it.

POSTMASTER AT WHITEHEAD, N.S.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the postmaster at Whitehead, N.S., been dismissed? If so, for what reason and at whose request?
2. Was there an investigation? If so, when and where, and what was the result of the investigation?
3. By whom was he replaced, and who recommended his successor?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. (a) Yes. (b) For political partisanship, on recommendation of Mr. G. A. R. Rowlings.
2. No. The postmaster was asked twice what he had to say in regard to the charge of partisanship, but he evidently could not deny the charge since he twice evaded giving a straight answer.
3. Mr. G. H. Munroe, on recommendation of Mr. G. A. R. Rowlings.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Justice been called to the case of the Attorney General of Ontario, appellant, and the Hamilton Street Railway Company, respondent, as reported in appeal case 1913, page 524, in which it was decided that 'It is not the practice of their lordships to give speculative opinions on hypothetical questions admitted. The questions must arise in concrete cases and involve private rights.'
2. In view of this decision, does the minister consider he will obtain from the Judicial Councillors of the Privy Council answers to the proposed questions of the right honourable Premier with reference to the issue raised by Bill (No. 3) intituled, 'An Act to amend the Marriage Act?'

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. The minister believes that the questions to be submitted in connection with the proposed amendment to the Marriage Act, will be analogous to those which the court in the case referred to answered, and not to those which it declined to answer.

DISMISSAL OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES IN SOUTH RENFREW.

Mr. PROULX:

1. How many employees, permanent and temporary, in the riding of South Renfrew have been dismissed from the public service since the 21st of September last?
2. What are their names and when were they dismissed?
3. Who were appointed in their places and when were such appointments made?
4. What emolument or salary do the said employees receive?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Department of Marine and Fisheries. One in the Fisheries Branch, who had jurisdiction over the whole county of Renfrew.
2. Paul Lassman.
3. No. one.
4. Answered by No. 3.

CONTRACTS IN SOUTH RENFREW.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What contracts were awarded by the various departments of the government in the riding of South Renfrew since the 21st of September last?
2. When were such contracts awarded and to whom, for what service and for what amount?

Mr. ROCHE:

1 and 2. Post Office Department. On October 6, 1911, a contract for rural mail service starting from Arnprior, was awarded to Mr. D. K. Cunningham, at $375 per annum.

DISMISSAL OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES IN NORTH RENFREW.

Mr. PROULX:

1. How many employees, permanent or temporary, in the riding of North Renfrew have

been dismissed from the public service since the 21st of September last?

2. What are their names and when were they dismissed?

3. Who were appointed in their places and when were such appointments made?

4. What emolument or salary do the said employees receive?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Department of Marine and Fisheries. One in the Fisheries Branch, who had jurisdiction over the whole county of Renfrew.

2. Paul Lassman, November 7, 1911.

3. No one.

4. Answered by No. 3.

CONTRACTS AWARDED IN NORTH RENFREW.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What contracts have been awarded by the various departments of the government since the 21st of September last for services on works in the riding of North Renfrew?

2. When, and to whom were such contracts awarded, and for what services and amounts, respectively?

Mr. ROCHE:

1 and 2. Post Office Department. Three mail contracts have been awarded, viz.: Lapasse and Westmeath; on October 9, 1911, a contract for rural mail service between these points was awarded to Mr. Wm. H. Cavanagh at $260 per annum.

Perretton and Government Road Crossing—On November 23 a contract for rural mail service on this route was awarded to Mr. M. Thrasher at $399 per annum.

Lake Dore and Micksburg—On September 22, 1911, a contract for ordinary mail service was awarded to Mr. M. Dick at $200 per annum.

INSPECTION OF JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Mr. SEVIGNY:

1. Has the government the right of inspection of joint stock companies incorporated under the law of Canada?

2. If so, has the government the right to know the names of the shareholders incorporated under the said laws, and will the government give to the House the names of the shareholders of the Canadian Vickers, Limited, Company?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.

2. There is no means by which the government may demand from a company incorporated under the Companies Act the names of its shareholders.

WHITE HEAD ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has Patrick Conway, lightkeeper at White Head Island, been dismissed? If so, for what reason and at whose instance?

2. Was there an investigation?

3. Was Mr. Conway appointed by order in council?

4. Was he dismissed by order in council? If so, on what evidence?

5. Who was appointed as his successor?

6. On whose recommendation was his successor appointed?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. (a) Yes. (b) Active political partisanship. (c) G. A. R. Rowlings, Esq.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. (a) Yes. (b) On the statement of Mr. G. A. R. Rowlings.

5. Almon Munroe.

6. G. A. R. Rowlings, Esq.

HON JUSTICE DUGAS.

Mr. SEVIGNY:

1. On what date was the order in council passed appointing Mr. François Octave Dugas, Advocate of Joliette, a judge of the Superior Court for the province of Quebec?

2. On what date did the said François Octave Dugas, receive notice of the order in council or of his appointment.

3. What is the date of the commission of the said François Octave Dugas, as judge of the Superior Court for the province of Quebec?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. September 6, 1909.

2. September 9, 1909.

3. September 6, 1909.

INLAND REVENUE OFFICE AT JOLIETTE

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has a charge been laid against J. C. Robitaille, Inland Revenue Officer of Joliette, Quebec?

2. If so, what is the nature of said charge and by whom was it made?

3. Has an investigation been held? If so, what was the result of same?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes.

2. Of having, during the last Federal election, acted as a political partisan. The charge has been laid by the member for the constituency of Joliette.

3. No investigation has been made as the evidence before the department renders such unnecessary.

TIDAL WAVE AT GASPE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the government been informed that a tidal wave devasted the Gaspé shore in January last, carrying away several houses, destroying many vessels, fishing tackle, etc?

2. Does the government intend to aid the fishermen of the Gaspé coast who have been ruined by this tidal wave?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has received no information in regard to this matter.
2. Answered by No. 1.

'NIOBE' AND 'RAINBOW.'

* Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Is it the intention of the government to sell the 'Niobe' and the 'Rainbow?'
2. If so, what steps have been taken to effect such sale?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The intention of the government will be made known in due course, when its policy in connection with the Naval Service is announced.
2. Answered by (1).

PROVISIONING 'RAINBOW' AND 'NIOBE.'

* Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Have any contracts been made since October, 1, 1911, for provisioning the 'Niobe' and the 'Rainbow'?
2. If so, with whom, when, and for what length of time?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No.
2. Answered by (1).

SOREL WHARF.

Mr. LAVALLEE:

1. Who were and who are now contractors for the government for the wharfs in deep water at Sorel?
2. What was the contract price, and what is the balance still due the contractors?

Mr. MONK:

1. J. E. Beauchemin, Sorel, Quebec. Contract transferred to Messrs. Geo. Magnan and A. E. Pontbriand.
2. (a) Original contract, $125,000; extension authorized by order in council, $37,889.20. Total, $162,889.20.
(b) Amount paid to date, $157,660, leaving a balance to be paid, on completion of contract of $5,220.20.

PRINTING BUREAU CLOCKS.

* Mr. WHITE (Alberta):

1. How many clocks have been installed at the Printing Bureau, and what was the total cost of each installation?
2. In what departments or rooms are the said time clocks used?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Fourteen time-recording clocks. Total cost of installation, $2,557.50.
2. Ground floor: 3 clocks in hallway; 1 in press room.
First floor: 1 clock in general office; 1 in proof-reading room; 1 in linotype room.
Second floor: 1 clock in bindery, east wing; 1 clock in bindery, centre; 1 clock in parliamentary room, No. 2.
Third floor: 1 clock in bindery, east wing; 1 clock in bindery, centre; 2 clocks in parliamentary room, No. 1.

FISHERY INSPECTOR IN BELLEVILLE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has Mr. J. M. Hurley, Dominion Fishery Inspector, of Belleville, been dismissed? If so, when, by whom at whose request, for what reasons, and on what grounds?
2. Has the government or any of the ministers received any resolution passed by the Board of Trade of Belleville about Mr. J. M. Hurley since his dismissal? If so, what are the contents thereof and who were the proposers seconders and signatories of said resolution?
3. Does the government intend taking any action on above resolutions?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes; by Order-in-Council 16th December, 1911, at the request of E. Guss Porter, M.P., on the ground of offensive political partisanship.
2. The secretary of the Belleville Board of Trade on January 17th ultimo, forwarded a copy of a resolution passed by the Board on motion of Mr. C. M. Reid, seconded by Mr. H. Sneyd. The resolution passed, expressed appreciation of the public spirited services of Mr. J. M. Hurley, and states his co-operation in all matters had always been cheerfully given, and especially in connection with the armouries, railways and the proposed new government docks.
3. The resolution does not call for any further action.

INQUIRY COMMISSIONER GARCEAU.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. When was Mr. Napoleon Garceau, advocate of Drummondville, appointed commissioner to hold inquiries against public employees?
2. Who recommended his appointment?
3. What is his salary and how much does he receive for travelling expenses?
4. Has he been appointed for a fixed territory and what is the territory?
5. Does he perform his services for all the departments? If not, for what departments does he act?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. 16th December, 1911.
2. Minister of Inland Revenue.
3. Fifteen dollars per day and actual travelling expenses.
4. Province of Quebec.
5. No. Department of Inland Revenue only.

RESTAURANT OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What was the salary paid to waiters in the restaurant of parliament during last session?
2. What is the salary paid to waiters this session?

Mr. MONK:

During the early part of last session male waiters were employed in the restaurant, one at $50, another at $40, and the remainder at $30 per month, with board in each case. Later in the summer most of those were discharged and girls substituted instead, at monthly wages of from $20 to $22, with board. This latter system has been continued and girls are employed at above remuneration. There are also, at present, in the restaurant service, three men who are paid $50, $40 and $30, respectively, monthly, and are supplied with board.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all letters, petitions, memorials or other documents received by the Prime Minister or any other member of the government, relating to the passage of a federal marriage law or legislation in regard to the so-called effect of the Ne Temere Decree.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all orders in council passed during the last ten years relating to the abolition or regulation of tolls on canals.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, charges, complaints, reports and other documents relating to the dismissal of Luke Day, Public Works Department, of North Sydney, C.B.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, charges, complaints, reports and other documents relating to the dismissal of D. McDonald, Esq., M.D., deputy of the Indian Affairs, of Baddeck, C.B.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, charges, complaints, orders in council, reports or other documents in the possesssion of the Department of Customs relating to the dismissal of Lyman C. Smith from the customs collectorship at Oshawa, Ontario.—Mr. Sinclair..

For a copy of all petitions, letters and memorials received by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries since the first day of October, 1911, protesting against the issuing of a fish trap license to Captain John H. Thorburn, Sand Point, Shelburne county, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all orders in council, petitions and memorials, passed or received by the government of Canada, respectively, since July 1, 1908, relating to foreign shipping engaged in the coastwise trade in Canada; and also a copy of all correspondence between the government or any department thereof and any person, company or corporation relating to the same.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all documents, reports, letters, complaints, &c., relating to the dismissal in 1896, of H. St. Amour, postmaster, at St. Amour, county of Prescott, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Proulx.

CIVIL SERVICE AMENDMENT ACT.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, by providing for the appointment of an additional Civil Service Commissioner, who shall have the salary of a deputy head of a department.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF A TARIFF COMMISSION.

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

On section 3,

Mr. EMMERSON. Has any action been taken with respect to the personnel of this commission? In one of the New Brunswick papers it was announced that a gentleman representing a New Brunswick constituency was to be appointed.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The personnel of the commission has not been decided upon; it has not been under consideration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Have the qualifications of the gentlemen who are to occupy these very important positions been considered, and what are they?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am convinced that the success of the commission will depend to a very large extent upon its personnel and that we need men of the highest qualifications. As to what the calling, profession or occupation of such men should be I am unable to say at present. The duties of the commission are set out in the Bill and while we have not decided upon the personnel I am of the opinion that we should have men of special aptitude for the duties so prescribed. The commissioners should be of high class ability because their duties will be quasi-judicial and administrative, they should be men of energy, ability and high standing. I cannot say further at the present time because we have not considered the personnel.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It goes without saying that the men to be entrusted with the duties contemplated by this Bill should be men of ability within their spheres. It would appear to me, however, that they are simply to be statisticians, simply to collect information, which we have already to some extent in some of our departments. Clause 4 of the Bill sets out that they are to make inquiry into:

(a) The price and cost of raw materials in Canada and elsewhere, and the cost of trans-

portation thereof from the place of production to the place of use or consumption;

(b) the cost of production in Canada and elsewhere;

(c) the cost of transportation from the place of production to the place of use or consumption, whether in Canada or elsewhere;

(d) the cost, efficiency and conditions of labour in Canada and elsewhere;

(e) the prices received by producers, manufacturers, wholesale dealers, retailers and other distributors in Canada and elsewhere;

(f) all conditions and factors which affect or enter into the cost of production and the price to the consumers in Canada;

(g) generally, all the conditions affecting production, manufacture, cost and price in Canada as compared with other countries.

I repeat that some of this information is already in our statistics which are given to the public from year to year, and, in a larger measure such information is collected in the United States through their Labour Bureau or some such organization. I would say that the proper way to collect such information is by attaching statisticians to the Department of Trade and Commerce or the Department of Finance.

But it is intended to prepare a brief and to secure information for the Minister of Finance in support of his own conception of what should be considered proper political economy. My hon. friend the other day, in the course of his observations on the second reading, told us he was a protectionist, a moderate protectionist as he qualified his own statement. He did not tell us nor have I read anywhere what is the difference between moderate protection and immoderate protection. I do not know that I ever heard of a protectionist who called himself an immoderate protectionist, he is always moderate. The line of demarcation between moderate and immoderate protection is a hazy one and rather difficult to define, it is like seeking the line between moderate drinking and immoderate drinking. My hon. friend will tell me that his ideas are in favour of moderate protection. For this I do not quarrel with him, these are his views, but there are men in the country who do not believe in protection, who are in favour of absolute free trade and men who believe in a tariff for revenue only. Then there are men who call themselves moderate protectionists who are prepared to go any length in the direction. The object of this Bill is to collect information in order that the minister may find therein a support for his views of moderate protection. Perhaps my hon. friend will disclaim that idea and will tell me that the information collected under this Bill by whomever it may be collected will be uniform and will be for the advantage of all.

There is another manner of collecting information. My hon. friend perhaps remembers what old Dr. Johnston said in his latter days. Speaking of the time when as a younger man, he was engaged in reporting he stated that his reports were always fair and accurate, but he always took good care that the weak dog got the worst of it. I believe that under this system the free trade dogs and the tariff-for-revenue dogs will also get the worst of this information. Let us have the information which is collected for all, for the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who does not believe in moderate protection but who is a free trader as well as for those who are moderate protectionists, and even for the man who wants to have the barrier as high as Haman's gallows.

We know now the character of the information that we are going to have. It is to be exactly of the character which I have stated, it will not be impartial information, but it will be information for an object. I may be asked what reason I have to speak as positively as I now speak. I have gathered my conviction from the debate of the other day, more particularly from the speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) who, I regret to see, is not now in the House. The hon. member for St. Antoine spoke on this Bill as if he had been the power behind the throne. When my right hon. friend opposite (Mr. Borden) formed his Cabinet everybody expected that the hon. member for St. Antoine would be included in it. Everybody thought that both his exertions and the ability which he is known to possess in financial and business matters entitled him to a seat in that Cabinet. But although he is not a member of the government he seems to be the power behind the throne. He has proved that he has even more power in the government than those who are members of it, and, therefore, I attach a great deal of importance to the information which he has given us, and he has told us in so many words that the men who are to be appointed on this commission are to be in sympathy with the sentiment of the present administration. He stated that in his speech and repeated it in answer to my hon. friend for Carleton, New Brunswick. He said:

> I beg your pardon, the words 'high protectionist' were not used by me. I said they must be in sympathy with the well known sentiment of the present government.

Well, the well-known sentiment of the present government as defined the other day by the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), and we knew it before, is in favour of moderate protection. Therefore, the men who are to be appointed on this commission are to be moderate protectionists, they are to be in sympathy with the sentiment now ruling the country. I ask my hon. friend opposite is it in accordance

with British institutions that this commission should be formed on such a basis as this? Is it in accordance with what we know of the continuity of government that partisans should be appointed in the Civil Service or on any commission? If you appoint a temporary commission the government may put on that commission any man they think will serve an object, but if you appoint a permanent commission such as this is intended to be, is it in accordance with the spirit of British institutions that you should appoint partisans, or if you wanted to put it less strongly than I do, men who would be in sympathy with the government of the day? This is absolutely repugnant to our system of constitutional government. The very nature of our institutions is based on party government, and contemplates that there should be an alternation of party in the administration. The very nature of our administration is predicated upon the fact which we know by the experience of British countries that governments are not immortal, governments are like men, born to die. Even this government is not eternal or immortal, there will come a day when it will give way to its opponents. If we appoint this commission composed of partisans, men intended to be in sympathy with the present policy of the government, what justice will it be when their opponents come into office? That is not in accordance with our principle. The principle upon which this commission must be governed is that the men who are appointed to it shall be absolutely free from any political bias.

If justice is to be done to the whole country, not only to supporters of the government but also to its opponents, you must appoint men who are not biased or partisan and who will give the information they collect without any colour at all so that every one may ascertain the facts as they are. They should be men, not influenced by sympathy with the present government, but anxious to give the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The very manner in which it is proposed to appoint this commission justifies our opposition to it. I object to a commission entrusted with the collection of information on all subjects mentioned in the Bill which will do it with the view of preparing a brief for the minister and not simply for the purpose of collecting information, whether that information will help the views of my hon. friends or the contrary. I think the principle of the Bill is altogether wrong and that the method to be followed under it is not that on which my hon. friend should proceed. Complaint has been made that our statistics are not as perfect as they should be. I agree in this, but I submit that any legislation to improve our statistical records should not be enacted for a political object, but simply for the obtaining of information.

Mr. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman is unduly alarmed. I am afraid he is not following out the principles he exhibited to the country during some fifteen years in which he held office. He objects to partisans being appointed on this commission. Well, nobody would select a man because he was a partisan, but on the other hand I do not suppose any one would reject any man, otherwise fit and suitable, because he had some political opinions. It would be difficult to find any one who is not affiliated with one or the other of the political parties. During the fifteen years during which my hon. friend was in power, when he appointed a great many commissions, I am not aware that ever, from first to last, he appointed a single Conservative to any one of them. Yet he informs us this afternoon that any such course is absolutely outrageous. How is it that this has occurred to him to-day for the first time and not on some previous occasion during his fifteen years in office? It is well known that in this country men who have taken very active part in political affairs are frequently appointed to positions on the bench, and we know that, with very occasional exceptions, they all, in spite of their political affiliations, administer justice as it should be administered. My right hon. friend suggests that if any one appointed on this commission should have any particular opinions regarding the trade policy of this country, that will affect his inquiry into the matters brought before him. The same objection might be urged to the trial by judge of a matter between two men, one of whom had been a strong supporter of his in politics and the other an opponent. Yet no one would venture the opinion that he was therefore not fitted to administer impartial justice between these two. I do not see the force of the right hon. gentleman's objections, nor do I think this is the proper time to consider the principle of the Bill, because we did that on the second reading and are now only concerned with its details. As my right hon. friend must understand, it would be impossible to name now the personnel of the commission. What we are endeavouring to do is to have legislation passed, and then we shall consider who are the most suitable persons to appoint. It would be reversing the usual order to decide on the personnel of the commission first and then bring in legislation for the purpose of establishing that commission and appointing them to office. The government will be responsible for appointing the best qualified persons as commissioners, should this Bill become law, and I have no doubt the selection will be one which will commend

itself to the judgment of all fair-minded people.

Mr. GUTHRIE. My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has surely a short memory with regard to the appointments made by the late government, commissioners or otherwise, during the last fifteen years. Turning around to his followers and waving his hands he said that during the last fifteen years my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the late government never appointed on these commissions any but partisans. If my right hon. friend will reflect for a moment, he will see that the statement was very inaccurate. If he will refer back to one of the important commissions appointed in the last four or five years, the Civil Service Commission, he will find that the chairman of that commission was, prior to his appointment, a Conservative of the most pronounced type. And if he will refer to the second Civil Service Commission, consisting of one man, Mr. Justice Cassels, he will find that Mr. Justice Cassels, who was appointed by the late government judge of the Exchequer Court, was not, in his political career, on the Liberal side at all events. I think I might recall other commissions of which the same may be said. In the appointment of the Civil Service Commission, care was taken that no one appointed could be considered a partisan in any sense of the word.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE. My hon. friends laugh at that statement, but they know that Prof. Shortt was a non-partisan. I have frequently heard him speak, I have discussed party matters with him, and I can say that he was distinctly non-partisan at the time of his appointment. In the appointments of judges, the record of the late administration is anything but a record of partisan appointment, in Ontario, Quebec or Nova Scotia.

Mr. BRADBURY. Name one in Manitoba.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Let me name one or more that I am familiar with. I recall the case of Mr. Justice Nesbitt, now Hon. Wallace Nesbitt, who retired from the Supreme Court. There was Mr. Justice Middleton, at present a judge of the High Court of Ontario. I think I am also right in saying there was the case of Judge Phippen, now connected with the Canadian Northern railway—a case in Manitoba, I believe. There was the case of Mr. Justice Townsend, appointed by the Conservative government and promoted to the chief justiceship of Nova Scotia.

Mr. EMMERSON. And Chief Justice Barker of New Brunswick.

Mr. BORDEN.

Mr. GUTHRIE. And others could be named. In regard to judicial appointments or the appointment of commissioners whose powers were judicial, the late government did not seek the line of partisanship, but appointed, as far as was in their power, men who were non-partisan, men of independent judgment. The question, of course, becomes important in view of the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds), himself speaking on the motion for the second reading of the Bill, that various schools of thought in regard to the tariff existed in this country. He stated openly that there were high protectionists, moderate protectionists and free traders. Surely it is all-important for the members of this committee to know from which of these classes he will appoint the gentlemen who are to compose this commission. If we had some reasonable assurance that there would be one from each class, I think it would be rather satisfactory at this juncture. In the United States, in their proposed measure, they certainly recognized this, for they provided for the appointment of five, of whom three were to be Republicans—leaving two to the Democrats or whatever the other parties might be. I think we should have some assurance of the personnel before the clause is passed. Perhaps, if the clause stood over my hon. friend (Mr. White, Leeds) might make up his mind on the subject.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friends opposite, I think, have not been earnest and sincere in their opposition to this Bill. This has not been a real fight, but a sham fight, a pillow fight. That was quite apparent on the second reading. These gentlemen have simply been setting up bogies and attacking them. They have been reading into the Bill what was never in the Bill, and no one knows it better than themselves. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has assumed a good deal. Where is there a word in this Bill with regard to high protection, or reasonable protection, or free trade ?—or as to partisans being appointed commissioners? There is not a word; these hon. gentlemen have simply read this in the Bill for the purpose of their own arguments. As I have said, the duties of these commissioners are quasi-judicial and administrative. I want men who are capable of getting the facts, of sifting out information and presenting it in a form that we may rely upon. It will be valuable to us, as I have said, in framing a tariff. And it ill becomes Liberals to stand in the way of light and information. The consumers of this country want information.

Mr. GUTHRIE. We want the facts.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We want the facts, and hon. gentlemen opposite are

standing in the way of the facts when they oppose the appointment of this commission. They are standing in the way of the light. The consumers of this country complain, as some of our free trade friends complain, that an undue measure of protection is enjoyed by certain interests. How can we tell whether these interests make unduly large profits, unless we get the information? And that information is not available at the present time. How are we to get at that information otherwise than is here proposed? Hon. members opposite talk about this as subverting the constitution. I think that argument is completely destroyed by looking at the case more in detail. Suppose we proposed here to appoint a commission to investigate one particular industry, let us say the cement industry, with the idea of finding out the cost of production and the prices at which the product is sold at various points in Canada, would hon. gentlemen opposite say that this would involve a subversion of the constitution? In the Customs Tariff Act, I think, it is provided that if there is evidence that a conspiracy or combination exists for the purpose of unduly enhancing prices, the government may appoint a judge to investigate and ascertain the facts. And what may the government do on the report of that judge? They may reduce the customs duty in order that the public may have fair-play in the matter. What essential difference is there between this and having an inquiry with regard to one particular industry and appointing a Tariff Commission for the purpose of investigating not one, but all industries, to ascertain the cost of production and the prices of commodities throughout the country? What is there prima facie wrong in that? Is it not commendable instead of being prima facie wrong? The only thing that can make it appear wrong is that hon. gentlemen opposite have read into it their own suspicions. They have approached this proposal in a suspicious manner, instead of in an open and a fair manner. As I have said, there is not a line in this Bill that suggests high protection or reasonable protection, or free trade. My hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made some observations with regard to a statement of mine that I was not a high protectionist, but believed in a reasonable degree of protection, and he asked me what was a reasonable degree of protection? That is not an easy thing to define, but here is what I would say to my right hon. friend: If an industry which is capable of being maintained in this country, an industry in which we have some advantages and not such great disadvantages as to make it improper that this industry should be developed at all, and if this industry is capable of furnishing work to our labouring population and of giving reasonable profit to the men who are developing it, and if, by reason of a protective tariff an undue return is obtained by the men who are developing that industry, a return above what might be deemed an adequate and fair return, then I should say that industry was too highly protected. If on the other hand, we can build up industries in this country, if we can develop our resources by a tariff which does not permit undue profits to those engaged in that development, an industry which affords work to our people and produces here goods that otherwise would be produced abroad and imported into Canada, I think we may say that the protection that would have this result would be reasonable protection. And in saying that, I believe I am expressing a view which is not substantially different from that of my predecessor in the office of Minister of Finance. Read 'Hansard' and note carefully what he said, and you will find that the party for which he was the spokesman in tariff matters was not a free trade party, or even a tariff-for-revenue-only party. I think you will find any number of utterances on the part of my predecessor in favour of a policy of reasonable protection. This was subject, of course, to our having advantages for the development of industries in this country. I think he would assume—and I would say the same and would have no hesitation in giving adherence to this view—that there may be some things that we cannot manufacture to advantage, and, in the case of such industries, it might be fairly argued that there should be no protective tariff.

Now, I have said that hon. gentlemen opposite are standing in the way of light and information in opposing the creation of this Tariff Commission. And let me say to them that I believe that if they had had a Tariff Commission to supply them with the facts, there would have been no election on the 21st of September last.

I state that it was because they were not possessed of the facts that they negotiated the reciprocity agreement with the United States—simply because they were not possessed of the facts and the United States was possessed of the facts by means of a tariff commission. My hon. friends opposite were not possessed of the facts, and the result is that we are here and you are there. My right hon. friend might have been sitting here to-day, and no election would have taken place, but instead of that, he is sitting over there, and I must say that he looks pretty well in either place, because he is a distinguished looking man.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Happy on either side.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). See that you are not on both sides. Now my hon. friend has spoken with regard to these commissioners being mere statisticians. I must take issue with him; they are a good deal more than statisticians. He has read some of the subsections there which would indicate that statistics were to be accumulated, and I agree with him that as to certain of these subsections, statisticians might reasonably obtain information. But if he will look over them all carefully, he will find that very much higher qualifications are required in these men to discharge their duties than the qualifications of mere statisticians. For example, the cost of production in Canada and elsewhere—one of the most difficult things to ascertain, requires judicial qualifications, and other abilities of an unusual kind, because in the cost of production you find so many different factors and elements. In the first place, you have the cost of the raw material and the cost of laying it down. Then you have to consider how much capital is invested in that enterprise, and that may mean an investigation as to whether a company is over-capitalized or not. Then you have to find what are the fixed charges, the cost of management, and the efficiency of the management, because with poor management as distinguished from good management, your cost will be increased. You have to consider whether the capital invested was paid bona fide, that is, if it is watered, and to what extent it is watered; in other words, judgment of a very rare kind is required for the investigation into the cost of any commodity or product. In the same way the cost, the efficiency and the conditions of labour in Canada and elsewhere must be inquired into.

Mr. NESBITT. In deciding whether a company has been over-capitalized, will the minister require this commission to report the facts, or will he judge for himself?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend will observe that in the reports that have been made, there is to be a copy of the evidence. Let me say this—because I do not desire that there should be any misconception as to the scope of this Bill—I do not say that because the commission makes a report that it is to be absolutely conclusive. As I said the other day the minister himself, must keep in touch with living conditions, he must see what is going on about him, as he does to-day, he must keep in touch with business conditions; and while this Tariff Commission will supplement the information he may have, at the same time he must use his own judgment, and if he has any cause to suspect or to believe that the evidence furnished with the reports of the Tariff Commission is not accurate, of course he will re-commit such questions to the commission, to be taken up again for further consideration. As I remarked on the second reading, we do not desire to be relieved from responsibility with regard to the tariff, and all the Tariff Commission does, is to enable us to obtain information on which to act. Let me say this, that of all the people in Canada who desire information to be obtained, those who call themselves free traders, and the consumers, should be the most anxious to get it. If my hon. friends think they can score on that, I believe they are very much mistaken. I believe the consuming population of Canada are greatly interested in the question of the tariff, they want the facts and our protectionist friends, those who enjoy or think they enjoy a reasonable protection, want the facts also; in other words, it is in the interest of all the classes in Canada without exception, I do not care what their economic opinions may be, to have reliable information.

Mr. KNOWLES. The minister says that he does not desire ministerial responsibility to cease. Suppose a couple of years hence the minister should ask the House to place a duty on certain articles and some of us should object; does the minister think that he would be justified in closing the matter by simply saying that the commission had found certain facts to exist?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I would say this, that great weight should be attached to the reports of the Tariff Commission. But I am far from saying that they should be conclusive in the sense indicated by my hon. friend. I think the report of the Tariff Commission should be available to every member of this House as well as to the minister, and then no doubt it will carry great weight. But that is far from saying that it is absolutely conclusive.

Mr. KNOWLES. It would not be a justification in itself?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Not an absolute justification, no, but it will have its due weight.

Mr. CARROLL. I think this is a reason why we should know the personnel of this commission before this Act passes, because the minister argues that it is in the interest of the producers that this Tariff Commission be constituted. But it will not be in the interest of the consumers or the labouring classes if three high protectionists are placed on this commission.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Where does my hon. friend find in this Bill one word to

indicate that high protectionists are to be appointed commissioners? Not a word, he is finding it in his own imagination, and no where else.

Mr. CARROLL. We are simply asking for information as to the personnel of this commission.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I can tell my hon. friend that the question of the personnel of the commission has not yet engaged our attention. Let me ask my hon. friend, did he ever know in this case of any legislation going through this House, of the personnel of the commission being announced in advance of the passing of the Bill creating the commission?

Mr. McKENZIE. The minister says that he will take the report of the commission. Does he mean the comments or conclusions gathered by the commission, or the evidence itself?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My idea is this, that the information and reports of this commission will be departmental information, available for the government in considering tariff questions. Now that information, like all other information which is departmental, may be called for by this House, and may be laid on the table. I would be the last man to suggest that the House of Commons should be denied the information obtained by means of the expense which they have authorized. There is no intention of that kind in this Bill. My hon. friends have been simply raising spectres with regard to this Bill. The object of this Bill is to obtain information which could not be obtained in any other way. But because we propose to obtain information which hitherto has not been obtainable and cannot be obtainable otherwise, does not mean that the government seeks to be relieved from its constitutional responsibility for the tariff, and for tariff rates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend, in his opening remarks, was kind enough to tell me that he would endeavour to meet my inquiry as to his idea of moderate protection.

I do not know that he has made the subject much clearer than it was. Perhaps it is clear to his mind. I wish I knew myself, but the difficulty is that nobody, whether in this country or any other country, has ever been able to draw the line between what is moderate protection and immoderate protection. I never knew a protectionist, not even the gentleman who stated in Toronto that he wanted the protective barrier against foreign goods to be as high as 'Haman's gallows,' who ever pretended that he was anything but a moderate protectionist. The idea of the moderate or immoderate protectionists with regard to protection is very much like the idea of the old squaw about whisky. Her idea was that a little too much was just enough. A little too much is just enough protection for the purpose of the manufacturer or of the man who is a moderate protectionist.

My hon. friend says that the object of this Bill is to have the facts. I agree with him that that ought to be the object of the Bill. It ought to be to get the facts and nothing else, and if I saw in this Bill evidence of an intention to have the facts and nothing but the facts, the truth and nothing but the truth, for my part, I would be satisfied with it. My hon. friend tells us that if we had had the facts there would have been no election on the 21st September, that we would not have been where we are now but where he is. Well, I must say, that looking at the long faces of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, there is a compensating feature to the fact that we were defeated on the 21st September. There is more joy on this side of the House than there is on the other side. I have noticed on several occasions during the present session that the faces of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have lengthened and lengthened until they were looking very much the picture of despair. Perhaps we may see the same thing again during the present session. I do not want my hon. friend to waste any pity on this side of the House; we are quite happy where we are and where hon. gentlemen will be some time or other.

My hon. friend tells us that if we had had the facts, as they had them in the United States, we would never have committed the imprudence that we did of making an arrangement with the United States. They have the facts in the United States, and we have not. But, if I am correctly informed, in the United States they collected the facts that they have without a Tariff Commission, and simply by a statistical bureau. I understand that they want a Tariff Commission in the United States just as my hon. friend wants to have a Tariff Commission here, but they were able to collect the facts with a simple statistical bureau such as they have now. I understand that in the United States, as in this country, the dominant party is not satisfied with having a statistical bureau which will collect the facts and present them as they are, but that they rather desire to give a colour to them in favour of their own view, which is the view of the present administration. Of course, my hon. friend tells me that there is nothing of that kind in the Bill. Who expects to find anything of that kind in the Bill? There is such a thing as an Act and an ulterior motive to that Act not to be found within the four

corners of the Act itself. My hon. friend did not put in his Bill that the object which he had in view was to have, not the broad facts as they exist, but simply a commission to prepare for him, and for the government of which he is a member, in favour of the view upon political economy which my hon. friend and his colleagues entertain. He did not tell us that, it is true, but we had an influential member on the other side of the House telling us that that was the intention of the government.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the meaning of these words spoken by the hon. member for Montreal St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) the other day? Speaking of the personnel of the commission he said, not that they must be high protectionists, but that they must be in sympathy with the well known sentiment of the present government. Well, if these are not partisans what are they? They may not be offensive partisans. It is difficult to lay down the line and say what is an offensive or an inoffensive partisan. Under the present administration we find that offensive partisanship is simply to be a partisan. These men who are to be appointed commissioners under this Act, must be men who are in sympathy with the sentiments of my hon. friend. That is the qualification that was laid down by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine. If I am told by my hon. friend (Mr. White) that the hon. member for Montreal is wrong, that he did not speak by authority, that he did not know what he was talking about, all I can tell my hon. friend is that until the words of the hon. member for St. Antoine have been disavowed by him, I will persist in believing that the members of the commission will be partisans and that they will be appointed with the object of supporting the views of my hon. friend. My hon. friend tells us that we shall have the information. Certainly, we all agree to that, but he tells us also that we shall be the first to agree to this Bill which is to be put upon the statute-book, in order to get the information. He tells us that those who are against high duties ought to be in favour of this Bill. He tells us that there are men complaining to-day that the duties are too high, and that their complaints should be investigated. Investigated by whom?—by men who are against high duties? No, by men who are in favour of high duties. That is the kind of justice that we are going to have. You are going to appoint a commission composed of men in sympathy with the present government. Men are men after all. We can all agree to this that we have our own passions, our own prejudices, and our own views. My hon. friend belongs to the legal profession, and he knows that in a court of law the same fact may be presented by two men, who will give an entirely different colour to it, each of them honestly and acting in good faith. My hon. friend knows that men are unconsciously biased in favour of their own proclivities. Does he mean to tell me that when the facts are investigated by men who are of his own way of thinking, who are in favour of duties—call it moderate protection, if you like—you can expect from these men a report which will be in favour of the converse view of no duty upon the articles under consideration? They would not be men, they would not be acting in accordance with the dictates of human nature, if it were to be supposed that under such circumstances they would give such a report. What alarms us in this matter, Sir, is that, as stated by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), when speaking in answer to my hon. friend on the second reading of the Bill, you are taking this Yankee device, which has not yet become law in the United States, but is intended to produce such an effect as to promote the view of the dominating party in the United States. The same thing must obtain here if you adopt the same methods. That is the reason why I say that the Bill of my hon. friend is not intended, according to the statement of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, to result in the preparation of an unbiased statement of the facts, but that it is intended to prepare a brief in every case for the administration in favour of the views which are held by my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated to the House that if the purpose of the Bill were simply to provide information, he would be glad to support it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would the right hon. gentleman suggest to the House what might be added to or substracted from the Bill that would make it such to his mind?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Simply to organize a statistical bureau such as they have in the United States and such as we have, to some extent, in this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The right hon. gentleman states that he would favour the Bill if it organized simply a statistical bureau such as exists in the United States. I have been at some pains to look into the legislation in the United States, to ascertain how the tariff board which exists at present, and which has existed for two years back is operated there, and I can see in it nothing more of the nature of a statistical bureau than that which is contemplated by the present Bill. The tariff board appointed by the President of the United States under the authority of the Customs

Act of 1901, is a tariff board designed for the purpose and with the powers of the Tariff Commission contemplated by this Bill, and has done work that is not of a statistical character at all, as well as work that is of a statistical character.

So that if the right hon. gentleman contemplated a board clothed with the power and having the objective of the tariff board of the United States, then he must be satisfied with this Bill as it stands, and I suggest to him that the Minister of Finance cannot devise an amendment either by addition or omission that will better provide for what the right hon. gentleman himself wants. Does the right hon. gentleman suggest that a definition of a moderate protectionist should be inserted in the Bill? The right hon. gentleman is greatly concerned this afternoon because he does not appear to know just what a moderate protectionist is. I suggest that he turn to the hon. gentleman behind him who has acknowledged to the House that he is a moderate protectionist and ask him what in the world he is. Then the hon. member for Richmond also made the same avowal to the House, and the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) refused to state that he would eliminate protection from our tariff, and I do not think he would say that if he is a protectionist. He is anything but a moderate protectionist.

Mr. OLIVER. I must protest against the hon. gentleman using a suggestion that was made in a previous debate to which it did not suit me at the moment to reply. But when the question comes up, if my hon. friend will bear with me, I will give him all the information.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am at a loss to understand how the question can be up if it is not up now.

Mr. OLIVER. At all events I am not up at the moment, but I shall take care to be up and to enlighten my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN. He was up and very much up, and was enthroned in office for seven years, but then he was a protectionist just in the sense the late government was and that, I think, was moderate protection although in some cases it was immoderate, and in some cases not protection at all, just as political exigencies or necessity might dictate. The right hon. gentleman, surrounded as he is, and with the experience he has had, surely should be in a position if any man in the world is in a position, to define what moderate protection is.

The position as it appeals to me, is this. The tariff in this country must be framed on either one or another of two hypotheses. It must be framed to suit the fair exigencies of business and the people, or to suit the exigencies of politics. The right hon. gentleman while he was leader of the government professed to adhere to to a policy of moderate protection, interweaving in some way with a tariff for revenue only, but he framed his policy, that is to say he drew the line where it would suit the exigencies of politics. I make that statement advisedly, and from having observed the policy of the right hon. gentleman, both as a member of this House, and as a citizen of Canada. I do not think the right hon. gentleman will deny that that was the policy that guided him in the framing of his tariff. If I require further authority I read from an editorial in the Manitoba 'Free Press', which is the organ of the right hon. gentleman in western Canada, and which strenuously conducted newspaper warmly supported him in the late contest.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend honours me when he says that the 'Free Press' is my organ.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am always pleased to honour my right hon. friend when I can do so with truth. The editorial is headed 'A Permanent Tariff Board,' and contains the following sentence:

> The late government was as protectionist as it thought it necessary to be to placate powerful interests and make them neutral or friendly.

Now that is the talisman, according to the organ of the government itself, that regulated their protectionist policy. So that while the hon. gentleman who lately represented western Canada, and whose views this doubtless interprets exactly, will, I hope, not disavow the authority of his organ in the west. If we are to follow that principle then the method adopted by the late government is beautifully suited to the case, authorizing a rambling band of politicians to pass over Canada and find out just what would be the political effect of a certain schedule here or there, and then fixing the schedule with a view to getting as large a percentage of votes as possible. That being the case, a tariff board certainly is an unnecessary luxury in Canada. But, if, on the contrary, we are to base our tariff on the business, commercial and industrial effects it will have, and so have the objective of the successful carrying on of Canadian industries and Canadian industrial life, we cannot have too much light, and no schedule in our tariff that cannot stand the light should stand without light, and on the other hand no schedule and no set of business people in Canada should be made to suffer the odium of ignorant suspicion in this country. That is the purpose of the tariff board. But hon. gentlemen want to know who the men on the board would be. There is not a responsible man on the opposite side who would

suggest that it was the duty of the government or of any one to assert now who the men would be. They say: If we do not know who they are, tell us their opinions. The hon. gentleman who sits behind the first minister has acknowledged that we know constitutionally no differences of party in this country and consequently it would be impossible, and not to be expected that the government would state from which party they were to come. The hon. gentleman is greatly concerned about a statement of my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames). No one in this House has more admiration for the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) than I have, and his conviction evidently is that most people in this country are, on tariff matters, in line with the government of the day. I think he has ample evidence to support his conviction because the great majority of the people in this country do believe in the policy of reasonable protection that is the policy ot this government.

The hon. member (Mr. Ames) made some remark from which the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) draws the inference that he would debar a man if he had leanings towards free trade. For myself, if the appointee were qualified in every other way, if he came to the duties of his office with the qualifications which I think he should have, qualifications as a student and as a fearless investigator, qualified, in a word, as the minister has stated he should be qualified, then my opinion as a private member is that he should not be debarred from serving on the board. No minister has stated that any political opinion is to disqualify any man from serving on this board, if he is qualified fairly to investigate and to report, these are the qualifications insisted on by the government.

Now why should this Bill not pass?

Mr. NESBITT. Because the hon. member is keeping it back.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member says I am keeping it back. I feel quite confident that my hon. friend, when he comes to speak, will follow my illustrious example.

Mr. KYTE. The Minister of Finance intimated that if there was more information the consumers of this county might be more reconciled to the policy of reasonable protection. I think that is the key of the whole situation.

Mr. WHITE. Did I say that?

Mr. KYTE. I regret very much if I have misinterpreted any statement of the hon. minister, but he said that what was needed was more information, and that if the consumers of Canada had more information perhaps they would be more reasonable in their attitude towards protection. That is a paraphrase of what I understood the hon. Minister of Finance to say, that is the key of the situation. So far as one can gather from ministerial statements, this commission will be an institution for the purpose of gathering information of one kind with the object of inducing consumers to believe that they are wrong and that what is needed is more protection. It seems to me that that is a manifest deduction to be drawn from the speech of the Finance Minister. A year ago a commission was appointed for the purpose of getting information on the subject of technical education. That is a question in which different classes of the community are deeply interested. Had the leader of the late government proposed on that commission the representative of one particular class, such as the manufacturing interests, he would have been met by protests from all over the country.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When the Bill appointing that commission passed this House, were the names given of the men who were to be appointed?

Mr. KYTE. They were not then, and I do not think anybody on this side has asked the present government to name the particular persons to be appointed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Did anybody ask for a guarantee, when that commission was appointed, that the labour and other interests would be represented on it?

Mr. KYTE. Whether that was asked or not is entirely beside the question. As a matter of fact all interests were represented on it. The manufacturers, the labouring men, the universities, were represented on that commission. Every interest likely to be affected by its proceedings and report was represented. Further than that I would remind my hon. friend that in the composition of that board, the Conservative party was not overlooked because in the appointment of Mr. Simpson and Mr. Murray of Toronto, the late government named two men affiliated with the Conservative party.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I want to deny that. Mr. Simpson is an avowed Socialist.

Mr. KYTE. From the experience I have in this House, I am quite prepared for interruptions from the hon. gentleman and do not take any account of them. But to come back to the question, what we desire is to have some guarantee from the Minister of Finance that the consumers of this country will be represented on this commission, and that it will not be an institution devised simply for the purpose of educating people into the belief that protection is the best policy for this country. If the sympathies of the men composing the commission should be entirely in favour of protection, we have reason to believe that they

will be careful to summon before them only those who would be in sympathy with a higher tariff. As I pointed out the other evening, there is no provision in this Bill to enable a man to come forward voluntarily and give his evidence. It is provided that witnesses shall be summoned before this board to give evidence, but I submit that there should also be a provision enabling any man, no matter what may be his views on the tariff, to come forward and state them. The omission of such a provision justifies the conclusion that this institution is simply created to lead people into the belief that protection, and protection alone, is the proper policy for the country.

Mr. CURRIE. Does the hon. gentleman declare himself a free trader?

Mr. KYTE. I do not know that whatever the hon. gentleman's views may be can have much significance, but, since he appears anxious to ascertain mine, I am in favour of such protection only as is necessary for the revenues of the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must confess that I am much surprised at what I have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite. I thought that on the second reading of the Bill we had arrived at a conclusion as to what its real intention was, namely, to procure information for the government and the country in order that we might frame a tariff measure suited to our needs. And let me say now that if there are hon. gentlemen more in need of information on that subject than any other they are to be found on that side. During the second reading of this Bill they exhibited the most extraordinary ignorance of the character of our tariff. I say that without any intention of being offensive, because they have been taught by their leader that the tariff in force is a low tariff, instead of which it is one of the highest taxation tariffs we have had during the last thirty or forty years. Go through it item after item of articles of every day consumption, and you will find the taxation on these increased enormously. Take the article of sugar, which is consumed by every family in the country, rich and poor. Now, if these hon. gentlemen, who plume themselves on being the low tariff party, were anxious to keep down taxation, why did they so enormously increase the duty on sugar? Raw sugar is the basis of the refined article, and the higher we increase the price of the raw the higher we raise the price of the refined. Hon. gentlemen opposite were not satisfied with the duty on raw sugar as they found it, but immediately on assuming office set to work to see how high they could make it. They told us that their tariff was for revenue only, and they were determined to get all the revenue they could out of sugar. If we apply the tariff of the late government to the imports of sugar of the last year, we will find that they had increased the duty in 1911 on raw sugar alone by $344,000, which is a very considerable item for a low tariff government. It looks rather strange that they should be so extremely alarmed lest the Bill before the House should result in a higher tariff when they themselves have acted along that line by increasing duty after duty on articles of daily consumption.

Now, I say that there is no excuse for that increased duty on sugar; and if as hon. gentlemen opposite say the Finance Minister is going to put somebody on this commission who will work along the line of increased duties, I think these hon. gentlemen should welcome it, because that has been their policy for many years. Without making special reference to what any hon. member said on the second reading of this Bill, I must say that I am amused at some of the statements made on the other side of the House on the subject of the tariff, for that subject came largely into the discussion. But let me point out a few concrete examples to show how far these hon. gentlemen are astray in their opinions of their own tariff. If these hon. gentlemen want a tariff in accordance with their ideals, and if they think that Tariff Commission will have the effect of raising the tariff, I think they should welcome this Bill instead of opposing it. But I do not think that is the intention of the Minister of Finance. He wants a commission simply to give information. During the last fifteen years I have given great attention to the study of the tariff; in fact, I venture to say I have given as much attention to it as any other hon. member of this House. I do not boast of it; it was my duty to do it. As a result of that study, I venture to say that, if any hon. member on that side thinks he has been supporting a lower tariff on many articles, he is sadly mistaken. And I believe that information to show how he is mistaken is what this commission will supply. I have given some instances of increased tariff in this House before, but let me call attention to a few of them now. Take the case of fire-arms. I was charged years ago with being a high protectionist by a gentleman who claims to be a free trader. But when I pointed out that his free trade principles carried him far above my idea of moderate protection in the rate of tariff duties, I think that hon. gentleman was quite surprised. When the late government came into power the duty on fire-arms was 20 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite immediately put it up to 30 per cent. That was not very like a free trade or lower tariff government..

Mr. EMMERSON. Dangerous weapons.

Mr. HENDERSON. Anyhow they thought they would put the tariff on a higher plane. Many people in this country wish to buy rifles and guns for hunting and that sort of thing, and they had to be taxed by this additional rate of duty. But the answer was that the British preference would regulate that. It would take one-third off the 30 per cent and bring it down to 20 per cent, at which it had stood before. But they forgot we did not buy our firearms entirely from Great Britain, but largely from the United States. Firearms coming in from the United States or other countries pay 30 per cent duty, and only those coming from Great Britain enter at 20 per cent. I see, Mr. Chairman, you are looking at the clock, and I must be brief, otherwise six o'clock will arrive before we get through. But let us consider the clock for a minute. This is an instrument you will find in every household—abundance of them. Did the Liberal government, when it came in, leave the duty on clocks where it had been? No, they wanted 'tariff for revenue' so they increased the duty on clocks. They said: Here is a thing that every man must have in his house, and here is a chance for us to get more money. And the same with watches. They knew that everybody in Canada desires to have a watch, so they said: We want revenue, so we will make them pay higher duty on their watches. I looked up the figures the other day to see what the increase was. The duty on watches under the much abused National Policy, had been 25 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite raised the duty to 30 per cent. But they said the British preference would regulate that, and bring the duty on watches a little below 20 per cent. But they forgot that Great Britain was not a watch making country. This is exactly one of the things in which our tariff commission could help. They would be able to tell us that Great Britain is not a watch making country, and that consequently the hope of applying the British preference to the duty paid on watches will not be satisfactory. We get our watches chiefly from Switzerland, the United States and France. So, instead of paying 25 per cent on watches, as it was under the national policy, last year we paid over 28 per cent on watches from all countries, notwithstanding the British preference. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been supporting that tariff since 1897, and they are crying out to-day about the high tariff, when as a matter of fact this is the very tariff they made and supported. I might go on with item after item. Take linen goods. The duties were increased from 25 to 30 per cent. Of course, the British preference applied, but everything in this line that we get from countries outside of Great Britain came in at the higher rate of duty. Take even the grey cottons, which are made very largely in Canada. The duty was 22½ per cent, but these hon. gentlemen, when in power, increased that duty to 25 per cent, of course, expecting the British preference to bring it down to 19 per cent. But the fact is that we do not get all our grey cottons from Great Britain. It is a fact known to every business man in Canada, that grey cottons made in Great Britain are not sold in Canada to any great extent. Why? because they are not so good. They are not of the same quality as the American and Canadian cottons, and the people of this country will demand the American or Canadian goods in this line in preference to those made in Great Britain. They have to pay now 25 per cent instead of 22½ per cent as it was before. But you may tell me that on the Canadian grey cottons of course there would be no increase, because they are made in Canada and do not pay duty.

Have we forgotten the theory of Sir Richard Cartwright and his friends, when they advocated so strongly, that if you place a tariff on an article of Canadian manufacture the price will just work up to the price of the imported article? That is the case, and there may be a great deal in it. Why, we are paying an increased duty price on all our Canadian made grey cottons. Take coloured cotton, 30 per cent under the old government, raised to 35 per cent by the hon. gentlemen who are now crying high tariff, and who now dread a commission, a partisan commission that may be appointed that will increase the duty, after having sat here ever since 1897 and supporting a high tariff. I am surprised that such is the case. But nevertheless, remembering what we heard during the second reading of the Bill, that seems to be the feeling of hon. gentlemen. After raising the duty on coloured cottons from 30 to 35 per cent, the government became alarmed, and reduced to 32½ per cent, leaving it still 2½ per cent higher than under the National Policy. They thought that all our coloured cottons were coming from Great Britain, and were coming in under the reduced tariff. We do get a great many from Britain, but I tell you the best coloured cottons in every day wear by the women of this country are the coloured cottons made in Canada, no doubt about that. Take cotton prints for every day wear, the Canadian women want them and they will have them. They buy American prints, of course not high class prints, those they will buy from Britain, and the duty will be somewhat lower. That seems to me to be unfair. The preference is given to the woman who wants a high class article, but the woman who wants an article that will wear and wash, has to pay a higher

duty on it, practically. That applies to coloured cottons of every class. Take the men who wear ducks, denims and all these coarse goods that are used by the farmers, workingmen and the labourers for summer wear, they are all called upon to pay a higher duty by reason of this increase, because British goods of that class are not imported into Canada. You can go through the shops of Canada and you do not find ducks, denims, cotton tweeds and cottonades on their counters to any extent, the people do not want them and consequently they are not to be found there. The result is that we have been paying during the last ten or fifteen years, duties on the articles that we do want, that the people want, a great deal higher than we did before. Why, then, all this alarm that the government is going to appoint a Tariff Commission that will be in favour of increasing the duties? Why, that is exactly along the line that hon. gentlemen have advocated and supported for the last ten or twelve years. I do not see why they should be alarmed about it. My hope is that the Tariff Commission that will be appointed will do away with a great many of these anomalies; it will have the effect of pointing out to the government the unfairness of a great many clauses in our present tariff along the line I have indicated. I am not finding fault. Hon gentlemen may say I am complaining about the British preference; nothing of the kind. But I say in many things it works against the interests of the people of this country, inasmuch as the duty on so many articles was abnormally increased before the British preference was made applicable to this country. It may be said that this whole discussion, perhaps, is a little aside of the Bill which is before us. But after hearing what hon. gentlemen opposite have said, who are so extremely alarmed that a high tariff is going to be the result of this commission, I thought that I could say something on the question. I am not alarmed that our tariff wall will be made higher; I am under the impression that the very effect of this commission will be to lower the tariff. We heard something this afternoon about some gentleman in Toronto having talked about a tariff as high as 'Haman's gallows,' and the insinuation was thrown out that that was the kind of tariff this commission was going to recommend. I hope the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition, and who made reference to that this afternoon, will not forget that the man who made that remark in Toronto was a Liberal friend of his own, not a Conservative.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Gurneys were Liberals, there is no getting over that. It was Mr. Gurney who was the author of that statement, a friend of the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Gurney was a Liberal, as the Minister of Finance is a Liberal.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, the Minister of Finance is a mighty good Liberal, I think; he is going to give hon. gentlemen more Liberal government than we have had for a great many years. But the late Minister of the Interior admits that Mr. Gurney was a Liberal when he made that statement.

Mr. OLIVER. No, no.

Mr. HENDERSON. I remember well the criticisms about it and there is no getting over the fact that Mr. Gurney was a Liberal, and I am not aware that he ever changed his politics. I do not know how he voted, whether he voted for or against reciprocity, I never inquired into it. But on the question of the tariff, Mr. Gurney had been a Liberal.

Mr. OLIVER. How long ago?

Mr. HENDERSON. When he made this statement, and I am not aware that he changed his politics since.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has stated that Mr. Gurney was a Liberal when he made that statement. Is it not correct that Mr. Gurney left the Liberal party in 1878 when the Conservative party introduced the policy of protection, and he has always been a Conservative from that time to the present?

Mr. HENDERSON. I have lived near Toronto ever since 1878, and I never so understood it, and I believe the people of Toronto do not so understand it. I do not think Mr. Gurney is a Conservative today; if he is, I do not think his conversion has been thorough. Now strong objection was taken to something said I think, by the hon. member for St Antoine Montreal (Mr. Ames), and the inference was that he was recommending that partisans be appointed on this commission. Now what is a partisan?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear; ask the Postmaster General.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now I will ask the right hon. leader of the opposition, in fact I do not need to ask him, because I remember in this House when the right hon. gentleman, who was then leading the government, in discussing a question similar to this, said: Why, we are all partisans; he said that he himself was a partisan, and I do not think he has changed his mind. Has the right hon. gentleman forgotten that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. He remembers that, he is a partisan, and we are all partisans. That does not apply only to the members of this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am disqualified from sitting on this commission.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the hon. gentleman could hardly take that small exception. I understood the remarks of the right hon. gentleman at that time to apply to every man in the country. Who is the party man?

An hon. MEMBER. The Minister of Justice.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, the Minister of Justice was, even judges on the bench, because it is very difficult to get rid of political feelings, but where are you going to find men to put on a commission of this kind if you do not take partisans?

An hon. MEMBER. They would be no use.

Mr. HENDERSON. They would be no use because they would be men who had no opinions of their own. I do not wish to obtrude beyond the hour of six o'clock and I shall be very happy to give way to the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte).

Mr. KYTE. I do not object to partisans being appointed to the commission, but I object to partisans from one party alone being selected.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at 8 o'clock.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has developed into the humoristic apologist for the low tariff ideas which prevail so markedly and so suddenly amongst those who sit on the government benches! In view of what the Minister of Finance has said with respect to the light that is to be thrown on the whole question of the tariff by this commission, and in view of the attitude taken by the hon. the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) it is, I believe, an opportune moment to have light thrown on the course that is likely to be followed by the commissioners when appointed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) claimed that in view of the recognized policy of the present government, favouring a high protective tariff in Canada—

Mr. MEIGHEN. He did not say that.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I do not wish to misquote what the hon. member (Mr. Ames) said, but I gathered from his remarks that there are three schools of economic thought in Canada, the free trade cult, the tariff-for-revenue cult, and those who advocate the protective theory, whether you call it high, low or moderate. The hon. member (Mr. Ames) took it for granted that in view of the attitude this government had taken for many years on their fiscal policy, the selection of members of the board would be from among those who favoured protection. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) was pleased to give utterance to some very witty remarks with respect to the attitude taken by members on this side, and these remarks read in contrast with some utterances of Sir Charles Tupper, leader of the opposition in 1896 and 1897, are undoubtedly humorous. When we recall the jeremiads and lamentations of Sir Charles Tupper as respects the havoc that would be created in Canada by reason of the Fielding tariff in contrast with the prosperity of Canada under the so-called National Policy, the humour of the remarks of my hon friend will be quite apparent.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say a word? He can recall, as I can, that the speech of Sir Charles Tupper to which he refers had reference to the first tariff brought down by Mr. Fielding and not to the second tariff of the same year, which was a very different tariff.

Mr. EMMERSON. Both tariffs were practically on the same lines, the difference being that the latter one provided for a greater reduction of duties.

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), viewed the question from the exigencies of politics, but the exigencies of politics are one thing and the exigencies of the country are another. After all, it is not what tariffs have been in the past or what practice has been followed that we are interested in, so much as the course that is likely to be pursued under this new departure with respect to tariff creation. The Minister of Finance says that we on this side have created spectres and that we are fighting these spectres, but it seems to me that if spectres there be, they have been created by the utterances of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), and of other supporters of the government. I asked a question of the Minister of Finance to-day about a rumour which was given wide currency in the eastern press which supports the government, and that rumour was to the effect that a member of this House, who represents a New Brunswick constituency, a lawyer by

profession—indeed I might name him, I refer to the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket)—is to be appointed one of these commissioners. Now, when the resolution with reference to this Tariff Commission was first introduced by the Minister of Finance, he told us that he had in his mind ideals with respect to the experts—he used the word experts—who were to constitute this tariff board, and I gathered from his remarks that we were to have an effort on the part of the government to create a scientific tariff board, and that qualified experts would be appointed with the view of recognizing all the interests of the country. I regret that the Minister of Finance failed to take the House into his confidence this afternoon, and to give his ideal as to the personnel of this board. The hon. gentleman has been charged with adopting a Yankee device in promoting this legislation, and it may be interesting to know what course has been adopted by the Congress of the United States, with respect to this same matter. In the very elaborate Payne-Aldrich Tariff Bill of 1909, there was nothing especially creating a Tariff Commission, but it had it it a very innocent clause in these words:

To secure information to assist the president in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this section, (relating to the application of the maximum and minimum rates) and the officers of the government in the application of the customs laws, the president is hereby authorized to employ such persons as may be required.

That clause in no sense created a Tariff Commission, but in pursuance of it appropriations were made to pay the salaries and expenses of the persons who might be appointed, and last autumn we are informed that these all told, amounted to over one hundred officials.

At first it was to be a body composed of three members. They had a staff of officials, experts and agents which Congress provided for them. It is interesting to know the character of the board constituted by President Taft, because he acted upon the authority of the Payne-Aldrich Bill. As chairman of the board he appointed Henry Crosby Emery, a Republican. He was formerly professor of economics at Yale University. He appointed as the second member of the board, James Burton Reynolds, who was a newspaper correspondent and editorial writer, a man in a quasi public position, a strong Republican, connected with party management in one of the states. Then he appointed Mr. Alvin Howard Saunders, a prominent Republican in Illinois, owner and manager of the 'Breeders' Gazette,' a stock review in the central states, a man interested in stock raising. I may add that Mr. Reynolds was the assistant secretary of the treasury for four years in one of the Cabinets, where he had charge of customs affairs. He had also been chairman of the Parliamentary Reciprocity Tariff League. It was alleged that this was a partisan board, and it was the object of considerable criticism on that account. The President, in order to remove any ground for criticism, appointed two additional members to the board, because the Bill, under which he organized the board, did not fix any limitations as to the number. He appointed Mr. William M. Howard, a lawyer by profession, and a Democrat. He had, I think, held some public position which gave him particular knowledge with respect to tariff matters. The fifth member of the board was Thomas Walker Payne, a Democrat, a man of great ability and high standing, who had been formerly professor of economics at the University of California. Previous to that he was a teacher of economics in the University of Virginia, and at a later date, I think he was connected with the University of Texas in a like capacity. There was a board consisting of three Republicans and two Democrats. Two of them were professors, one was a newspaperman, and two others were publicists, of whom one was a lawyer. Those gentlemen were supposed to be well qualified to aid as experts the government and President with respect to tariff matters. But this board did not even then come up to the ideal of those who had advocated the constitution of a non-partisan board, and there has been a good deal of criticism of it, both on that ground and in respect to its power. Up to the present time it has aided the government by and through its staff in gaining information. It is true that in procuring this information they relied more upon their experts and officials, and practically it would be on the same footing as if the department of my hon. friend were to create a staff of experts to procure for him the information which this board procured for the President of the United States through their experts and agents. Since then, Congress has made two efforts to create a Tariff Commission apart from this Tariff Board. One Bill was introduced by the Republicans, and another by Democrats, but neither Bill has made much progress up to this time. Now it will be admitted that the people of the United States were seeking some such body as I have described. The object of the board was undoubtedly to eliminate special privileges which were supposed to be favoured by the tariff. The object in view, as stated by the President and understood by the people, was to secure information which would justify the elimination from the tariff of all special privileges. Now, they have not yet accomplished that object.

There is a suspicion that the object of a Tariff Board such as is constitued by this Act is not to eliminate any special privileges, but to create special privileges iu favour of this or that particular class. In view of this suspicion, whether it is well-founded or not, we should have information from the minister if not with respect to the actual personnel of the commission, at least as to the class of men who are to be appointed. If the appointees are to be politicians, men who have been closely identified with the tariff policy of the party now dominant in this country, then this Bill merits very severe criticism at the hands of the members of this House and I am sure it will be severely criticised if not condemned by the people of Canada. A witty writer in speaking of the Tariff Board of the United States compared them to setting hens, and asked: What will the Tariff Board hatch? The minister, in saying that we have no right to ask at this stage for the information for which we have asked should bear in mind that what will be hatched will depend very materially on the character of the eggs which are to be placed under this board. If they be high tariff eggs, and if the commission is appointed to seek out devices whereby due privileges can be given to special classes, the proposal would be strongly condemned by the people of Canada. If a man is particularly interested in one class of industry he is likely to favour that class as a member of the board. I hold that the manufacturing interests are not alone interested in the tariff, that the great consuming body in Canada are entitled to have representation on that board and I think the minister would be doing himself great justice if he would candidly say to the consuming classes of Canada that it is his purpose to see that their interests shall be represented on this Tariff Commission when he makes a selection of the members of that board.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would the hon. gentleman then support the measure?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend cannot answer my question by asking another one. The responsibility with respect to this Bill does not rest on me. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has placed upon himself the responsibility of creating the board in the interests of the whole of Canada. If a board should be created representing all interests in Canada then the fears and alarm felt by the consuming class throughout Canada——

Mr. CURRIE Would the hon. gentleman tell us who are the consuming classes apart from the producers in this country?

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend wants to have private instruction with respect to that matter we shall try to arrange with a night school. I have looked into the conditions prevailing in connection with the board in the United States, and the criticisms of the board there have taken two forms. There are those who believe that that board will hatch out wisps of nothing, and there are others who believe that it will hatch out more high tariff snakes in the interests of the privileged classes, of the big manufacturing interests. It is true they say it is not a Tariff Commission, that it is only a board of advisers, and they do and hope to do nothing and will not hatch out anything. But in this Bill we have a proposition with respect to an investigation as to the cost of production at home and abroad, and I could not do better than refer to a criticism that has been made with respect to the attitude taken by the President in this regard. At first the President simply took the advice of this board with respect to the maximum and minimum tariffs. The scope of their inquiry was only within those restricted limits, but later on he, of his own motion, issued instructions to the board requiring them to inquire into the cost of production at home and abroad. My hon. friend proposes by this Bill to have an inquiry as to the cost of production at home and abroad, and this criticism of the American board is certainly very pregnant of ideas for my hon. friend in any inquiry they may have prosecuted in that direction. They said:

> Moreover, as the President himself has indicated, and as shrewd observers have pointed out, there is no such thing as determining the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. How can we even say that the cost of production at home is this much or that much? Costs differ, do we mean the cost of the largest mill or the smallest.
>
> Do we mean the cost in the average plant or in the one that is run at an efficiency higher than the average? Do we mean the cost under the very worst conditions and in the factory which takes the booby prize in good management? Horrid thought. The truth of the matter is that there is more difference in cost of production between plants right here at home than between plants in the United States and those in foreign countries.

They go on to state the reason:

> There is a reasonable answer to this criticism. Political policies must be broad enough to work with. Tariff policies, to be stated, must be stated in broad terms. Platforms must say 'free trade' or 'tariff for revenue only,' or 'tariff to equalize the difference in cost of production at home and abroad' or 'high protection,' or 'prohibitory tariff.' This difference in cost of production was a plank in the Republican platform. President Taft attempts to conjure with it and instructs

the 'tariff board' with it, not because it is the name of a perfect tariff theory or even a practical method.

This difference in the cost of production was a plank in the Republican platform, and after the passage of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff, President Taft told the country that it was his determination to go into the matter so that there would be a reduction of the tariff in the United States and he caused this board to inquire into the cost of production at home and abroad. Yet the President of the United States said:

> There is no such thing as determining the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad.

And it is laid down as a conclusion:

> The precise difference in cost of production is not capable of definite ascertainment; all that even the most scientific person can do is to exercise his best judgment in reaching a conclusion.

That is almost axiomatic. If you consider this matter solely from the point of view of political exigencies well and good, but if you want to get at the real conditions, you certainly do not want a Tariff Board such as is proposed in this Bill. You say that these men are to collect evidence and that that evidence is for the benefit of its Finance Minister. Well, the evidence should be drawn from all sections and there should be a provision in this Bill compelling the board to draw evidence from all sections and all interests throughout Canada, whether in the remote west or here in the east. If any one desires to go before the board and state the facts relating to his business, he should have the right to do so. This Bill falls short of any such proposal and places in the hands of a select body of men, who possibly might be biased or coloured in their economic views, the gathering and the culling of evidence, the eliminating from it of features that might be an important factor in enabling us to reach the conclusion on this tariff question. There is the danger in connection with this Bill. The varied interests of the country are not safeguarded. It is all very well to say that these are bogies and spectres, but they exist, not in our minds, but by reason of the character of this Bill, by reason of its phraseology, its limitations and its restrictive methods. To say that the commissioners can do so and so or will do so and so is not sufficient. What we ought to do is force them to take evidence from every section and every interest. They should be bound, just as the Railway Commission is, to hear the application of every body interested or who has any grievance. Any man in Canada can compel the Board of Railway Commissioners to inquire into any matter which he may deem a grievance as respects himself or the community in which he resides in connection with transportation interests, and if the commission should not answer his appeal, he has the right to call on the Minister of Railways to bring it to the notice of the Railway Board.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Is the hon. gentleman in favour of some tribunal investigating these conditions?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not framing a Bill, I am not inviting my hon. friend to consider any Bill that I am proposing, I am discussing this Bill and I say it does not go far enough. If the hon. gentleman wants to know my views on economics, I may tell him that I am a free trader in every sense of the word.

An hon. MEMBER. Since when?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been a free trader for a long time, but I recognize that it was impossible to make a sudden change to free trade. The day will come, however, when that policy will prevail in Canada.

Mr. CURRIE. Never.

Mr. EMMERSON. The silent member has spoken. We are told by that silent modest retiring gentleman, the member from Simcoe, that we are never to have anything nearly approaching free trade. I suppose that settles the question. But after all we are dealing with this Bill as to its possibilities and the fruits it may bear in the future, it is not a matter of material moment whether this one or the other favours free trade or a tariff for revenue only or protection pure and simple. But it is a matter of supreme importance to the people whether, in constituting this commission, we are creating an agency that will act in the interests of the manufacturers, and erect greater barriers in favour of the privileged classes against the welfare of the people. If there is anything in this Bill tending in that direction, it should be eliminated.

There should be every opportunity given to discuss this Bill clause by clause, minutely, and, if possible, to remedy it. I assume that it makes no difference what my opinion in respect to the Bill is.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. I say 'hear, hear' to that, because I know that my hon. friend proposes to put it through and he has a ready and willing supporter in the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) and other members who are quite willing to nod just as he beckons. I take it for granted that this Bill is going through whether we are in favour of it or not. But it is of great importance as to whether the people of this country will favour a measure of this kind which will have, even if not intended, the result of affecting the interests of the consumer. The farming and consuming classes are compelled to buy in the dearest mar-

ket, and in whose interest? In the interest of the manufacturer and only recently, on the 21st September, we denied to the producers the privilege of selling in the best and the widest market. So, they are clipped at both ends. We have given them a hobble skirt. We have hobbled them on all sides and now all through the country they are hobbling along by reason of the attitude of this government and the party which supports it. If this measure is to go through, I want this hobbling removed and as hobble skirts are not in favour in the fashionable world——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and as they are not in favour in the fashionable world, so is our hobble skirted policy with respect to the tariff not in favour among the consuming classes of Canada and the sooner the government realize that, it will be very much better for them and, regardless of the benefits which might accrue to them, it will be very much better indeed for the people of Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Chairman, the Bill before the House is a very important Bill, and one which should require careful consideration by every hon. gentleman who represents a constituency in Canada. We have listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) and I am quite sure that they were interesting to the House even although they were not as instructive as my hon. friend thought they were. I have looked very carefully into the Bill and I find it to be a very simple one and one that appeals to every class of people in Canada. Every man who has taken any part in politics for the last few years, knows that the tariff has been, and will continue to be, a very important question in politics My hon. friends on the other side of the House, when in opposition many years ago, made an effort to put the farmer against the manufacturer, pointing out to the farmer that protection was in the interest of the manufacturer and that it could not possibly be in the interest of the farmer.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is right.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend agrees with that old policy?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure that a very large majority of the people of Canada differ from my hon. friend on that point.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is not a large one.

Mr. BLAIN. And I would say to my hon. friend and the Liberal opposition, that whatever impression they were able to make on the farmers of Canada in the years gone by, they will not be able to make any now. The farmers have realized that there is no class of people in Canada who have benefited to a greater extent by the National Policy, if you might call it that, than the farmers themselves. They have built up in Canada, under the so-called National Policy, put upon the statute-books by the Liberal-Conservative party and continued in the main by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in office—a splendid home market.

Mr. EMMERSON. It must have been very sick for about eighteen years.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has argued it from that standpoint, but I am arguing it now from the standpoint of the Bill before the House. The farmers pronounced on the 21st September upon that question. The policy of the late government, when introduced, was a bid for the farmers' vote. They threw out the policy of partial reciprocity between Canada and the United States and it made a distinct issue in the last election that ended on the 21st September, with what result? With the result that the farmers all over Canada, almost in every part, turned to the Liberal-Conservative party and said: We will give you our support, and they did it on the 21st September last.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are sorry for it now.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that his Minister of Militia came up from the battle on the 21st September and, when interviewed in the city of Montreal and asked the question: How do you account for the defeat, said: In my county the farmers went against me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are sorry for it now.

Mr. BLAIN. The only sorrow I see in Canada anywhere is on the other side of the House.

Mr. TURRIFF. No, no.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friends have not and cannot discuss any question since this House assembled a few months ago without introducing the reciprocity proposition in some part of the debate, showing that whatever else may have been on their minds there is this important question upon their minds which was settled on the 21st September.

Mr. EMMERSON. You would like to have it forgotten.

Mr. BLAIN. I am a frank protectionist. I am not ashamed of that position, and the farmers who sent me here are protectionists too.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Moderate or immoderate?

Mr. BLAIN. I am for moderate protection, of course. We have never had a man in this House who was a protectionist to say that he was anything else than a moderate protectionist. I was looking over the tariff the other day that was in force when the Liberal-Conservative party were in office before, and I made some comparisons between that old tariff and the boasted Fielding tariff of 1907. Go over item after item and you will find that in many cases items that hon. gentlemen condemned for so many years while they were in opposition and condemn now are exactly the same as in the Fielding tariff that they boasted so much of. Take, for instance, the article of apples; 40 cents a barrel was the duty put on long years ago. That was condemned by hon. gentlemen opposite. They said: Of course, protection cannot protect the farmer; but when they came into office and brought down the boasted Fielding tariff the same old duty of 40 cents a barrel was placed on apples. They condemned it when they found it had been placed upon the statute-book by the Liberal-Conservative party and applauded it when they left it as it was in the measure of the Liberal government. This question of establishing a Tariff Commission was introduced into Canada only a few months ago, but in reality it had been referred to in this country and in the House for many years.

When it was mentioned, some months ago, before the House assembled the newspapers took it up. The newspapers on either side of politics understood what was meant, and nowhere did they take from it what hon members on the other side take from it, that it is a Bill designed to take away legislative powers from the government of the day. In proof of this, let me cite an editorial from the Toronto 'Globe', a newspaper that would not be too friendly to this government. On January 6 last, the Toronto 'Globe' said, referring to the Tariff Bill:

> The Canadian Commission will have no executive functions, and will in no way usurp the right of parliament to regulate imposed duties. It will report to the government findings of fact and evidence upon which the same are predicated, and these will be laid before parliament in justification of such fiscal changes as may from time to time be proposed by the government.

So the 'Globe' understood it very well, for it points out the very substance of the Bill the Finance Minister has introduced. It does not for a moment suggest that this Bill will take away any functions of the government or of this parliament. It is understood that the functions of the Tariff Commission will be to lay before parliament for the use of every member, and I suppose particularly for the use of the Cabinet ministers now in office, such important facts as are necessary for an understanding of any proposals to alter the tariff. Surely, that is something that commends itself to every man. Surely it will commend itself to that class of people who suggest that the manufacturers of this country are too highly protected. To hear hon. gentlemen opposite when mention is made of manufacturers, one would think that the manufacturers were the enemies of this country instead of its friends. I do not think it becomes any member of this House to cast reflections on the manufacturing class whose members are to be found in both parties and who paid last year no less than $250,000,000 in gold in wages to the people of Canada. They do not require any defence on my part; they are well able to take care of themselves. Imagine the manufacturers of Canada, who have their money invested, who watch their business closely, and enterprisingly seek a market for their products, coming to the Finance Minister and suggesting to him to put on the statute-book a protective policy, as hon. members opposite would call it, diametrically opposed to every interest of the farming class in Canada. The farmers are the main customers of the manufacturers.

Without the home market afforded by the farmers, the manufacturers of Canada could not succeed. I cannot see how any man on either side can suggest—I doubt that any man really would suggest—that the manufacturers would come to the doors of parliament demanding such increases of duties as hon. members on the other side speak of to kill off the farming industry of this country. I believe that the farmers are interested in the tariff and that the manufacturers are equally interested. I believe that hon. members on the other side are in favour of tariffs—they proved themselves so by keeping the National Policy on the statute-book. It was a debatable question in this House what changes they would make on coming into power in order to keep the pledges that they had given to the people years before. They failed to keep those pledges. And I do not think the people of this country will take them at their word any more. For my part, I am thinking the Bill should commend itself to this House, and I am sure it will commend itself to the people. If there is a manufacturing establishment now that has the benefit of protection higher than it should have, the duty of the Tariff Commission will be to gather such information in respect of that establishment and manufacture, and lay it before parliament and the people so that the case may be understood. That is all my hon friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds) is asking. And I think

it will be time enough for hon. members on the other side to condemn the Tariff Board when it has been in operation and has made some mistake. It is all very well for hon. members opposite to declare that they are seeking information. The leader of the opposition declared in this discussion that he was anxious for facts. He was crying for information because my right hon. friend said that when we were discussing the reciprocity proposition a few months ago there was some suggestion that we of this country did not have sufficient information, that we suffered in that respect in comparison with the legislature on the other side of the line which had complete information. I think my hon. friend is correct in that we did complain of lack of information. Some hon. members suggest now that they want information, but that information could be had in some other way. In what other way? By adding to the staff of the Finance Department. Would not that cost money? The only difference is as to whether these new officers should be called a Tariff Commission or whether they should be called officers of the Finance Department to gather these statistics and lay them all on the table. That is a small matter, so small that I do not think the hon. members opposite will interest the people of Canada in their criticisms. Looking over the Bill, its simplicity appeals to me. This commission is to investigate

(a) The price and cost of raw materials in Canada and elsewhere, and the cost of transportation thereof from the place of production to the place of use or consumption.

That has always been a subject of discussion when tariffs are before the House:

(b) The cost of production in Canada and elsewhere;
(c) the cost of transportation from the place of production to the place of use or consumption, whether in Canada or elsewhere;
(d) the cost, efficiency and conditions of labour in Canada and elsewhere;
(e) the prices received by producers, manufacturers, wholesale dealers, retailers and other distributors in Canada and elsewhere;
(f) all conditions and factors which affect or enter into the cost of production and the price to the consumers in Canada.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say there is nothing in the Bill relating to consumers. Surely this is a reference direct enough. And why should not the Finance Minister be as much interested in the consumer as hon. gentlemen on the other side? The Minister of Finance and his colleagues will have to report in a few years to the people of Canada. I should think that the Minister of Finance would be as much interested in the consumer as any hon. gentleman on the other side who has no particular governmental responsibility. Therefore, I think, it is rather narrow criticism, if I may put it that way, for gentlemen on the other side to suggest that this Bill has nothing in it but suggestions for increasing tariffs, that there is no thought in it from the consumer's standpoint, and is merely bolstering up the manufacturing interest. I do not so read it, and no one can fairly read into the Bill any such interpretation. And the Toronto 'Globe,' which I have quoted, understands fully the purpose of this proposal of the government for a National Tariff Commission to lay before the people all the facts, so that proposals in changes in the tariff may be dealt with on the basis of those facts.

If, for example, on looking over the tariff, it is found that one manufactured article has more protection than it should have, then the machinery of the Tariff Commission is called into operation and the commission considers the price of the raw material, the transportation cost, the cost of labour, and it goes into a close examination of everything that enters into the cost of manufacturing that article, and that information is laid upon the table of the House.

Mr. TURRIFF. No.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says no, but the fact is that all information will be laid upon the table of the House except such information as may be of a private nature, and which would allow one business man to take advantage of his competitor. I do not suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) would argue that such information should be made public.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is not one word in the Bill that compels them to lay any information on the table of the House. The information is to be supplied only to the Minister of Finance, as I understand it.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman think that the Minister of Finance is going to change the tariff without consulting his colleagues and without submitting it for the approval of parliament?

Mr. TURRIFF. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, who is the information for?

Mr. TURRIFF. The whole trend of the Bill is that that information should be given to the Minister of Finance, and he and the government can use their judgment as to whether they will submit that information to parliament or not.

Mr. BLAIN. I have sat in this House for many years, and I have heard the late Minister of Finance, Mr. Fielding, give

reasons why certain changes should take place in the tariff, but to hear these hon. gentlemen opposite talk now, you would suppose that the present Minister of Finance was intending to appropriate this information for himself and in the interests of the manufacturers.

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) says 'hear, hear,' and he is the gentleman who, in years gone by, has advanced free trade and low tariff propositions in this House and out of it, but who experienced a change of mind, and for fifteen years supported a protectionist government and helped to keep them in office. Perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has experienced another conversion. My understanding is that the Tariff Commission will gather all the necessary information, and that when the proper time comes the Minister of Finance will give to the House the reasons why such a rate should be raised or lowered, as the case may be, and the only class of information that will not come up for public discussion, is that information which may be obtained from one manufacturer or one farmer and which, if made public, might injure the business of another manufacturer or another farmer. The whole burden of the opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite to this Bill has been—notwithstanding that the explanation given by the Minister of Finance has adequately answered that objection—that this Bill is going to take away from parliament the power to legislate on tariffs, and give it to the Tariff Commission.

Mr. NESBITT. Not a word.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt) was frank enough to compliment the Minister of Finance upon the clear statement of facts he gave to the House when he introduced the Bill.

Mr. NESBITT. I did not say a word about the other thing.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) who is interrupting me, whether he is a free trader or a protectionist.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer.

Mr. NESBITT. I told my hon. friend the other day that I was for a reasonable tariff.

Mr. BLAIN. Oh, yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, here is the long list of articles mentioned in the tariff, and will my hon. friend point to any single item which during fifteen years he ever ventured to put his finger on and say: The rate is too high. It is, therefore, fair to conclude, that the tariff, as it is now, is a moderate tariff.

Mr. NESBITT. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, the hon. gentleman is perfectly satisfied with it, and no doubt there are some people in the country who differ from him on that point. There are many people in this country who are protectionists because of the existing conditions, and because that to the south of us we have a very highly protected country. I suppose that everybody, other conditions being equal, would believe in the principle of free trade.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, the right hon. gentleman advocated free trade on the people of Canada for many years. When he was in opposition before he stood on public platforms, and he told the people if they put him into power he would give free trade as they have it in England. He went from one end of Canada to the other telling the people the same thing, telling them he was not in favour of tariffs, that tariffs had made the manufacturer rich and bled the farmer——

Mr. TURRIFF. White.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, bled the farmers white, and the people of Canada took the right hon. gentleman's word and they put him in power, but he did not give them free trade. The right hon. gentleman is trying that on the people again, but I can assure him that they will trust him no more. The right hon. gentleman has prided himself as a peacemaker, and I do not wish to detract from any credit which is due to him in that respect. He has been a very prominent man in Canada for many years, and he is entitled to credit for anything he has done in the interests of the country. But, the right hon. gentleman cannot claim that he is now assuming the attitude of a peacemaker, because his speech of this afternoon was an evident attempt to inflame the manufacturer against the farmer and the farmer against the manufacturer in this country. Judging from the discussion in this House of last Wednesday, and of this afternoon, the members of the opposition seem to desire, notwithstanding the verdict of the 21st of September, to make a further effort to take Canada out of the ranks of protectionist countries. Well, I do not think the right hon. gentleman and his supporters will have very much success in that line. We, on this side of the House, are reasonable protectionists, and we are willing and ready to say so in this House or out of it, but hon. gentlemen opposite who during fifteeen years of office were protectionists, are afraid or ashamed to say so. One of

them is in favour of protection on coal, another in favour of protection on iron, another, when he was sitting on the government benches moved for an increased duty on pork, and so on down along the line.

There is the hon. member for South Wellington, a protectionist of course, who is credited with saying that he could change as quick as any other party in Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to deny that.

Mr. BLAIN. To me it is necessary.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do deny it.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend say he is not a protectionist?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I stated on Wednesday what my position is, I believe in a tariff for revenue with incidental protection, of course.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is an item in the tariff with a duty of 30 per cent. Would my hon. friend state whether a duty of 30 per cent is for revenue or a protective tariff.

Mr. NESBITT. Tell us the item, perhaps it is revenue.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is 10 per cent a bushel on oats, is that protective or revenue only?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is your own view?

Mr. NESBITT. As the hon. gentleman is making the speech I would like to know his view.

Mr. BLAIN. Forty cents a barrel on apples. The Liberal-Conservative party put that on, and my right hon. friend and his supporters retained it.

Mr. NESBITT. My hon. friend knows that I voted to take that off.

Mr. BLAIN. When?

Mr. NESBITT. On the 21st September.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend voted to take it off, and I would point out that the people of Canada differed with my hon. friend on that point.

Mr. NESBITT. My constituency did not.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend had rather a close call.

Mr. NESBITT. Not very close when they trebled my former majority.

Mr. BLAIN. If I wished to do so I could tell the reason.

Mr. NESBITT. Let us hear it.

Mr. BLAIN. It had nothing to do with reciprocity. My hon. friend sits for a county that used to give 1,500 Reform majority. What is the matter with it now?

Mr. NESBITT. I polled more votes on the 21st September than ever were polled when they gave 1,500 majority.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend comes from a province that left him and his leader only 13 members out of 86. There was some little difference of opinion in that province as to whether they wanted those duties taken off or not.

I am heartily in accord with the Bill. I want to compliment the Finance Minister upon his frankness when presenting it to the House. He told the House what the duties of the commision would be, and how far their findings would go in the settlement of the tariff. He said the duties of the commission would be simply to gather information for the use of the government and people of Canada, and that the government and the party would be responsible for whatever tariff changes were made, if any were made after that information was brought before the House. I am willing to trust the government, I have faith in the government as the people of Canada have. I am not going to say that this Tariff Commission will be a bad one before it has had an opportunity of giving its views to the people of Canada. I am going to wait, as my hon. friend has often twitted us on this side to wait, until the Tariff Commision is appointed, I am going to wait until I have an opportunity of looking into the work they have done, and if I find as a supporter of the government, that they are not giving an equivalent for their cost and for their position, then I will be one of the first to condemn the commision. There is a demand for it in this country, when there is such a diversity of opinion as to whether the tariff is too low or too high. I am going to join with my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance and his government, in giving to the people of Canada an opportunity to have an independent tribunal to furnish this House and this country with such information so that the government of the day can make certain changes, if changes are necessary, either up or down. It may be down, it may be up, but this information will be for the use of the government in determining that, and I am heartily in accord with the Bill and will give it my support.

Mr. NEELY. This is a very important section, because we all know that no matter what may be the object of this Bill, or the purpose in creating this commission, a very great deal will depend on the personnel of the board. Early in the session, I put some questions on the order paper, relative to the personnel of this

proposed commission, and as to what walks of life they would be selected from. The information I received at that time, was very indefinite, so indefinite as not to be information at all. I do not know that hon. gentlemen opposite have any right to criticise or find fault with those on this side of the House, who ask for information as to the character of the personnel of this commission. That appears to me to be a very vital point. It was pointed out in the debate on the second reading of the Bill that there had never been any demand in Canada for the creation of a board such as this, except the demand made by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. We have never heard of any body of farmers or agriculturists, of any labour unions, of any other labour interests in this country calling for the creation of a tariff board with this single exception of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

There is fear in the hearts of a great number of people in Canada over the prospect created by this Bill. That is the fear, the well-founded fear, that the government are projecting an important departure in our fiscal policy in the interests of the manufacturers. When has there been any demand from any section of the people except the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, for this measure? That being the case, we are justified in wanting to know from the minister what class of men he proposes to appoint on this commission. If they are to be partisan politicians, men who believe in a high protective duty, we all know what we may expect from the appointment of such a board. We have no definite knowledge as to who would constitute the board, but judging by the influence which puts this government into power, we can draw a very fair inference. There are more people interested in the tariff question than the manufacturers. The great consuming classes are still more interested, because it is they who pay the larger share of the duties, and in their interest we would like to know whether they are going to be represented on the personnel of this commission. We on this side have been accused by hon. gentlemen opposite of being sometimes free traders, and sometimes protectionists. Well, so far as my information goes, the Liberal party in this country is a unit on the tariff question, but what about hon. gentlemen opposite? Take my hon. friends in the province of Manitoba, one of the things they found fault with in connection with the late reciprocity agreement was that it did not sufficiently reduce the duty on agricultural implements. They are low tariff men. Take our friends from the province of Quebec, if newspaper statements are correct, many of them secured their election, not on the ground of sympathy with the Conservative party in its fiscal policy, but on the ground of being in sympathy with the Liberal party on its fiscal policy, but against it on the question of the navy.

Mr. PELLETIER. That is news to me. I never heard that before.

Mr. NEELY. I would like to know from the Postmaster General if his followers in the province of Quebec did not take up a position in favour of reciprocity.

Mr. PELLEITER. That is news to me. On election day, in the city of Quebec, when we had the results of the election from all over Canada, I said to the large crowd which was listening to us that we were glad Canada had written this glorious page in its history and had shown it was in favour of Canada for the Canadians and of British connection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am prepared to say that some of the Conservative candidates were in favour of reciprocity, but against the navy.

Mr. PELLETIER. I know of none.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I know of several.

Mr. PELLETIER. I had something to do with the elections and ought to know.

Mr. NEELY. Many things are said after the elections which are not said preceding and during them. I may tell my hon. friend that possibly his friends in that province of Quebec, may have something to tell him later on, about another question than the one before us, and which was instrumental in bringing him and his supporters to this House.

Mr. PELLETIER. What was that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Tell us now.

Mr. NEELY. Let my hon. friends have a little patience, they will be told about it in due time. The question of the personnel of this commission is a very important one. We know at whose demand and desire this commission is being appointed by this government.

An hon. MEMBER. At whose?

Mr. NEELY. At the request of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

An hon. MEMBER. Give us some evidence of that.

Mr. NEELY. I would like to know of any other representative body in Canada who ever asked for it?

An hon. MEMBER. Did they?

Mr. NEELY. They passed resolutions calling for a Tariff Commission at their annual meetings.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Not of this kind.

Mr. NEELY. Of course the Canadian Manufacturers' Association did not actually draft this Bill, but they have taken a position year after year in favour of appointing a permanent Tariff Board, and we know perfectly well that the manufacturers of Canada were largely responsible, by their assistance, for bringing this government into power. What is the situation that is going to be brought about in matters political by the creation of this board, if it is to be constituted from active partisans? We know that in certain provinces of Canada there are liquor interests which have to go to the governments of those provinces to secure licenses and which consequently have to stand in with the license boards appointed by those governments. Well, we are asked to appoint a Board of Commissioners who will have it in their power, if they should be partisan, to do great service to the present government. Is it not true, that, if they should be partisan, they could say to these manufacturers: if you are not good, if you do not give an active support to the Liberal Conservative party, we will fix you when the time comes for us to recommend what tariff rates should be imposed on the goods that come into competition with yours?

So, I say, it appears to me that this question is not the idle question hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe, this question raised by hon. members on this side as to what information the Minister of Finance and the leader of the government have in their possession with reference to the class of men they propose to appoint on this commission. In a discussion on this particular question, I do not wish to enter upon many of the matters which were brought up by the hon. members for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and Peel (Mr. Blain). They, in fact, discussed the whole tariff situation and the fiscal policies of different parties. I do not propose to do that. But, perhaps, I may be permitted a word with reference to what was stated by the hon. member for Halton. Before he concluded his remarks that hon. gentleman expressed the pious hope—it was a pious hope, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman was sincere in it—that if this Tariff Commission got working, we should find that the result of their operations would be to lower tariffs rather than to increase them. Though he expressed a hope on that point, my hon. friend did not express very much conviction. I should be glad to entertain the hope, even without the conviction, but I am very sorry that even that hope is denied me. Let me tell the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) also that he did not deceive the House or the country when he picked out from the tariff list a few items on which the late government had increased duties to some extent, as intimating to the House and to the country that the government had actually increased the duties. The items so carefully selected by the hon. gentleman were, in the main, not items of production in this country but of manufacture outside.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sugar.

Mr. NEELY. An hon. member says 'sugar.' That is produced to some small extent in Canada, but not to an extent worthy of consideration. By carrying his argument to its logical conclusion, my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) could prove equally well that there is no such place as free trade England, for while England is a free trade country, she does put taxes on goods brought in from other countries not produced within her own borders. On the items mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and basing the tariff on revenue, the late government might well have been justified in placing considerable duties upon them. But, having made such a careful study of the tariff as he told us he has done, the hon. gentleman should not have left out of consideration the very important statement given to the House, I think on the 4th April last, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster, Toronto), in the form of a table of figures demonstrating that taxation had been, on the average, largely decreased since the coming into power of the Liberal government in 1896. But I do not wish to digress.

The Finance Minister has been complimented on having made a frank statement on introducing the Bill. Well, why cannot he be frank with all the members of the House while we are dealing with this section of the personnel of the commission? Why cannot he tell us now that he will appoint men who, he is confident, and the government is confident, and who he is confident the country will be confident, are men who will see to it that every class in Canada shall be carefully looked after in the work they propose to carry out? Cannot he tell us that?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I thought I had said that, in substance.

Mr. NEELY. Perhaps the hon. minister did say it in substance. But we all know very well that human nature is human nature the world over. And if the hon. gentlemen propose under this Bill to appoint three gentlemen as members of this permanent tariff board who are known throughout the country to be partisan politicians or who do not represent in themselves the various and to some extent the conflicting interests of which this country and every country are made up, then we shall be justified in suspicion as to the operation of the Bill.

Mr. STAPLES. What three elements does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) think should be represented?

Mr. NEELY. If I were responsible for the Bill, I should tell the hon. gentleman very quickly. Not being responsible, I have no hesitation in telling him any way. In the first place, I think the farmers should be represented; in the second place the great labouring interests should be represented; then, as I have no fight with the manufacturers—none whatever—I see no reason why the manufacturing and industrial interests of Canada should not also be represented. And while I am opposed to the creation of this board and think it unnecessary, and think that the effect will probably be bad, yet I say to the hon. minister that if he will state that these interests shall be represented, much of my objection to the Bill will absolutely disappear.

Mr. STAPLES. I am not going to make a speech, for I think that ample has been said on both sides and the Bill might go forward. But I want to put a question or two to my hon. friend (Mr. Neely). He seems much concerned about the interests of the people of the west. I think he is quite justified in being so, he also stated there is serious and strenuous opposition to this legislation. I want to ask my hon. friend, is he not aware of the fact that when the right hon. leader of this House (Mr. Borden) came to the western country previous to the campaign, he stated clearly that he would appoint such a commission as is here proposed? Does he not also know that when the speech from the Throne was made on the 10th of November last, this subject was mentioned in that speech? Does he not know also that in fulfilment of these promises this Bill has been presented to this House? Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken of certain elements in the country as deserving that such a commission should not be appointed. Let me ask him, has he any resolutions from the farmers organizations or any other organizations opposing this measure? The whole opposition is on the part of the other side of this House. And for what purpose? For political purposes and nothing else.

But you are not making any headway; even the press of the country is not coming to your assistance. You are simply wasting the time of the House for no other object than political advantage.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think I should call the attention of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) to the remark he made a moment ago, when he said that the Toronto 'Globe' understood the nature of the Bill now before the House, and he read an extract from the 'Globe' of January 6. I remember that article in the 'Globe' because it rather complimented the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) for the stand he is supposed to have taken in the Cabinet Council in opposition to the broader measure which it was the intention, I believe, of the government to bring down. The point to which I take exception is that the member for Peel read an extract from the editorial column of the 'Globe,' and anyone who did not understand the situation would say that the 'Globe' must have known on the 6th of January what this Bill contained, that the 'Globe' must have had some private wire from the Minister of Finance. But what he read, in fact, was the Toronto 'Mail and Empire's' words, and not the 'Globe's' words at all.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend pass it over to me?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The article reads as follows:

A statement in the 'Mail and Empire' as to the scope and functions of the Tariff 'Commission' to be created by the government as soon as parliament gives authority therefor, indicates that the 'commission' is not to be a commission at all in the commonly understood significance of the term. The Canadian commission, we are told,——

Now come in the inverted commas:

—'will in no way correspond to the proposed tariff commission in the United States, where the tariff commission, as distinguished from the tariff board, contemplates the creation of a body authorized to raise, lower, or suspend customs duties with the approval of the President. The Canadian commission will have no executive functions, and will in no way usurp the right of parliament to regulate imposed duties. It will report to the government findings of fact and evidence upon which the same are predicated, and these will be laid before parliament in justification of such fiscal changes as may from time to time be proposed by the government.'

That is the statement of the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' quoted by the 'Globe.' I will send the paper to my hon. friend. He marked it himself where he was quoting, and he will see the quotation marks. How, in the very nature of things, could the 'Globe' know the contents of this Bill? Nobody on this side of the House knew it until Wednesday last when it was introduced.

Mr. BLAIN. I was careful to say, and my hon. friend must know, that when this matter was first introduced, the press on both sides of politics understood fully what the intention of the government was. I did not suggest for a moment, that this article was written after the introduction of the Bill, because I knew, as my hon. friend knows, that the Bill was only introduced last Wednesday, and I gave the

date of the 'Globe' when I read the article.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That is not my point, my point is that the hon. gentleman led the House to understand that he was quoting from the 'Globe' article. My hon. friend knows very well, that what he read, is not a statement from the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' at all, it is an editorial of the Toronto 'Globe,' commenting upon a statement made a few days ago by the Toronto 'Mail and Empire.'

Mr. BLAIN (reading):

The Canadian Commission will have no executive functions, and will in no way usurp the right of parliament to regulate imposed duties.

Hon. gentlemen will see at once, that that was not a quotation from the 'Mail and Empire.' I have the 'Mail and Empire' now under my hand, and I will read it again. This is the Toronto 'Globe' commenting upon an article written a few days prior by the 'Mail and Empire,' not a quotation at all, but in the editorial columns, without any suggestion, except the suggestion that the 'Globe' itself was agreeing with a statement in the 'Mail and Empire.'

The Canadian Commission will have no executive functions, and will in no way usurp the right of parliament to regulate imposed duties. It will report to the government findings of fact and evidence upon which the same are predicated, and these will be laid before parliament in justification of such fiscal changes as may from time to time be proposed by the government.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Is that clause not in inverted commas?

Mr. BLAIN. No, I think not, and my hon. friend must know that.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Why, I can almost see them from here.

Mr. BLAIN. Without taking up the time of the House, I will produce before the debate closes, the article written in the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' to which this 'Globe' editorial refers.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Now the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) is looking at the article. Does he not see the inverted commas?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Hastings says no, and I will put the article in the hands of the Chairman.

Mr. CROTHERS. The principal argument presented by the right hon. leader of the opposition, and many of his supporters was based upon a statement alleged to have been made by the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, (Mr. Ames). I do not think the right hon. leader of the opposition was quite just to my hon. friend from St. Antoine in not reading all that he said on that occasion. The House will bear with me for a moment while I read two or three sentences, including the phrase referred to by the leader of the opposition. On page 2702 of 'Hansard' my hon. friend from St. Antoine is reported in these words:

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

I do not see what the hon. gentleman could have said in favour of men to be appointed to this position more clearly than what he did say. To say that he desired three men who were in favour of protection to be appointed to this board, was only an indirect and polite way of saying that he did not desire the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), to be a member of that board.

Mr. NEELY. Is the hon. gentleman apologizing or explaining the position of the member for St. Antoine, when he says that the member for Red Deer should not be appointed on that board? Is it not simply a question of the information that this board is to get?

Mr. CROTHERS. I am coming to that. I say that is only an indirect and polite way of saying that he was not in favour of the member for Red Deer being a member of this board, because he could not find a gentleman, even on the other side of the House, who was not in favour of protection. The difference between members on this side of the House and members on the other side of the House is that we preach protection and practise protection; whereas hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House preach free trade and practise protection. Now, in dealing with trade and commerce by way of tariffs, the legislature may take one of several positions. It may say that it is in favour of absolute free trade.

I do not know any civilized nation that has ever taken that position, that has ever adopted absolute free trade, trade unrestricted in any respect whatever. It is not pretended that free

trade in that sense is practised even in England. Another position may be taken in favour of a tariff for revenue only. Many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have referred to that position. To speak of a tariff for revenue only with incidental protection is misleading. You may have a tariff for revenue only and still have eliminated from that tariff all principle of protection. Is there any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who desires to take a position in favour of a tariff for revenue having eliminated from that tariff the principle of protection? England collects a large revenue.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Does England collect any revenue on material produced in England?

Mr. CROTHERS. I was just coming to that. The point I was trying to make is that you may have a tariff for revenue and have eliminated from that tariff all principle of protection. That is the sort of revenue tariff, as I understand it, that is practised in England. England collects a large revenue from imports into England consisting of things that are not produced in England. England is consistent as a revenue tariff country and from that tariff is eliminated all principle of protection. As my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) knows very well, that is the principle of free traders. They take the ground that if they are to raise a revenue at all they are to collect that revenue upon imports of articles that are not produced in the country. As an illustration of that you have in England a tax of 10 cents a pound on tea. Is there an hon. gentleman in this House who will say that he is in favour of a tariff of that kind from which the principle of protection is entirely eliminated? Not by any means. Hon. gentlemen opposite never attempted to introduce a tariff of that kind. They went up and down this country from the time that Sir John Macdonald introduced the National Policy resolutions in this House in 1876, until 1896— twenty years— leading the people to believe that if they were successful at the polls they would introduce the principle of free trade. But, when they came into power they proceeded to practise protection, they have practised it ever since and they are in favour of it to-day; that is in the sense that they are not in favour of eliminating from our tariff the principle of protection. I do not think the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will get up in this House and say that in that sense he is a free trader; nor would any other gentleman on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) said a few minutes ago that he was in favour of a tariff for revenue. That is not the question. If he is a free trader, to be consistent, he must say: I am in favour of a tariff having eliminated from it all principle of protection, and if he is not prepared to go that far he is in favour of protection and not free trade. So, I say that there is not an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who is in favour of free trade.

An hon. GENTLEMAN. There is one.

Mr. CROTHERS. Except the hon. member for Red Deer. It was stated by my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Mr. Borden), this afternoon, in answer to a statement to the effect that the members of this board would likely be three Conservatives, that he was not aware that during the fifteen years when the Liberal government were in power they had ever appointed a Conservative to a prominent position. I think he was substantially correct. I have thought over the matter with reference to the Supreme Court of Ontario, and I find that durilng the fifteen years of the Liberal government they appointed sixteen members to the Supreme Court, that out of the sixteen, fifteen were pronounced Liberals, and one was a mild Conservative, and we all know the influences that secured him that position.

An hon. MEMBER. And every judge in Manitoba.

Mr. CROTHERS. And every judge in Manitoba. As far as I am aware my right hon. friend the leader of the government was quite right in saying that there had never been a Conservative appointed to any position of influence in this country during the whole fifteen years that hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. I do not think that I would go as far as my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). I think the government will be able to find in this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, three Conservatives well qualified to fill the position, and I hope they will appoint three Conservatives. I have no doubt they will appoint men who are in favour of protection, just as the leader of the opposition is in favour of protection in that he is not in favour of eliminating from the tariff all principles of protection. It seems to be admitted by all parties that it is not safe to proceed to revising the tariff without securing some special information. If I remember aright, the Conservative government, in the year 1893, prior to the revision of the tariff, sent three or four members of the government about the country to gather special information. I suppose they were all partisans. They went about the country, and manufacturers and others appeared before them, each man who appeared before them presenting his particular view of the

matter. Then, we had a revision of the tariff in 1897, and we had three members of the right hon. gentleman's cabinet going about the country, and I suppose they were partisans just as the committee of the Conservative Cabinet in 1893, went about the country, partisans, gathering up evidence. Again, in 1907, the Liberal government sent three members of the Cabinet, three partisans, through the country to procure information with regard to the revision of the tariff. So it is admitted by all that it is essential, before dealing with the tariff, to secure special information with regard to it. The methods that we have heretofore adopted have been to send out three or four partisans to get that information, and yet the right hon. gentleman objects to this board, because, he says, it will be composed of partisans. We have nothing but partisans heretofore going about looking for such information. This board will not only get facts, but they will investigate, they will inquire, they will not accept the statements of gentlemen, perhaps manufacturers or others, who desire a particular duty placed upon a particular article. They will investigate and inquire into all the facts, they will find out what the article costs, what proportion of the cost of production is and should be assigned to wages. I am specially interested in that. I would like to know what proportion of the cost of any article should be assigned to wages. So, we must boil it all down to this question, whether we are to have an independent board who will inquire and investigate and get at the bottom of things, or whether we shall endeavour to get at the information as we have done heretofore by three or four members of the government going about the country, and in a desultory manner getting such facts and views as they could from different parties interested in regard to the tariff. There seems to be no ground whatever, for objection to this Bill, and I think it should be accepted at once.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Chairman, my fear is the very opposite of the hope which has been expressed by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers).

He expresses the hope that the Tariff Commission would get down to the bottom of things; my fear is that it will get the tariff up to the top of things. My hon. friend threw out a very curious challenge when he knew that my humble personality was on this side of the House—I rather think he withdrew that challenge afterwards in my own particular case, but for fear it might be still standing I accept it with cheerfulness and I hope with courage and with the ability to give a good reason for accepting it. The hon. gentleman said: was there any hon. gentleman on this side of the House who could go in for what he very correctly described as a tariff for revenue only. Well, I would and for this most obvious reason; that the tariff is a system of taxation, and we are all seeking science in a system of taxation. Now, when you collect on things that are only made outside of Canada, everything you take except the expenses of collection goes to the revenues of the country and, therefore, that is an approach at any rate, to a scientific system of taxation. When you put a tariff upon an article produced in the country, you collect duties for the country, and so far so good; but you collect two revenues, you collect another revenue for the interested minority inside the country. It is to the second revenue I object as being the most unscientific thing in taxation that one can conceive. I would like to say a word or two about the very interesting remarks made by my hon. friend, from Peel (Mr. Blain). I always like to hear my hon. friend, and sometimes he has followed me in debate and I was not even then very much put out by him, but the boot is on the other foot to-night, and I certainly will not try to put him out by anything but fair argument. I was very much struck with what seemed to have occurred to him, namely, that the tariff is still and constantly with us. I think that is a most peculiar circumstance; it is a curious thing that the tariff is everywhere. I read a paragraph in a leading paper in the United States the other day, which said: Congress will have most of its time this year taken up with the tariff; Congress has had most of its time taken up by the tariff for the last three years. Here, we in Canada have talked tariff for twelve months, fought the hardest and best-natured battle we could on tariff, and we come back to parliament and we meet tariff again. It is peculiar; I agree with my hon. friend. He says the tariff will be with us for many years, and I say it will be with us until it is treated in the only way it is proper to treat it, and that is with a bludgeon. The only thing to hand out to the tariff is a club, and when it is treated in that way, you will get rid of it, at any rate for a long time. It is perfectly true, that in the fifty years during which Britain was so busy building up a world trade which will baffle all readers of all future times, she could not attend to tariff matters at all; it is perfectly true that after fifty years a very great statesman was able to get some thought concentrated upon it, but I think the people are over-hopeful who at the present moment are looking for a return to protective principles in Britain.

It is a very unwise thing to prophecy, but I will prophecy that Germany will be

a free trade country before Britain returns to protection, and I make that prophecy with, I think, some kind of authority, based on the marvellous results of the recent elections in Germany. As I have said, it strikes me as being most peculiar that this government, of all others, should be dealing with tariff questions at this moment, because we have just fought an election, and we fought it on a specific principle on the part of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, laid down by the leader of their party who is now Prime Minister of the Government. One of the strongest points in the right hon. gentleman's speech in this House was: Let well enough alone. Well, why is not the government doing it; are things not well enough? The position of the government is the most vastly illogical I can conceive. They have won the election and they all proclaim that protection won it; then why have they not the courage of their convictions to put the tariff up? What are they frightened about? However, that is anticipating what I am going to say. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) also made a very impassioned defence of the manufacturers of the country. I cannot understand his point of view; of course, I suppose he cannot understand mine. He said: these gentlemen have put their capital into their business. Where did they get the capital? Well, just as the consumers have got a very much smaller amount, by making it for themselves, the only way a self-respecting man wants to get capital. I tried to teach in a little debate the other day, in which I am afraid I was misunderstood by some of the workingmen of the country, the idea that you will only have good workingmen when you teach them to be self-supporting, but I have more sympathy with the workingman than with the manufacturer, who wants to lean upon the shoulders of a bolstering and supporting government. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), occupies a little more detached position than some of his colleagues, he does not have that seat in the Cabinet which many of us would have liked to have seen him have, and I do not for one moment, say that as a taunt. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) used to be a very active member of the Opposition side of the House, and I want to argue with him on this question and to try to make my position clear to him. He looks at the interests of the manufacturers; while I look upon the interests of the consumer, entirely so, and I do it on a very simple principle, I can find it in Adam Smith, and I can find it in almost the same words in Bastiat. They both lay down the principle, the end of all production is consumption. I do not think there is a man or boy in Canada to-night who does not believe that this is obviously true. If the end of all production is consumption, and if you look after the consumers, you are looking after everybody. That is the difference between my point of view and the point of view of my hon. friend from Peel. Is it not as clear as a sunbeam at mid-day that if you see that you have plenty of consumers in your country, and plenty of things that they consume, there will be nothing wrong with the producers? If you have consumers in great numbers there will always be plenty of consumption and the producers are the natural consequence. I do not feel that I need, in this informal discussion, go further into the subject of the general position of free trade versus protection. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) is not in the chamber, but I know he will do me the honour to read what I say about him in 'Hansard.' I always like to see him rise in the House; I like the lineaments of his face, and I like him when he goes on to show up what I must confess are the variegated views of the party, even on this side of the House. But I wanted to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) that I am not at all sure that he is not the real Diabolus in this play. We all remember that when he was once asked in this House, he was then sitting in Opposition, what he would do about the British preference, he made no bones about the kind of protection he believed in; there was no sentiment about him. He replied: you give me fifty of a majority on the government benches, and I will soon let you see what I will do with the British preference.

May I again appeal to the courage of my hon. friends opposite. If those are their opinions, why do they not carry them out? If they are not their opinions, why do they seek to put the subject on one side by referring it to a Tariff Commission? We have heard a good deal of the need of information. Well, we cannot have too much information; I concede that point very readily. We have, however, some information on tariffs, and on tariff commissions already. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance interests me. I have heard the hon. member described as a moderate protectionist. Well, Sir, they all begin that way; the becoming of a full-blown protectionist is a rake's progress, they all begin in that fashion. I remember very well Mr. Morley pointing out, when Mr. Chamberlain first began his propagandism in England, that in France they put the modest little duty of 1 shilling and 10 pence on flour, and said there would never be any reason to raise it. There was soon a duty of 12 shillings, an increase of 500 per cent. All protectionists begin as moderate protectionists. I am afraid I would have to describe myself as an immoderate anti-protectionist, because I reaffirm my strong belief in the club as the proper way to deal

with all tariffs. We have some facts about the tendency of tariffs, and we have these facts as to the tendencies of tariffs under commissions. I have given a fact as I could give many others, as to the tendency of tariffs, which is nearly always to rise. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has tried to prove that that happened under the government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and with men struggling in the strength of their low tariff ardour to hold the tariff down, if the rates rose under such aegis and protection, what route would they naturally take when they have their friends behind them? How can they do anything but rise? I should be very much mistaken if I should be successfully contradicted when I say that the tendency of tariffs is to rise under commissions, and that that was proved to the hilt in the countries of Germany and the United States, which have always been the countries from which supporters of protection have derived their main argument. You appoint your commission, up goes the tariff.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that applies to the United States?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). As far as my information goes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It must go a very short distance.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I would like to have successful contradiction. I said the kind I wanted was successful; I did not know that there had been any reduction in the United States since the time a tariff was first made. When were the reductions made?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. gentleman stated that wherever a commission was appointed, the tariff went up and that that applied to the United States. I contradicted that. I wish plainly to state that I am right and my hon. friend is wrong, that the tariff has not gone up in the United States since the commission was appointed, and furthermore, every recommendation based on the commission's report has been for a revision downwards.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Will my hon. friend be good enough to specify some of the articles which have been reduced by the action of the commission, and will he state in addition that there has been no rise in the tariffs?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I shall state positively that there has been no rise. The Payne-Aldrich tariff went into effect in 1909, and under the same Act that put that tariff into effect the Tariff Board was appointed. Since that tariff went into effect there has been no rise. The hon. gentleman for Red Deer stated the contrary. On the facts adduced by the Tariff Commission, and I refer specifically to wool, known as schedule 'K' in the Customs Act, the President of the United States has made strong recommendations to Congress for the reduction of the wool schedule.

Mr. NESBITT. It has not been done.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It has not been done, but the commission in so far as it has interfered has endeavoured to have it brought down and it is only a matter of time.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I am very glad that my hon. friend has been able to prove that in the United States a Tariff Commission has actually produced a recommendation for a reduction, I am glad to have my information on the tariff increased.

Mr. MEIGHEN. May I refer to the pulp and paper schedules in which a reduction has actually taken place?

Mr. NESBITT. That had nothing to do with the recommendation of the board.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The board reported on the schedule.

Mr. CLARK (Ded Deer). That happened as part of an arrangement of which my hon. friend was one of the most bitter opponents.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What difference does that make?

Mr. CROTHERS. Are you prepared to retract what you said to the effect that wherever there was a Tariff Commission appointed the duties had gone up, and your reference to the United States?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). If my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie says he has handed his honour and his ability to conduct a debate over to the Minister of Labour, I will do anything that he says.

Mr. CROTHERS. That is not answering the question.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I would remind my hon. friend that this is the second time he has had to be reminded of that kind of thing, because the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) told him emphatically one evening that he felt quite equal to looking after himself.

Mr. CROTHERS. I ask you whether you would retract the statement I have quoted?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). If everybody on that side of the House including the Minister of Labour was as anxious to learn the true facts on the tariff question, three-fourths of the people of Canada would be free traders at the next election.

Mr. CROTHERS. That is no answer.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). It is a general statement which conveys an answer, it tells

my hon. friend of an honest and open mind. Does he think I want to gain a single point in debate or in my position on the tariff question by making a statement which I know to be false? If I think it is right, why what can I do to retract it, but I am going to reiterate the statement and I am going to say that the evidence drawn from the United States is an extremely slight one, as to the tendency of tariffs under commissions. It is a certainty they went up permanently in Germany. They could not go up much higher in either Germany or the United States. With two-thirds of the people in Germany becoming Socialists and two-fifths of those in the United States becoming paupers, it is extremely difficult to say what the course of the tariff will be in the future.

The Minister of Finance referred to this as a pillow fight. After he has had a little more experience of tariff debates in this House and is a little more able to take care of himself, than he can possibly be now although his abilities are very great, we will give him as much as he likes but he need not be afraid of suffering from too much pillow fighting on this question. He spoke of it being a bogey. It is a bogey if a bogey is a thing that frightens. You talk about new facts. We have too many facts. He proclaimed his belief in the new facts and followed that by a reference to the election of September 21st.

He said that if we had known more facts then we would not perhaps have had that election. Well, I can only inform him and the government that we know more facts in the west now. I received a letter this morning from a friend of mine, an intelligent farmer in my own constituency. It comes from a part of the country where is to be found the finest land in Alberta. It was written by a sturdy, strong-headed Scotsman originally, who was for many years in the United States and came to western Canada when so many other men in the United States came over. He tells me that ninety per cent of the inhabitants there would be anxious to-day to sell their holdings at $10 an acre less than they would have been induced to take for their land by any means before the 21st of September last. My hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) smiles incredulously, but of course he has no regard for the farmers on the prairie. His regard is limited to the lumber combine of British Columbia. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) said that reciprocity lay heavily on our minds, and this intelligent farmer in my constituency tells me in his letter that the wheat is lying heavy on the prairie. How can you expect to make Canada a great and successful country by means of a ridiculous economical fiscal policy of that kind? Can you not see that we are more likely to make Canada the prosperous country she ought to be by filling the stomachs of hundreds of poor families in the slums than by building up multi-millionaires in the palaces of our cities. I see that I am exciting some interest among hon. gentlemen opposite, and I have no doubt that in a little time we may succeed in getting some sound ideas accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, because they are not bad-hearted men, but just a little wrong-headed on this question.

Mr. STAPLES. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to read that letter?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition has it. I do not expect credence from my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples), but if he wants to challenge my statement I am quite willing to accept his challenge and let the House judge between us.

Mr. STAPLES. I only wish to point out that when an hon. gentleman refers to a letter or any other document, he may be called on to quote it and put it on record in 'Hansard.'

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). For my hon. friend's information and that of the House, I would point out that a few days, or it might have been a few weeks—and a few weeks are only a few days in the history of a country—before September 21 there were 600 inquiries sent to a real estate office as to the value of lands and the opportunities for investment and immigration to that part of the country, but since the election those inquiries have dwindled down all told to 24. I need hardly point out to hon. members of this House, whose fathers were pioneers in this country, trying to make an honest living out of it, that it is all very well to build up millionaires, but you will never build up a strong, prosperous country unless you have strong yeomen on your farms, and you cannot have these unless you give them a square and fair deal in this matter. Facts are what we want, and I have given a few.

I now come to close quarters with this proposition for the establishment of a tariff commission. It is the business of government and parliament to get the facts for themselves. Imagine Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Goschen, or Lord Randolph Churchill, or Mr. Low, or Sir Robert Peel, or Mr. Lloyd George, or Mr. Asquith, all Chancellors of the Exchequer within the last two generations—imagine their being told that they should appoint a commission to do those things which it is essentially the function of parliament and governments to do. When I came to this country Mr. Fielding with other members of the government, of which he was a distinguished member, were members of a temporary

commission—very different from that which we are appointing under this Bill, which is to be a permanent one. Mr. Fielding has gone from this House now and has left behind him no personal enmity but many strong admirers. When Mr. Fielding went about the country on that temporary commission he showed on many occasions that he knew more about the business of the men who appeared before him than they even knew themselves. In that respect he was superior to other members of the board which is a criticism that I know will commend itself to hon. gentlemen opposite. One gentleman who appeared before that commission in connection with the tariff on dried apples, said he was as quick as a needle and knew everything about that subject. It was his duty to know it for the information of his own department.

An hon. MEMBER. Dried apples?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). There are some interruptions, Mr. Speaker, which I must pass over in silence. We had in Mr. Fielding an example of greater industry than we have had in parliament this long while. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) introduced into this House a resolution in favour of free agricultural implements. If my memory serves me rightly my hon. friend corrected me before, and he now has an opportunity to set me right if I have not accurately stated his resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am sorry that I shall again have to correct my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). What then did my hon. friend do? I guarantee it is not what he is going to do now.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I would have thought that the hon. member for Red Deer, before discussing what I did would have tried to know what really was the resolution I did move on that occasion to which he refers. That resolution was to the effect that in my judgment the time had come when the agriculturists of Canada were entitled to substantial reduction on farm implements, such as would not, under the circumstances, be inconsistent with a protective tariff.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I stand corrected with all the grace possible, but let me tell my hon. friend that in every western constituency, where I took any part in the last election, certainly in my own, every three cent advocate—and I am not using that expression in a professional sense—of anti-reciprocity said that Mr. Borden, if elected to power, would give this immense boon of free agricultural implements.

I should not be surprised if there were three-cent advocates—again not in a professional sense—in the constituency of Portage la Prairie to promise some things of that kind on behalf of my hon. friend. However, the question about the terms of the resolution is a small one. My point is that he made a speech in support of that resolution, a speech which I do not know I have any great reason to admire. For he was not very kind to me at the beginning. He referred to me in a way that hurt me, and I have always regarded with favour a dictum of Cardinal Newman that a gentleman, even if he have not the term 'hon.' before his name, will not willingly wound any man. The hon. gentleman called me an 'exotic.' Mr. Chairman, I have observed that if ever I want a slur upon the person of the Englishman or the policy of England, I must always go to the English party in this country for it; I have not got it on the other side. However, I was not very much put out, I would like to tell my hon. friend. But I was a good deal more put out than I would have been if he had brought his resolution on at a time when we could all have debated it, for if I had had a chance to reply to him, I should not have been put out—at least, I would have tried to do as much putting out as was done to me. After all, the term was not a very worthy one. The question of a man's views on protection and free trade is not a question of whether those views do or do not come from England. If they do come from England, are they any worse for that in the eyes of hon. gentlemen who, forsooth, have just refused to have truck or trade with the Yankee, because they are such Englishmen? Why, then, should a man or opinion be called 'exotic,' because he or it comes from England? The question is, does the man stand for freedom, does he stand for truth, does he stand for justice? If he and his views stand for freedom, truth and justice, I want to tell my hon. friend that the more 'exotics' of that kind you get into Canada the better. But I want to tell him also that truth and justice and freedom are not exotics in Canada, though we could do with a little more freedom—a great deal more freedom—on the trade question.

We have a speech made by the hon. member, I listened to that speech, and it seemed to me very admirable and very convincing; that was not very difficult for he had a favourable audience when talking of reduction of tariffs. But he was kind to the House. He told us the mechanism of the speech, the process of its manufacture. He said: I collected these statements myself. So, we knew how he went about it. I am not criticising my hon. friend; he must not be uneasy, I am commending him. He did these things himself, he told us, and he produced an admirable and convincing speech. I believe it is unanswerable. I was not incommoded

by the man who came into my riding and spoke in favour of free agricultural implements, because I am in favour of free agricultural implements myself—as I am in favour of free everything else—But what greater credit could come to a young and ambitious member of parliament than to take up a case like that and prove it? Is not that his high duty and function as a member of parliament? What are these ministers going to do to earn their salaries when they get all these commissions appointed? Probably the most scholary and best informed individual Tory I have met in this country said to me: I do not see what responsible government is coming to; what are we doing, making all these commissions? I agreed most emphatically with what he said. It is nothing less than an infraction of the principles of responsible government—You are handing over your duties, as we are handing over our responsibilities, to a commission. We have the word of the Minister of Finance that he would in every case give very great weight to what the commissioners said. And why not? If you pay men anything from $5,000 to $7,500, they ought to have some weight,—they certainly get some weight. They are to be an advisory board. If they give you advice and you take it they fix your taxes. If they give you advice and you do not take it, you take back to the government and to parliament the responsibilities of which you have divested yourself and which you have given over to the commission. There is no getting away from the dilemma.

I was surprised to hear my right hon. friend the Prime Minister compare his commission to a court. The highest court in any British country is the high court of parliament itself; and when you make a smaller court—call it a commission or what you may—and give it the duty that parliament has performed within the British Empire from time immemorial, you reduce the dignity and effectiveness of parliament and make it very likely that the status of a member of parliament and a member of the government will be lowered. Parliament has been called not only 'the high court of parliament' but also the 'high inquest of the nation'—the high inquiring place, inquiring by the operations of their own minds. That is how they have earned the distinction that has crowned English statesmen in all generations, and that is how we have built up the greatest parliamentary institutions the world has ever seen.

Something has been said of the cost of production. My view is that there is a thing which a member of parliament has no right to talk about. For my part, I would begin to discuss the tariff at a much earlier point. And, personally, I do not want any one to tell me about the cost of production on my farm; that is my business; and, under freedom, I would run it and compete with the world. Talk about the defence of interests by acts of government—I wish men on this side of the Atlantic would study, more than they find time to do in these busy days, the works of some of the biggest men. Ralph Waldo Emerson, than whom no prose writer is more worthy of our attention, dealing with this very argument, said: If you want to make men do not protect them by the shabby artifices of cunning tariffs; let their work defend them, let their works speak for them. That is the 'cost of production' that I would like Canadians to go into.

I have tried to say a few words upon the principle of this Bill. I believe that it is emphatically a new and a wrong departure. We have heard something about it being borrowed from the United States, and borrowed from Germany. I can conceive of no smaller rôle for Canada than borrowing the discarded ideas of any country, and in borrowing higher protection to-day, not even the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) can say that he is likely to be borrowing very long from Germany. In Germany has happened an election only less in its consequence than that which happened when the repeal of the corn laws was carried in Britain. For the remarkable thing about these German elections is that the universal opinion of the population in the cities of that country that have returned Socialists is in favour of free trade. Their victories have been won even at the seat of royalty itself, there are 4,400,000 men, every one of them pledged to free trade, and thank God, also pledged to a reduction of armaments. We have had a scare on the question of armaments, which I do not think is affecting Canada so much now. But I am afraid that on this question of a Tariff Commission we have a scare with much more reality in it, but I shall only be too pleased if I happen to be wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) opened with a statement that I had rather offended him in what I said in January, 1911. I was not only surprised but I was quite unable to conceive anything that I said that could have given rise to that conviction in his mind. However, it appears that the word 'exotic' was not congenial to my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). It was very flattering. It means a rich, rare and tropical plant.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It is still more difficult to understand the offence that my hon. friend took from the word as it now appears

to him. There is no one less desirous of wounding the feelings of the hon. member for Red Deer than myself. Since the days that he entered the House I do not think that he has had a more attentive listener to his remarks than the humble member for Portage la Prairie. I have often marvelled, at and indeed I have studied to ascertain the secret, of that most unusual power by which he is able to make what appears, when read in 'Hansard,' as a very unconvincing speech when heard in the House itself spoken from his lips, most impressive. The term which I used of course strictly in the sense in which I understood it, that is to say as representing one born in another clime of thought, if I may so speak, and on another soil who has not yet reached in this country the stage where conditions are as familiar to him and as conducive to sane opinion as were the conditions in the old land. That was the sense in which I used it. My recollection of the word hovers around a very illustrious statesman, I think Robert Lowe, who first used that word in the English parliament, and Mr. Lowe, as the member for Red Deer will remember, was one of the most talented debaters that ever sat in the British House of Commons. In introducing this word he applied it to no less a distinguished institution than the established Church of England, and referred to it as an exotic plant on Irish soil. So the hon. member for Red Deer must realize that when I used the word in January, 1911, it was far from being intended in an offensive sense, because I have every respect for his opinions, as I have for the opinions of every other member of this House. The hon. member seems to think that I harbour some opinions antagonistic to English immigration. How could he take such an inference from anything I said? I am sure that we welcome in this country every Englishman, no matter how rabid a free trader he may be. When I study history, I find that the right hon. leader, whom the member for Red Deer so humbly, and at one time so servilely followed, only fifteen years ago, preached doctrines now firmly believed in by the member for Red Deer; and when I reflect how far he has advanced since coming into closer contact with conditions in Canada, I may hope that in the course of fifteen years longer he (the hon. member for Red Deer) will even become qualified for a Conservative administration. The member for Red Deer also regretted that he did not have an opportunity of replying to my remarks last January. Now it is quite true that the motion was moved on Wednesday, but the member for Red Deer well knows that on three subsequent occasions it was reached on the order paper, and on each occasion the right hon. leader of the opposition, then leading the government, moved the adjournment of the House. I think on two of those occasions, I myself, rose and protested, and urged that the right hon. gentleman should permit a further discussion of this question, but every one was silent on the government side, and no one was more silent than the member for Red Deer himself.

Mr. TURRIFF. Before this clause passes, I would like to say a word or two. I am opposed to this Bill for the particular reason that it is asked for, and is in the interest of only one class in the country. Outside of the manufacturers, no class of people have asked for a Tariff Commission. There is no class of people outside the manufacturers who can benefit by this Tariff Commission. This Tariff Commission is to be appointed by the government for only one purpose, there is only one purpose that it can serve, and that is to advance the interests of the manufacturers of Canada. The Manufacturers' Association time and again, year after year, have asked that this commission should be appointed. Now, if it were simply for the purpose of getting statistics and information, the Minister of Finance has had a good business experience, and he could very well, with the officials in his own department, procure all the information that he needs. If it was necessary to appoint more officials, he could do so; but he would have officials who would be more likely to be non-partisan than any men who will be appointed by this government.

I think that if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, was himself naming these commissioners they would be fairly well selected, but the Minister of Finance, if he will allow me to say so, is still somewhat young and innocent in political life, and I am afraid that it will not be only his voice that will carry weight, but that it will be the voice of the older sinners in that respect, who will want to make this commission an instrument for the purpose of helping out the manufacturers. Why is the government so ready to fulfil at once this particular promise that the Prime Minister made when he was touring the west? He made several other promises just as emphatically as he made the promise to appoint a Tariff Commission. We have not heard of any steps on the part of the right hon. gentleman or his government to carry out and fulfil those promises because some of those promises were in response to the demands and applications of the farmers of Canada. This particular one was made in response to the demand and application of the manufacturers of Canada and nobody else. The Minister of Finance acknowledged last Wednesday, when he introduced the Bill that in so far as he knew there had been no demand from anyone

else outside the manufacturers to have this commission appointed.

The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), a few moments ago, referred to what protection has done for the farmers. I can tell him what protection is doing for the farmers at the present time in my part of the country. Protection has done this for the farmers, that they have from 50,000 to 500,000 bushels of wheat lying in the open, the way you would pile broken stone to make a macadamized road, simply because the elevators are filled up with wheat, and the railways are paralyzed, and cannot supply cars; whereas, if the farmer were in absolutely the same position as the manufacturer he would have a market for his wheat, roads to carry it to market, and he would not be losing that wheat. We who represent agricultural constituencies are naturally afraid of what the effect of this Bill will be, it being a Bill absolutely in the interest of the manufacturers.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend explain to the House wherein the farmer differs from the manufacturer?

Mr. TURRIFF. In what regard?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend was pointing out that the manufacturer had a better opportunity than the farmer to ship his product. Will my hon. friend explain that?

Mr. TURRIFF. The manufacturer is not limited in his market. The manufacturer gets his raw material free of duty, but the farmer has his raw material taxed by the manufacturer, and does not get it free of duty. In that respect he is at a disadvantage.

Mr. BLAIN. The manufacturer does not sell his raw material, and if he wishes to send his manufactured goods to the United States he has to meet their tariff the same as the farmer has to meet their tariff.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend can twist around it as much as he likes, but the fact remains that the farmer has been asking for a market for his product. The manufacturer is not asking for a market for his product outside; he is asking to have the farmer hampered by keeping the duties up so that he will get the market at home. How are you helping the manufacturer, particularly when you are paralysing the purchasing power of the farmer? Where is the purchasing power of the farmer who has 1,000, or 2,000, or 5,000, or 10,000 bushels of wheat lying out with the snow and rain falling on it, and not allowed to send it to the market that is open to the wheat, to the market that wants the wheat and to the man who is willing to pay for the wheat, and who would send that money into Canada where it would go eventually to the manufacturer, because it resolves itself into this, as pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer, that all production ends in consumption? We are afraid of this Bill, because as the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, (Mr. Ames), told us the other day, the whole tendency of this government, with its well defined protective policy, is to increase protection. My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, shakes his head. What about the duties now being levied, and the taxes collected on the lumber the farmer uses? What about the engines that are coming in, and that came in at a lower rate of duty a few months ago? They now come in at a higher rate of duty. There is one case in which they have taken the duty off altogether. Why? They took it off at the request of the manufacturers, because it was levied on an article that the manufacturer uses.

Mr. AMES. These are merely preventing and correcting misapplications of the tariff.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, preventing and putting on another interpretation, but all in the interest of the manufacturers and against the interest of the farmers. That is why we are afraid of this Bill. Let us see what the manufacturers have been doing for a little while back. During the past three years there have been forty-one mergers; 190 individual companies were consolidated into these forty-one mergers.

Mr. AMES. Is the grain growers merger for the purpose of speculating in wheat included in that number?

Mr. TURRIFF. So far I have never heard of any grain growers merger. I have never heard of the grain growers merger, and if it were so the grain growers are not asking for protection to help them but they are asking for free trade. The grain growers have not issued millions and millions of dollars of watered stock on which they want to collect from the consumers of Canada, 6, 7, or 8 per cent—stock that is not represented by one dollar of investment; yet that is what the manufacturers are doing and that is what this Bill is going to help them to do. These forty-one amalgamations represent a capitalization of $334,938,266, or almost $350,000,000. Let us see how that works out. I will take one or two individual instances. I will take the first on the list and I am quoting now from the 'Monetary Times.' I find first on the list Amalgamated Asbestos, which is a merger that took stock in six other companies with a total capitalization of $3,550,000 and I know, as a matter of fact, that of that $3,550,000 a large amount was watered. What was the new capitalization?

Mr. STANFIELD. What are the bonds selling for to-day?

Mr. FOWLER. That was before the 21st September, was it not??

Mr. TURRIFF. If my hon. friends will just keep quiet for a moment they will get all the information they want. This amalgamation has a capitalization of twenty-five million dollars; and, for the three and-a-half million dollars the capitalization of the companies they took in, they issued eight million dollars worth of bonds, one million eight hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars preferred stock, and eight million one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars common stock. The object of that amalgamation was to enable the men who got the common stock for nothing, to collect dividends from the consumers on that common stock. That particular company has been a failure, as naturally they should, because they went a good deal too far and the bonds are selling at a very low figure to-day, and, so far as I know, the common stock and the preferred stock are worth nothing at all. Now, let us take the Ames-Holden-McCready, Limited, Montreal. That amalgamation took in the Ames-Holden Company with a capitalization of $2,500,000, and the James McCready Company, Limited, with a capitalization of $1,000,000, a total of $3,500,000. They capitalized that at $11,500,000, but they did not issue all that. They issued in bonds $1,000,000 and in preference stock $2,500,000, which covered exactly the capitalization of the two companies amalgamated. Then, they issued three million five hundred thousand dollars of common stock, all watered stock, not one dollar of value in it so far as anybody knows. And, this legislation that we are passing to-day is for the purpose of helping such amalgamations as I have mentioned to take out of the farmers and the consumers of Canada interest on that common stock that has been issued.

Mr. AMES. As the name of a company I have a connection with has been mentioned, may I say one word to the hon. member? I would like to say this: that if, upon investigation, it should be discovered by the Tariff Commission that the merger to which the hon. gentleman refers has in the slightest degree enhanced the selling price of the articles to the consumer, I shall be most willing to consent that the thirty per cent duty which the Liberals put on boots and shoes should be reduced to twenty-five per cent, as it was under the Conservative government.

Mr. TURRIFF. And so, the hon. member (Mr. Ames) excuses the whole thing on the ground that up to the present this amalgamation has not increased the cost of boots and shoes. That is a statement that I accept from him, but I have heard dozens and scores of people within the last year or so complain of the advanced price of boots and shoes. I am to-day wearing boots exactly the same as I have worn for years and I am now paying $1.00 a pair more than I paid for the same boots a few years ago. They are not made by the firm with which the hon. member is connected, but by others. You can go into any store in Ottawa to-day and price boots and shoes and I venture the assertion that they are twenty per cent or twenty-five per cent higher than they were two or three years ago.

Mr. AMES. We should be delighted to have the Tariff Commission investigate the cost.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is exactly what the hon. gentleman wants; he wants a Tariff Commission, and he wants to name the commissioners, and there is the whole trouble.

Mr. AMES. And if the government should change in the meantime, we would not drop the investigation on that account.

Mr. TURRIFF. I want to point out to the Minister of Finance that I do not care how honestly he may try he will not be able in the highly protected company he sits in at the council to get a commission that is not more or less partisan, and this commission is for the purpose of reporting and ascertaining whether these manufacturers such as I have mentioned, and hundreds of others ought to be entitled to get protection enough to enable them to pay a dividend on common stock which is really watered stock. A year ago when the cement merger business came up, what was the argument of these gentlemen? It was, that they were entitled to get dividends on their money. What was the argument in connection with the bounty on steel? Not long ago I was in Montreal and a friend of mine who bought some of that common stock was complaining. Some twenty million dollars of common stock was issued and never one dollar of it went into the treasury of the company, but the innocent purchaser of that stock to-day says: Why should I not get paid interest on that stock.

Mr. McCURDY. Does the hon. gentleman say that no cash was paid into the treasury of the Dominion Steel Company for that common stock?

Mr. TURRIFF. That is what I said, and I got circulars from the Dominion Iron and Steel Company's brokers offering the preference stock at $85, and $100 of common stock thrown in as a bonus, and it was advertised all over the Dominion.

Mr. McCURDY. I may state for the information of the hon. gentleman that a certain part of the issued common stock was paid for in cash; at least five million dollars was paid for.

Mr. TURRIFF. Will the hon. member deny my statement that I was offered preference stock at $85 with one share of common stock thrown in as a bonus, for nothing. I know that statement is correct because I had the document in my hands making the offer and it was sent to me by mail.

Mr. McCURDY. I do not know what offers you may have received, but the preference shares were offered for subscription at $85 without any common stock bonus. I am sure the hon. member for Assiniboia is entirely mistaken in his statement regarding the preference stock. I would say further that part of the Dominion Steel Company's issued common stock was paid for in cash, $5,000,000 at a substantial price.

Mr. TURRIFF. May I ask the hon. member what the five million dollars' worth of common stock he has referred to was sold at?

Mr. McCURDY. About 60 I think.

Mr. TURRIFF. My information is that it was sold at 15.

Mr. McCURDY. That may be some additional cash which went into the treasury of the company.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, I do not care what the particulars are in any one particular case, but I do say that the whole tendency of these mergers is to put out millions and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of common stock, just exactly as in the case of the two companies I have mentioned, and the consumers and the farmers of Canada are expected to pay enhanced prices in order to pay dividends on that common stock which does not represent one dollar in the treasury, and that is all watered practically and should never have been issued. And, the intention of this legislation is to help the manufacturers by having a commission that will be favourable to them. That is what they are asking for. They are asking for a commission to get this information for the Minister of Finance. We all know that if you send out two or three different persons to collect information and make a report they will each differ as to the facts and possibly present reports from their own point of view, but when you have a commission working, as my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) stated, for a government that has well known protective principles, you will have their report and the evidence, and the manner of taking the evidence, all with protectionist ideas and leaning towards higher protection.

So far as I can judge from the Bill, they will take the evidence that suits them, any that does not suit them, they do not need to record, and any evidence they take that does not suit the government, the Minister of Finance can place before the House or not, as he likes. There is nothing in this Bill to state that all information and all findings of the commission will be laid before parliament for the use of the members and of the people of Canada.

Let us see one or two more companies that have amalgamated. Let us take the Dominion Canners, Limited, of Hamilton, Ontario. That company absorbed a large number of canning and preserving companies in Ontario. These companies had a total capitalization of $1,574,000. The companies were merged into the Dominion Canners, Limited, of Hamilton, Ontario, with a capitalization of $12,500,000, and for the $1,574,000 of combined capital of all those companies the Dominion Canners issued $1,500,000 in bonds,, $2,100,000 in preferred stock, and $2,100,000 of common stock. The balance of all this stock is in the treasury and it is to their interest, to the interest of the men who were in all these mergers, to have this Tariff Commission, and they are the men who have demanded it from the government, they are the men who want it, who will benefit by it. Nobody else wants it, nobody else has asked for it, and nobody else will benefit by it. The government is, I presume, carrying out pre-election pledges to these people, they are now delivering their part of the bargain.

Mr. GOODEVE. Would it not be to the interest of the consumer to have a statement of what these men are taking out of the consumer? That is the object of the commission.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, and the Customs Act provides that a judge of one of the High Courts should investigate that, but this Bill takes it out of the hands of the judge, and puts it into the hands of partisans appointed by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) and his friends.

Mr. ARTHURS. How many investigations were there into combines since the introduction of the Act?

Mr. TURRIFF. The Minister of Labour will have all of that information in his department. The paper companies were investigated by a judge and the duties were reduced in consequence. So my hon. friend will see how much better it has been to leave that part of it as it is, to leave the investigations in the hands of an independent judge, instead of men

who may, or may not, be partisans, but who are much more likely to be than not.

Then there is the Matthews-Laing Company. This is an amalgamation of the George Matthews Company with a capital of $1,000,000; the Park Blackwell Company with a Capital of $500,000; and the Laing Packing and Provision Company, Limited, with a capital of $500,000, a total of $2,000,000. This company has been formed with a capital of $7,000,000 and they have issued in bonds $1,200,000, in preferred stock, $2,000,000 and in common stock, $1,250,000. You cannot buy a dollar of the common stock on the market unless you buy some of the preferred stock or bonds as well. If you buy the preferred stock they will give you a bonus of common stock and allow you to buy a further proportion of common stock but they will not sell one dollar's worth of common stock to a man who is not prepared to buy the preferred stock as well, showing that they expect, although they have capitalized at almost twice the capital of the companies that formed the merger, that the common stock will become very valuable. Will any one say that that has not had an effect on the price of meats? Any one in Ottawa will tell you what has taken place in the last few months in reference to the cost of meat and other products controlled by these men.

These are the men from whom the commission will get information; they will give any information they please to the minister and the minister will give any information he pleases to the House. If the leader of the government had been as ready to carry out other promises he made prior to the election, his course would have been much better received throughout Canada because in all parts of the Dominion you have consumers, but you have not always manufacturers. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) pointed out that the manufacturers had put their money into these concerns. Will any one say that the farmer has not put his money into his business, and for every dollar engaged in manufacturing interests, how many hundreds are engaged in agriculture? I am not prepared to say what the proportion is, but I know there is a great deal more invested in agricultural pursuits than in manufacturing.

Mr. BLAIN. My point was that we should have protected the farmer as well.

Mr. TURRIFF. But the manufacturer is asking for this commission and he gets it, and the farmer has asked to have the protection taken off and he cannot get it.

Mr. BLAIN. When?

Mr. TURRIFF. They asked for free trade in natural products of the farm.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, take the requests made by all agricultural societies throughout the Dominion of Canada, and they are practically all on the lines of getting free trade in natural products. Take the request made by all agricultural societies throughout the Dominion, and they are all practically in favour of free trade in natural products.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, the great majority of them anyway.

Mr. AMES. Paid agitators.

Mr. TURRIFF. If my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) chooses to call the 700 or 800 farmers who appeared in this Commons chamber a year or two ago paid agitators, he may do so and let him take their judgment on what he says. They were not paid agitators—not one quarter of, or one tenth as much as the men the Manufacturers' Association sent around to get their ideas put into force. The manufacturers are the men who have the money to hire agitators.

Mr. STEVENS. Did not that large delegation of representative farmers ask the late government to remove the duty on agricultural implements, and did the late government do it?

Mr. TURRIFF. They asked to have the duty taken off agricultural implements and they also asked to have reciprocity in farm products with the United States, also to have the British preference increased and a general reduction in the duties. Is my hon. friend, who interrupted me, prepared to give them what they ask?

Mr. STEVENS. Did the late government acquiesce in their request for a reduction or abolition of the duties on farm implements?

Mr. TURRIFF. The farmers did ask for a reduction on agricultural implements, and my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who was then leading the government introduced a measure reducing the duty on agricultural implements but it was defeated by hon. gentlemen opposite.

An hon. MEMBER. How much?

Mr. TURRIFF. It was in my judgment not sufficient but more than the farmers are likely to get from the present government.

Mr. STEVENS. Is it not true that the late government reduced the duty 2½ per cent? And is it not also true that official valuation of binders coming to this country prior to that was $80 each and that subsequently that was raised to $160, so

that the farmer paid more duty than he did before?

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend from Vancouver shows that he does not know much about farming and agricultural implements. In the one case he is speaking about the duty on a six foot binder and in the other on an eight foot binder. The resolution before the House is not in the interests of the farmer and as a representative of the agricultural interests I am opposed to it.

Mr. FOWLER. I have been somewhat amused, in common with other members, at the lectures we have been receiving from the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). He has produced no facts on which to ground his arguments. He has dealt entirely with suspicions and inuendoes in which he has considerable experience, and in this connection he reminds me of what took place some years ago when he was an official of the then government of the day. At that time he had something to do with the opening of tenders, and on a certain occasion—I cite this to show the suspicion which certain persons who were tenderers entertained of the good faith of the hon. gentleman—a certain gentleman from Simcoe, or some part of Ontario, who had submitted a tender for certain timber lands insisted, so strongly did he suspect the good faith of the hon. gentleman, on being present when the tenders were opened. This hon. gentleman, who now poses as such a staunch friend of the farmers, reminds me of a certain individual who for many years had been engaged in the liquor traffic and had made a large fortune in selling liquor, and who, after he had acquired his fortune, became a very strong temperance advocate, but he took good care, while insisting on the necessity of prohibition, to hang on to the fortune he had acquired in the liquor traffic. The hon. gentleman reminds me very much of that temperance advocate in the state of Massachusetts.

Mr. TURRIFF. As my hon. friend has referred to me while I was an official of the Department of the Interior, I may be allowed a moment to reply. My hon. friend and others who were then in the Cabinet, were very ready to make insinuations and cast suspicions, but when an investigation was called there was not one of them who had the courage to summon me as a witness, although I was waiting at the door day after day, demanding to be called, and give evidence. If my hon. friend wishes to revive any of these old matters he is at perfect liberty to do so. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) was equally free with his insinuations. He went out to my constituency with his magic lanterns and insinuations, and at every place where he held meetings I doubled my majority.

Mr. AMES. It knocked out some of you all the same.

Mr. TURRIFF. I noticed at the next session of parliament that my hon. friend never opened his mouth in the House, he was in such bad odour with his own party. If the hon. gentleman wants to go over that ground again, well and good. Let him come out again with his insinuations and his magic lantern and my majority will be still further increased. I repeat that if any man wants to make any charge against me in connection with the opening of tenders, or the handling of Crown timber lands in the northwest, or anything else in connection with my official career, I shall be most happy to meet him and prove him a falsifier and his charges as lies.

Mr. FOWLER. If the hon. gentleman was not called as a witness before the investigation to which he has referred, it was no doubt out of kindness to him, because the committee knew the kind of evidence he was prepared to give, and did not want to hear him.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONK. I had intended moving the House into Committee of Supply. There are two resolutions in the Department of Public Works, and I wish to complete the work of this department so as to open the door for another department to take up its estimates to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we ought to adjourn now. The time has come, when we ought to adjourn.

Mr. MONK. If the House is not disposed to pass these two resolutions—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know whether it is so disposed or not.

Mr. McKENZIE. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) will remember that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) specially wanted the resolutions to stand as he had something to say about them. He is not here—

Mr. MONK. They stood at his request.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes, and naturally he would not expect that they would come up at this time of night.

Mr. MONK. I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will we take up this same discussion to-morrow?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 13, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

APPOINTMENT OF A TARIFF COMMISSION.

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

On section 4,—matters to be investigated.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Would the Minister of Finance kindly explain the difference between subsection 2 and subsection 4 of section 4? In one case the commission may make certain inquiries under the direction of the minister and in the other when they are authorized to do so by the Governor General in Council.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Both sections are purposely broad and designed to cover matters that have not been particularly specified. Take subsection 2. It is a matter of common experience in the Department of Finance for an application to be made for the lowering or abolition of the duty with regard for instance to certain machinery on the ground that it is not manufactured in Canada and is not likely to be. That is a matter of fact which might very well be referred by the minister to the commission for a report as to the probability of that certain article being manufactured in Canada. Subsection 4 is also designedly broad in its terms. It is for the purpose of covering more important matters, for example the chance of increasing trade with certain other countries and the effect that certain tariffs might have. It is purposely broad so that the commission may be utilized, under the instruction of the Governor General in Council, to report upon matters of that kind.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think the matter is practically all covered by subsection 1 with the various subsections. I do not see any object in giving the commission the general power in subsection 1 or giving the minister the general power in subsection 2 or giving the Governor General in Council the general power set out in subsection 4.

The minister has informed the House that this is not only to be a permanent tariff board, but, so far as it is possible to make it so, an independent tariff board. There is no doubt that he has secured for it a reasonable degree of permanency, for under section 3 of the Bill it is provided that the commissioners are to be appointed for a definite period of 5 years and cannot be removed except for cause. But I think that the independence of the members of the commission is challenged by every subsection of section 4. The board has no power to initiate anything, no power to take a single step without the special instructions of the Minister of Finance or the Governor in Council. I understood, when the Bill was first brought in that the board, was an independent and permanent board of inquiry, and would be instituted to make, apart from any special instructions from anybody, the inquiries set out in subsection 1 of section 4. But when we come down to analyse the sections of the Bill, we find that the functions of the board are subject to the direction of the minister. They cannot enter upon an inquiry, they cannot make a suggestion, they cannot do any of the things which the Bill contemplates they should do, and which the public believe they are to do and which are made the main excuse for the introduction of the Bill. Now, I would suggest to the minister that the words in section 4, 'under the direction of the minister,' be struck out. The clause now reads:

> 4. In respect of goods produced in or imported into Canada the commission shall, under the direction of the minister, make inquiry as to——

But why limit it to the minister. Is it not just as has been predicted in the earlier part of this discussion that this commission was designed by the government and the Finance Minister to aid its own purposes and his own purposes in tariff matters, and is not for the House or the public of Canada at all? Is it not so that the whole design and scope of the Bill is to furnish the Finance Minister and his party with, special information, in disregard of the rights of the House and of the people in general to receive that information? To my mind, the Bill would be far less objectionable if these words were eliminated as I have suggested. Though the board must be, and I presume will be under the Bill, established by the government, it should have a certain amount of independence to be able to inquire here, there or elsewhere without any directions or instructions from the minister. If you give it that power, that freedom of action, it will have a certain confidence, and, I think it will gain greater respect in the country than it will otherwise achieve. Now, in passing to the concluding words of subsection 1, I would suggest to the minister that he also strike out the words 'and report to the minister.' Without such an amendment, see how this plan works out: Here is a board of commissioners, a permanent

and so-called independent board of commissioners who cannot make a move in gaining the information or facts which the government deems it important to know, which cannot even start an investigation without the positive direction of the minister. And when that investigation is completed, the report must be made to the minister. The matter starts with the minister, and, so far as this clause goes, it ends with the minister. Now, if these facts are essential to be brought out, and if this information is necessary, and we want facts, we want information, the more accurate and fuller that information the better. But where do the members of this House come in; where do the people of the country come in? I am very strongly of opinion that if this commission is to report, it should report to parliament and not to the minister. It may be beyond the power of members of this House either to get the result of the inquiry or the evidence on which the results are based if the Bill is allowed to go in its present form. It may be that a large fund of information will be available to the minister and his friends, but that surely is not the object of the Bill. It should not be the object, and if it is not, I hope the minister will consent to the elimination of these objectionable words. I ask him in all seriousness if he will consent to strike out the words in subsection 1 of section 4, 'under the direction of the minister,' and the concluding words of subsection 1, 'and report to the minister,' and in the latter case, replace the deleted words with 'and report to parliament.'

Now, I can understand that if a commission of independent men, men properly selected—not such men as were suggested by my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) but well qualified, independent men —the information gathered by them may be of the greatest benefit to every member of this House. We on this side contend for that. We agree that the government cannot go too far in obtaining accurate and complete information on the subject set out in these subsections; but we do object to these facts being elicited by any secret process and only by special directions. We object to any limitation placed upon the power of the commission to inquire. And I think we are all interested that the report when it is made, and the evidence when it is collected, shall be available, and that the report of the commission shall be a report to the parliament of Canada instead of to the minister. I think that is a businesslike proposition. I make it sincerely, and I hope the minister will give it his serious consideration. It may be necessary, if he does not take that view of it, to move in the matter, but I hope that the suggestion may meet with his approval. I would like to hear from him on the subject.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) that a commission of this kind, and the duties that are allotted to it, must be under the direction of some minister not so far as their methods in making the inquiry are concerned—because in making that inquiry they will be acting independently of any direction from the government—but an inquiry into a particular matter might be more urgent, more insistent in the opinion of those charged with the duties of government than some other matter. Therefore, in view of such considerations it was entirely necessary that a commission of this kind should be under the direction of some department of the government. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that his own leader, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) yesterday told us that all this information could be better acquired by appointing statisticians in connection with one of the departments, that of Trade and Commerce, for example. It is perfectly obvious to my hon. friend, I am sure, that, if he is in accord with the suggestion of his leader, these statisticians would be acquiring information which would be the exact equivalent of the information to be obtained by this commission. With regard to the publicity for which the hon. member is so anxious, the statistics acquired in the manner suggested by the leader of the opposition would be reported to the minister and would come down to parliament in the ordinary course. There is nothing more in the provisions of this section than what has been already suggested and approved by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition. There is no provision in the Bill for any secrecy, except so far as the principle of secrecy has already been applied, by the late government and all preceding governments, with regard to the business affairs of this country. In respect of that provision, the Bill is only carrying out a well recognized principle of the government. There is no such provision in the Bill as that which my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I take issue with my right hon. friend's explanation of the section, and also with his statement in regard to the position of the right hon. the leader of the opposition. It is one thing to have a statistical bureau or a statistical branch of the Department of Finance under the eye of the minister. That is the proper course, and one which in this instance should have been adopted. That is the well established British way of obtaining statistical information. I have heard it stated that the trade statistics of Great Britain are the most convenient and most accurate published by any country in the world. They

are collated and published under the authority of the Board of Trade, the president of which is a member of the Cabinet. Why not adopt the British system in preference to this cheap Yankee device? You could adopt that system simply by establishing, in the Department of Finance or in some other department, a bureau manned with a sufficient staff to collect all this information. In that way you would have the doctrine of responsibility fully carried out; you would have no independent commission to pass on matters on which the minister or the government should pass. What is now proposed is a system modelled in fact upon the United States system. You appoint a permanent board the members of which are not clerks in any sense of the word. They are commissioners with high standing; you have exalted and dignified them, and you are preparing to pay them handsome salaries; you are giving them very wide and high powers; but these men, an independent board appointed for the purpose of acquiring information, cannot move hand or foot until the Minister of Finance beckons to them what to do; and upon getting the word from him as to how they shall proceed, there is no doubt that they will proceed in accordance with his wishes and those of the government of the day. Why not let this board have powers broad enough to enter upon an inquiry without the direction of anybody? I can understand that cases may arise where information is required speedily. Subsection 2 provides for that, and the minister can get the special information he requires. But all that is contained in subsections 'a', 'b,' 'c,' 'd,' 'e,' 'f' and 'g' should be open to the commissioners, and it should be their duty to enter upon the inquiry and continue it to the end, and make the result of that inquiry public, without instructions from the minister or the government. That is what we are establishing them for, and I think it would improve the Bill very much, in the judgment of the House and the country, if they were given that free hand. They cannot do anything but inquire and report. They have no power to make recommendations or to offer any opinion. We want the information; why not give them a free hand to start in, uncontrolled by the desire of the minister to send them on this expedition or that? The more I look into this Bill the more I realize the almost impossibility of obtaining the information which the government and the House would desire to obtain with regard to facts and conditions as they exist in Canada or elsewhere. Now, 'elsewhere' is going to be the troublesome part of it. The Board of Tariff Commissioners in the United States have realized that.

They have had the greatest difficulty in foreign countries in getting satisfactory information, although the United States has a consular system in regard to trade and commercial matters superior to any of the consular systems in the world. In every country, and practically at every port, there has been located a United States consul. The duties of these officers are not so much diplomatic like those of British consular agents. They are to a large extent trade and commercial agents, and one can gain a great deal of information from a persual of the reports of the United States consular agents in Germany, France, Belgium and Holland. I had occasion to go through them two or three years ago in connection with a proposal in regard to technical education, and I found that they dealt almost wholly with trade and commercial matters. The United States consular system is well developed throughout Europe; but, for all that, according to the statement of the Chairman of the United States Tariff Board, they have found the greatest possible difficulty in acquiring accurate information as to conditions, the cost of raw material, wages, transportation and the like in European countries. The Finance Minister is going to be confronted with the same difficulty to a much greater extent than have the Tariff Commissioners of the United States. It may be a comparatively easy matter to send representatives to Great Britain and ascertain these facts there; it may be a comparatively easy matter to obtain fairly accurate information in this country. Greater difficulty will be experienced in the United States. There is no power to compel any one in a foreign country to give us this information, and United States manufacturers will not be the easiest men to deal with when the Canadian commissioners seek information from them. But when they go to European countries, where we have no consular agencies, and where we have few trade agencies, I believe the difficulties will be almost insurmountable, and the information obtained will be highly inaccurate and thoroughly unreliable. I do not consider that much information of value will be obtained from an investigation in foreign countries; but I do believe that a great deal may be obtained in Canada, in Great Britain, and possibly in the United States, which will be of benefit to us in the future in determining upon our tariff legislation. Now cannot that all be gone into by the Board of Tariff Commissioners without any direction from the minister or the government, or from any other person? It is their duty to do it, they are there for that purpose, and why not let them go ahead, without any special direction, and without limiting their report to the Minister of Finance, but giving it to the public in general?

Mr. AMES. I think if you examine this clause 4 carefully, you will see that it proceeds from the lesser to the greater, that the first and second paragraph are more narrow, and more definite, and more specific than the 3rd and 4th paragraphs, and that the 5th paragraph really refers wholly to clause 4. Now let us see just how this works out in principle. Who is it that brings a Tariff Bill into this House, that presents the case for the revision of our tariff? It is the Minister of Finance. Clause 1 and clause 2 naturally give to the Minister of Finance the power of direction over that body of experts, that will collect for him the facts and information which he will need in order to make his draft Bill relating to the tariff, which draft Bill, I have no doubt, he submits to his colleagues which his colleagues, when satisfied with it, as a government, submit to the House. Therefore, whether we express it in the Bill or not, it will be the Finance Minister who will have the general charge and direction over that Tariff Commission, and it will be through the Finance Minister that that commission makes its report to the Cabinet and through the Cabinet to parliament. We may or may not specifically state in the Bill that it shall be under the direction and control of the Finance Minister, but whether we do that or not, that will actually be the case.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Why not say that the commission is independent?

Mr. AMES. Now, as to making the commission independent, I think that hon. members will see that if there is anything that will lead to confusion and general dislocation, it is that proposition made by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). This Tariff Commission, if they are to accomplish anything, will have to take up the work in a regular and definite way, and naturally the way that they will go about it, is to take up in order such schedules in the tariff, as in the judgment of the government call for first and earliest attention. Now there is no other body but the government of the country who can take upon themselves the authority to say that the wool schedule, for instance, or the iron schedule, or the cotton schedule shall first occupy the attention of this commission.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That is provided for by subsection 2.

Mr. AMES. Therefore, I say it will be necessary for the government to say to the commission, we desire that an inquiry shall first be directed upon such and such schedules, and surely through no one but the Finance Minister will these commands actually be given to the Tariff Commission, and when they prepare their report, whether it is stated so in specific words or not, it will be actually made to the Finance Minister and through the Finance Minister to the government.

Mr. GUTHRIE. If the hon. gentleman will read subsection 2, would not that meet the very objection he is urging to my argument? That gives the Finance Minister the power, when he desires to bring in a tariff, to investigate certain things. But I want to point out this contingency: Suppose there is a demand on the part of the public to have a certain industry investigated, for instance, the shoe manufacturing industry, and the Finance Minister does not think it should be investigated. Should not the Tariff Commission of their own motion, be entitled to go into that question, under subsection 2?

Mr. AMES. If anything is to be accomplished by this Tariff Commission in the way of gradually accumulating a library of facts and definite information that will serve as a basis, not only for the first tariff Bill, but for all subsequent tariff measures, they must proceed in an orderly manner. Naturally there will be but one authority to which applications for dealing with specific subjects will be made, and that is the government, and naturally there must be some special commission that will determine in the various claims which are made which claim is the most urgent and of the most immediate importance. Somebody has to take the responsibility of saying to that commission: You will study such and such subject first, and such and such subjects next, and you will report to us from time to time as you complete your inquiries in these various categories, and then we shall determine what action to take, and as to whether that action shall be immediate or deferred. You will surely get into confusion if you sit here and say to them, Go away, start on any subject you like, take your own time, study any subject you please, and report at any time you please, and we in the meantime will go on with our business. This government will have to decide on what subjects they consider tariff legislation is of most urgent importance. Therefore, they will say to that commission: Devote your energies first to such and such a subject, and when you have dealt with that, go on with the other schedules. I think I am right in saying that in the course of two or three years every item in our tariff schedules, we may reasonably expect, will be submitted to the consideration of this commission, they will send in probably a dozen volumes of reports in due course to the government, and in due course these reports will reach this parliament; but the order

they will take will have to be determined by the government, and through the Finance Minister indicated to this Tariff Commission. Now clauses 1 and 2 deal with a limited, definite and narrow sphere of activity, in which the order would be determined by the Minister of Finance. Clauses 3 and 4 are much wider, they are of a general character, and in 3 and 4 the indication comes from the Governor in Council, and probably the report will be made to the Cabinet direct. Those are matters somewhat out of the routine, not a consecutive investigation of tariff schedules. Number 3, I think, relates to combines, 4 relates to trade treaties, and those, as they from time to time come before the House and require attention, will be referred to the commission only when the government think it is of sufficient importance to interrupt them in their regular work, and ask them to take up these special subjects from time to time as they arise.

Now, as to foreign countries, the hon. gentleman suggests that we shall be able to obtain no information in foreign countries. In the first place, let me point out that the United States is having no difficulty in getting information from a great many sources. That information can be obtained by us through consular assistance, we can get it through the assistance of the British Embassy. Further than that there is no reason why we should not avail ourselves of some of the information that has been acquired by other commissions of investigation; we will not be above taking advantage of any investigations that the American Tariff Commission have carried on abroad, which, in the opinion of our commissioners, will be of use to this government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The more we proceed with this Bill the more it becomes apparent that we are moving in a vicious circle. Everybody agrees that we should have information that will be of assistance to the government, as well as to the public generally, to enable them to form a correct judgment upon tariff matters. This is a general proposition to which nobody objects. There are two methods of obtaining this information. It was suggested from this side of the House that we might employ a statistical bureau to be attached to one of the departments, the Department of Finance or the Department of Trade and Commerce, and that this information might be collected, as it is collected in Britain, to some extent in this country, and to a larger extent in the United States.

A statistical bureau would have been under the jurisdiction and control of one of these departments and would have done everything that is now suggested by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). But, this idea has been set aside. They are not satisfied to have a statistical bureau. The idea has been spread, and nobody has spread it more widely or solemnly than the hon. member for St. Antoine himself that we should have a big, independent commission composed of the biggest men we can find for the task. If we are to have such an independent commission, if it has been settled by the great majority, that we shall have such a commission, and that it shall not be merely a statistical bureau under ministerial responsibility, I take it that it should be a very high toned commission and that it should be composed of the biggest men, to use the language of my hon. friend, that the country can afford. Well then, if we are to have such a commission, if it is to have the character which the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, wants to give it, is he of the opinion that this commission should be under the control of the minister as any clerk might be? That is what he wants it to be. He wants these big men, the biggest men the country can supply, to be placed under the jurisdiction and control of the minister, to obey his commands, as they might be given to any clerk in the Department of Finance, or in the Department of Trade and Commerce. I would have been satisfied to have had the work done by clerks as it is done elsewhere, but that is not the idea of the hon. member for St. Antoine. He has combated that idea, he wants the biggest men the country can afford to come here at $7,000 a year, and be under the control of the minister as any clerk might be. The idea which has been suggested by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Guthrie) is that if we are to have such a commission, it should be an independent commission, to undertake this work and that the commands should go to the commission not from a minister but from parliament, itself, to do the work which it is suggested to do. It has to do what?—To collect information which would be reported to parliament, available to everybody, to the minister, of course, primarily, I admit, but to everybody else, also. The commission would do that work and at the end of the year we would have a volume giving us all the information that it had collected. The command goes to the commission to do what?—to collect information regarding:

(a) the price and cost of raw materials in Canada and elsewhere, and the cost of transportation thereof from the place of production to the place of use or consumption;

(b) the cost of production in Canada and elsewhere;

(c) the cost of transportation from the place of production to the place of use or

consumption, whether in Canada or elsewhere;

(d) the cost, efficiency and conditions of labour in Canada and elsewhere;

(e) the prices received by producers, manufacturers, wholesale dealers, retailers and other distributors in Canada and elsewhere;

(f) all conditions and factors which affect or enter into the cost of production and the price to the consumers in Canada;

(g) generally, all the conditions affecting production, manufacture, cost and price in Canada as compared with other countries.

If the character of this commission is to be maintained, as we conceive it should be, since we have discarded the other method which I mentioned a moment ago, I think the commission should not be subjected to the control of the minister or of the Governor in Council, but of parliament alone. It must collect that information, put it in book form, and report to parliament.

Mr. AIKINS. Assuming that the government wishes to formulate a policy when parliament is not sitting, and that the information has already been collected by the board, to whom should the board report in order that the government might formulate its policy?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The commission will report to parliament, the government will formulate its policy upon it, and I shall have, like anybody else, as a member of parliament, the right to criticise the action taken by the government. What I contend is, that if you are to depart from the principle which has been adopted elsewhere, of having information of this character collected under ministerial responsibility by a statistical bureau, then the commission must be under the direct control of parliament. It should not be possible for the government to interfere with its work. If the government, as was suggested a moment ago by the hon. member for St. Antoine, wanted to have some particular information upon some point, the minister, under section 2, could say: I want a special report upon this or that point. If somebody comes to parliament and asks to have some matter investigated if somebody comes, as was suggested by the minister a moment ago, and asks for a duty upon such an article, or the removal of the duty upon another article, and it becomes a question whether or not that article is manufactured in Canada, the minister may refer the matter to the commission, and get the information in that way. If the Governor in Council wants to have some information upon some other matter, then again, he can apply to the commission. What I suggest to my hon. friends is, that if they want to be consistent in this matter, and if we are to have all we expect to have from this commission and the work that is intended to be done by it, and which is enumerated in clause 4, the commission should not be subject to interference by the minister. The commission should be primarily responsible to parliament. I repeat that this does not prevent the minister or the Governor-in-Council, if they want to have special information upon any matter, from applying to the commission, and securing that information, but I feel very strongly that if we are to have this commission as it is intended, and as we always understood it to be, an independent commission, it should not be liable to be controlled by the—I will not say caprice,—but by the authority of the minister. It should be under the control of parliament and of parliament alone, primarily. My hon. friend to use his own words, states that this commission should be composed of the biggest men the country can give us. Does he believe that, if we have a commission composed of the most eminent business men of the city of Montreal, they will be satisfied to be treated as clerks, under the Department of Finance or the Department of Trade and Commerce? Is it not better, if we are to have the benefit of their business ability, training and knowledge, that they should go on untrammelled and prepare for the next session of parliament a report on these important subjects which are enumerated in section 4?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has returned to the question of whether it is advisable to have a bureau or a Tariff Commission. One would think that the idea of a Tariff Commission had never come to the mind of my right hon. friend before. I desire to call the attention of the House to the report of a speech which my right hon. friend delivered in the City of Montreal in October, 1908, on which occasion he was the honoured guest of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, about which we have heard so much during the last two days. I intend to read some extracts from what he is reported to have said. Discussing the woollen tariff he said:

As you know—you have referred to it, it has been part of your debates—you approached the government during the last session to have an increase in the woollen duties, and I will preface whatever remarks I may have to offer now by the fact that I was not a member of the Tariff Commission which prepared the tariff which was adopted in 1907.

That was a commission or committee of ministers.

The members of the commission were my colleagues, Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance, Sir Richard Cartwright, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Paterson, the Minister of Customs and Mr. Brodeur, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

When they brought in their report, and when they embodied it in the form of the

Act of 1907, I think it was pretty generally accepted at that time that they had reached about a happy medium, and taking it all in all, that the tariff was fairly satisfactory. But it so happened that in the course of a few months, the woollen industry, which it must be admitted has not been flourishing very much for the last few years, became embarrassed and was brought into very serious difficulties. Then we were approached to make some concessions to increase the duties.

I understood the right hon. gentleman to say yesterday that he was a free trader, or that he believed in tariff for revenue only, and if I am under a wrong impression as to that I would like to be corrected now. Well, at this time, the right hon. gentleman had been asked to consider the question of the tariff duties with regard to the woollen schedule, and he said to his audience further on in his speech:

Why is it that you cannot produce what is produced by the British manufacturer? Well, Sir, if it be that the conscience of the Canadian manufacturer is too severe, that they will give only pure wool and nothing else, I say that is not business. I tell you I am not a business man, but the first rule of the business man is to give to his customer what he wants to buy. And if that be true, why is it that you do not give him that cloth which he wants to buy? That is the reason and it seems to me to be a very strong argument. This was the answer which was given to me upon the very anxious inquiries which I made —the answer that was given to me was this —the British manufacturer can produce the cheap article of cloth from East India wool and from cheap waste which he gets at a price which the Canadian manufacturer cannot have. Well, Sir, that is a satisfactory answer, so far as I am concerned.

I am sorry my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) is not here; yesterday he said the end of production was consumption and I set out that doctrine of the hon. member for Red Deer against the statement of the right hon. the leader of the opposition when he says that, so far as he is concerned, the answer is satisfactory:

If it be true that the Canadian consumer wants that cloth, if it be true that the British manufacturer can have the raw material of that cloth cheaper than the Canadian manufacturer can have it in Canada, that is a condition of things which is in itself one to be considered, and which cannot be overlooked.

Why cannot it be overlooked; what is wrong about the British manufacturer obtaining this raw material more cheaply than the Canadian manufacturer; if there is anything in the theory advanced yesterday by my right hon. friend, where is he concerned in the cost of the raw material to the British manufacturer? I say that this statement here does not square with the policy laid down by the right hon. gentleman yesterday. He wants to know what the cost of the raw material is to the British manufacturer, and he says that if it is lower than the cost to the Canadian manufacturer, then, so far as he is concerned, that is a satisfactory answer. But this speech of the right hon. gentleman indicates a good deal more than his views with regard to the tariff, and, he proceeds to say:

How are we to proceed with this?

Remember they are discussing the question as to whether there shall or shall not be an increase in duty. To hear the right hon. gentleman yesterday one would naturally think that the minister should inquire into it, probably personally, or to some extent in his office, but this is what the right hon. gentleman said when he was addressing an audience of business men:

How are we to proceed with this? Gentlemen, I read to-day very carefully the discussion which has taken place in your convention during the last two days, and I noticed that a friend of mine, whom I do not see in this audience, but I believe he must be there amongst you somewhere, stated that there was a remedy at hand and that remedy was to send to England and to Germany a commission not of politicians, a commission not of party heelers, but a commission of good substantial business men.

In other words, the right hon. gentleman is considering the question of what he should do with regard to tariff increases and what is it that he suggests? Why, precisely what is suggested in this Bill: that instead of the government acting through its ministers, busy with other things, not able to go and make an investigation themselves, that the investigation be made by a commission of substantial business men. Yesterday we heard from some of my hon. friends opposite that this Tariff Commission should consist of a farmer, of some one representing the labouring interests, and of some one representing the manufacturing interests, but I wonder what these hon. gentlemen would have to say to a commission of good substantial business men to inquire into the situation and report, as is advocated here by their leader. Then the right hon. gentleman continued to say:

Why, sir, I subscribe to that with both my hands.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Please read again what I said before that.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). This is what my right hon. friend said:

There was a remedy at hand and that remedy was to send to England and to Germany a commission not of politicians, a commission not of party heelers, but a commission of good substantial business men.

My right hon. friend says 'hear, hear,' but let me ask him who was to appoint that commission? Why, of course the government would appoint that commission, and the arguments advanced here as to the kind of commission this government might appoint would apply equally to the kind of men my right hon. friend would appoint on his commission. Let us see what my right hon. gentleman says with regard to that:

Why, sir, I subscribe to that with both my hands.

There is nothing qualified about that; he has both hands up for it; he has both hands up for a commision of business men to investigate and report, so that his government, upon the report made by them may take such action as is necessary in connection with the tariff. And remember, these remarks of the right hon. gentleman are in reference to only one schedule of the tariff, and if the principle is correct with regard to one schedule, why not in connection with two schedules, or ten schedules, or twenty schedules for that matter. Where is the difference in principle? Why there is no difference in principle at all. No hon. gentleman opposite would, I am sure, contend for a moment that there is any difference in the principle of the thing; it is only a question of what number of inquiries shall be made by the commission. The right hon. gentleman says further:

Why, sir, I subscribe to that with both my hands if there is a case made out for investigation; but I have to say to my friend who has made the suggestion, that this very idea the Canadian government has already adopted. The last time that we received this delegation at Ottawa, some time in the month of July——

That refers to a delegation about this very matter of customs duties, and, as I indicated in my speech, delegations and petitions come to the Minister of Finance from time to time on matters of tariff, and the first question that comes up is: what are the facts. The right hon. gentleman continues:

—in the conversation I had with my friend the Minister of Customs, when I told him that we must do something, or look into this case and see whether or not something should be or should not be done, he suggested himself that we should send at once a commissioner to England——

In other words, the quest for facts that I have been talking about.

—he suggested at once that we should send a commissioner to England; not a party heeler——

The right hon. gentleman is evidently afraid that in some way they might succeed in getting a party heeler on his commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My right hon. friend seems to suspect his own government because, remember, it was his own government that was to appoint this commission. He seems to have it in his mind, it was an impression probably based on past experience, that there might be a party heeler on his commission and so he announces twice that there should not be a party heeler, and then he says:

Not a politician.

He is afraid also of politicians. The right hon. gentleman's own experience leads him to believe that there must necessarily be a party heeler or a politician on his commission, and from what has been said by him it would seem to me there was reason for suspicion that possibly, in spite of his best intentions there might be on his commission a party heeler or a politician. Well, let me assure my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that the same conditions will not obtain with this government as appear to have obtained formerly in that regard. He himself suggested in his speech that we should at once send a commissioner to England, not a party heeler, not a politician, but a business man, an expert, just what we are contending for in this commission; a commission of experts, of business men, of capable men, to obtain information upon which we may act rationally in connection with tariff matters. That is just what my right hon. friend was aspiring to, only he did not carry it out as we propose to carry it out. The right hon. gentleman continued:

—not a party heeler, not a politician, but a business man, an expert, and I have reason to believe, though I have not spoken to Mr. Paterson since this expert has already been sent by him to England, and he is now doing the work. (Applause.)

That statement was followed with applause, as no doubt we would expect to have such a statement followed with applause, when made by my right hon. and eloquent friend. He continues to say:

Gentlemen, I am not here to say that your demand is just or unjust; I am not here to say that your request is fair or unfair, that it is right or not right——

Here, he is not in a position to pronounce, because he has not the facts. He continues:

—but I am here to say that your complaints are such that they are entitled to the fullest consideration on the part of the Canadian government. We have not been willing up to the present time to disturb the tariff; it is only 24 months old, not even so yet; and therefore, if we are to have a principle of stability about the tariff we should proceed very leisurely upon all such inquiries. But at all

events there is a grave condition of things and we are prepared to meet it and to meet it in the manner which I have suggested.

And the manner he has suggested is, by appointing a commission to obtain the facts upon which the government might act, and that is precisely the principle that is embodied in this Bill.

I hope that this will command the assent of every reasonable man, as you are all reasonable men at this board.

Now, if that commanded and should command the assent of every reasonable man, why is it unreasonable that we should appoint a Tariff Commission by this Bill to do precisely the same work as that which my right hon. friend has in view, and with precisely the same object, namely, that we might have information on which we can construct a rational tariff?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). What date was that?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). 1908.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not a bad speech, either.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It was a splendid speech It is a lesson and a model, and I am only sorry that my right hon. friend has retrograded from the principles he laid down in that speech. It is one of the best arguments that I have run across for the appointment of a Tariff Commission, because it is based upon the desire of my right hon. friend for facts at a time when the question was up for his decision. My right hon. friend goes further, and talks of a permanent Tariff Commission. I wish to be fair to my right hon. friend: I do not say that the commission of which he appeared to approve was precisely on all-fours with this proposed commission; but I am going to show from what he said that the principle of obtaining through a commission information on which the government would act is by no means a departure from the policy which he himself has laid down in the past. He said further:

There is just another idea as to which I want to have a word of expression. You have stated, Mr. Chairman, in your address that you desire to have a permanent Tariff Commission.

I must believe that my hon. friend was sincere in his address to this association, and was not merely flirting with them politically. He said:

I do not exactly realize yet what is meant by a permanent Tariff Commission; but I am free to say that if it be meant that you would have a permanent commission such as I think they have in the United States——

What about that cheap Yankee device which we heard about from the hon. member for South Wellington?

—to follow the workings of the tariff from day to day, to follow the incidents, to follow the effects upon the producers and the consumer, and its daily effects upon the community, I do not see any reason why such a commission should not be appointed.

My right hon. friend and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association were evidently in perfect accord after that historic dinner, which took place in October, 1908. How far he has modified his views since, and how consistent he is in his modification of such views, I leave this House to judge. A little further on he said this:

I must be careful.

What he has said he has said carefully, and I think he said a good deal. If he had not in mind that he must be careful, I do not know how much further he would have gone. He went on:

You know parliament was dissolved yesterday and we are in the heat of an election now. My second is Mr. Monk, a prominent member of the opposition, and I must not make any promises, because I don't know what will be the consequences. I make no promises, but I say the matter will be looked into very carefully by my associates any myself.

With regard to what the right hon. leader of the opposition, and the hon. member for South Wellington have said with regard to the members of the commission being treated as clerks, either they have entirely misconceived the purpose of this Bill, which I can hardly believe possible in view of the explanations which have been given, or they are continuing to read into this Bill something that does not and never did exist in it. Now, what is the principle of the Bill? Hon. gentlemen talk about a Tariff Commission independent of the government. The principle of this Bill is this, and it cannot be anything else under our constitutional system: The government is responsible for the tariff, and that responsibility cannot be devolved upon an outside body. This commission is a body ancillary to the government, directed by the government to accomplish certain purposes, namely, to give us the information that we need in framing a rational tariff. The expression 'under the direction of the minister', means simply this, that instead of letting a commission, who are not directly responsible to the people, as the government is, pursue any desultory investigation they desire, they must be under the control or direction of the minister, who must know what matter is more urgent than others.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Is not that provided for in subsection 2?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No, it is not. The first clauses are general clauses. To say that a commission might start out and pur-

sue its investigation into anything here, there or elsewhere, would be simply to destroy the very purpose of a commission, which is to accomplish results, to bring about efficiency, to give us the information that we need from time to time in order to frame our tariff rates, and in order to remedy defects in the tariff as they become known, and the minister, informed by public opinion in many ways, realizes that there are certain things that must be investigated before anything else, and he is responsible. This only means that the minister must give the commission direction as to the lines of inquiry it is to pursue in order that it may be a useful part of the machinery of government for obtaining the information desired.

My hon. friend evidently has the conception that this should be an independent commission roving at its own sweet will in a desultory fashion about the country, not directed in any way, not responsible to the government, and bringing down reports and handing them to parliament. My hon. friend spoke about subverting the principles of the constitution. If the Bill were drawn along the line he suggests it would go very far to justify that criticism. The purpose of the Bill is to enable the government primarily responsible, to obtain information upon which it might first make up its mind as to tariff changes and then bring them down to this House. As I have said, the information is departmental, it is contained in reports to the department and as such as subject to the orders of the House as is other departmental information. Let us assume that instead of a Tariff Commission, we had a bureau of statistics. A great deal of information would be acquired from time to time by that bureau. Does any hon. gentleman mean to say that if this House asked that the information accumulated by the bureau should be brought down, it would not be produced? It is preposterous, of course, it would be brought down. There is no difference in kind between the information accumulated by the Tariff Commission and that which would be accumulated by such a bureau, as my hon. friend has referred to, it would be precisely the same kind of information obtained in one case by a tribunal and in the other by a sub-department of the finance department, by clerks or experts as my hon. friend has said. That being the case, all the arguments that have been brought forward by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) must fail of their effect.

Subsection 2 refers to other matters, as for example whether Canada is able or likely to manufacture certain commodities. This commission should in time, become skilled with regard to matters of this kind. What are the resources of Canada with regard to raw material, what would be the effect of a certain change in tariff, anything that, as a matter of fact, relates to the tariff or is connected with its administration and not included in the preceding sections may, by virtue of that subsection, be referred by the minister to the commission for inquiry and report. Subsection 4 has been made very wide indeed to cover matters not specifically covered by the preceding subsections. I think the objections raised are fanciful, they disappear when we come to examine them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What we are discussing at this moment is what should be the character of the commission which parliament is now creating, should it be an independent commission or a commission ancillary to the government. My hon. friend (Mr. White), has endeavoured to fortify himself by opinions expressed in 1908 during a debate in which I discussed two questions, one of them being the woollen duties. I then said that I had no objection whatever to sending a special commission to Great Britain and Germany to investigate the matter. That is done by all governments at all times: The government have power now to appoint men for the very purpose of obtaining information upon certain matters. There was nothing extraordinary about my suggestion, but that is no precedent for what we are doing now. My hon. friend would have found something more to the point in the other part of my speech, in which I said that we might consider the advisability of having such a commission, as they then had in the United States. That was considered perhaps too ambitious. There was then in the United States no such commission as has been appointed by President Taft, they had something very much in the nature of a bureau of statistics that collected very valuable information upon prices, methods of production, raw material &c., and I thought at the time that we might very well create a similar bureau. But this idea has been discarded, my hon. friend is not to-day introducing legislation to provide for such a commission as they had at that time, he is copying rather what has been done since under the administration of President Taft, he is really copying the Bill introduced in Congress, but not yet passed. We have discarded the idea I then had of having a commission ancillary to the government, a branch of the administration and we are appointing a broad and wide and big commission. The impression has been created in the public mind since the introduction of this Bill that my hon. friend is creating a very broad and independent commission. The commission ought to be one thing or the other, it ought to be an ancillary commission or rather a statistical bureau such as we have designed, under his own control,

or else a parliamentary commission primarily responsible to parliament. What is the objection of my hon. friend to this? He said that an independent commission could go at its own sweet will and do anything it pleased. I beg to differ from him. This commission could not go at its own sweet will, it would have to do what it was enjoined to do, to collect information on this, that and the other subject, upon the cost of production, upon raw materials, upon transportation, upon methods of manufacture, upon prices, and bring that information before parliament. That would be the first thing to be done, such a commission could not go out at its own sweet will but would have to fulfil the duty imposed on it by parliament. My hon. friend in another part of the Bill very properly reserves to himself the power to impose certain work upon the commission and he reserves to the Governor in Council also the power to impose certain other work upon the commission. To say that under such circumstances the commission should be simply under the jurisdiction of the minister is not in accordance with the conception of the feature of the commission which would give it its greatest usefulness, that is that it should be an independent commission. The present government have appointed several commissions to deal with different subjects. These commissioners have been given certain powers, they have been instructed to do certain work. Does the minister believe now that it would be possible for the Governor in Council to go back to these commissioners, and say: You shall do your work in such and such a manner. Such a course is inconceivable. This is the same thing, this should be above all things a parliamentary commission, of course with power to the government to use it when they think it advisable to do so.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). In the creation of this commission and of previous commissions, I think we are taking rather the wrong method. We should not spend too much time here in discussing what the powers of the commissioners are to be, we should rather follow the example of the United States where the special commissioners are placed under the direction of the President or with us it would be under the general direction of the government. The Bills creating these commissions should not go into details as does the Bill creating the Grain Commission.

But the responsibility should be on the government of directing the commission. The government having full responsibility, ought, in each case, to define the reference made to the commission. In that way, you would reach an ascertainment of the facts and a realization of the object of the commission, far better than by detailed definition with regard to the commission under an Act of parliament. Rather than maintain the policy that we appear to have adopted here, I would see the powers of the commission made very general, the whole placed under the direction of some responsible minister, and then hold the government to responsibility. And the government ought to assume that responsibility and define the reference in every case. In the case of the Railway Commission, the work to be done is different. In that case you have to be more definite in outlining the powers to be exercised. But in the case of commissions of this kind which, as has been said here, are ancillary to the government, the definition ought to be broad and general, and the responsibility ought to be on the government. There will be cases that cannot be reached, even with all the care that we can exercise. My view with regard to these commissions is that we must have more of them, and that we are going to have more of them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Government by commission.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Yes, I have no doubt that there will be more and more government by commission, but with it should go more and more responsibility on the part of the government for the work of the commission. What I wish to keep clear is the absolute responsibility of the government to the people. That secured, I am not so much concerned about the details. Our Statute-book is getting too large; we are taking up too much of our time with all these details. I contend that you would get a better administration and a better investigation if you maintain clearly the responsibility of the government. It may be that after a while a commission of this kind will build up a practice and will have rules that will have the effect of law. The courts that we have created, while they administer the law, have made rules that are particularly a part of the law, and that are observed and respected by every one. That is what we want to get into our commissions; we want to get a flexibility and yet an effectiveness that will be equal to the occasion, and this cannot be attained with too much limitation and definition. Create a commission with broad powers and under a responsible head—as they say in the United States, 'under the direction of the President.' I regretted to hear the discussion of details here in the matter of the Grain Commission. I would rather see a law creating a Grain Commission under the direction of the government to deal with

the grain trade of the country. I am not so much dissatisfied with the Bill now before us, but rather object to the discussions here of limitations in connection with the commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That sort of doctrine would well have suited Charles I.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I am not talking the doctrine of Charles I, but the doctrine of responsibility to the people. And the way to maintain an effective responsibility is to give broad powers and then hold those to whom they are given responsible for the exercise of those powers. If you have that as you ought to have it, in this commission, something will be done.

What little study of the tariff I have made leads me to believe that the facts can be ascertained by some kind of inquiry, and that men outside of parliament, men authorized to do it, will get thost facts, will analyse them and present them. And these men will be a board or court where those who wish to be heard can be heard, and all the facts presented. That will relieve parliament. We are talking of parliament being overworked. If the threshing out of facts can take place outside of parliament, and if we can get a statement for the guidance of parliament, it will facilitate the work of parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Or dispense with it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). No, facilitate it. I know of nobody who did so much to take away the responsibility of government and the rights of parliament, as did the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself.

An hon. MEMBER. Explain.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). We have seen it time and time again in this House. What I am proposing here is a means of securing efficiency and responsibility, of establishing a commission that will do work. As a result of that work, I hope, we shall get a tariff law that will fulfil the best wishes of the people of this country. And we do want a law in regard to the tariff that will fulfil those wishes. We do want the people of the west to have an opportunity to say what they think of the tariff of this country, and the people of the east also; and we wish them to be heard, as much as possible, free from political bias. We want a statement of facts, and if we can get such a statement before parliament acts, there ought to be no objection to the establishment of a commission to bring that about. I gather from the debate that went on in the country, and has gone on in this House, that the government was prepared to have some kind of commission that would collect the facts, and would present them to parliament and especially would collect the facts, as the Minister of Finance has stated here to-day, of such cases as were then pressing upon the attention of the government. There must be some direction of a commission of this kind, and some choice of the topics to be taken up. Let broad powers be given to the government, hold the government always responsible to parliament and you will get the work done and the rights of parliament will be preserved.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to say a word; and first, to express a little faint surprise at the position taken by the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) which I have heard here for the first time, not having had the pleasure of hearing him the other afternoon. I think it will help us in parliament and in the country as well to look a little at the genesis of this commission. What has given rise to the talk about a commission, and to the idea that such an instrumentality as the commission was necessary? It arose out of the practical difficulties met in obtaining information for tariff legislation and out of the general impression, not only with the ministers themselves, who had to gather information, but with almost every interest in the country, that the information gathered was fragmentary and was not in its width or accuracy information upon which a tariff should be based. Sometimes the committee of ministers that went around the country were referred to as the 'Tariff Commission.' They were a tariff commission in no sense at all. They were a commission in no sense at all. They were simply three or four gentlemen who having gone about certain portions of the country hearing people giving their various views for and against different phases of a tariff measure, tariff proposals, tariff wishes and wants, made up their minds as best they could.

But I think I am not violating any confidence, when I say, as a member of one of those so-called commissions, or better, committees of parliament, it was never satisfactory, and never resulted in what was intended. In fact, the ministers themselves, passing to and fro through the country, listening for an hour to-day and an hour to-morrow to the divergent and different views, almost always sketchy, ended by having a more hazy idea than probably they had when they started out. I went over this country from one end of it to the other, holding, in connection with my colleagues, open meetings, where everybody was welcome, and where we listened to what the people had to say. It resulted in this, that mostly you heard long-winded statements made by people who were fond

of talking, and generally people who had some particular fads to air. You could not turn them down, you were a committee of ministers, and the public was invited, and you had to listen to them courteously. You got another kind of information. You had carefully prepared expert statements by those who were advocating a certain interest, who came there to advocate a certain side of it, who would not look at arguments on the other side, who made as completely an ex parte case as they possibly could, and added to it their figures and their statements; a bulky document was filed away by your secretary, and taken along with you for the rest of the trip. Now, after that had gone on for one, two, or three months, or more, the ministers came together to frame a tariff. What had they? A lot more or less hazy impressions, where one blended with the other to such an extent that you scarcely had any clear idea of any one phase of the question; bundles, and bundles, and bundles of documents and statements, which you never afterwards looked at, which you were not able to digest, and which, when parliament called for them, were stacked up on the table so numerous that any man who looked at the outside of the package never thought of going into them. You had long statements, but no digestion or analysis of those statements. The ministers themselves were not able to digest or analyse those statements, the secretaries were not able to do it. It required expert men who understood that kind of thing, who made it their study, and had gone over them, had gone to the very bottom of them, and had added to the knowledge of them, knowledge gained otherwise, to make any fair analysis. I put it to my right hon. friend, and if his late Minister of Finance or his Minister of Customs were here, I would put it to them, whether what I am saying with reference to the modus operandi is not absolutely true. As a matter of fact, in the olden times my colleagues and myself came and sat down in the hurly burly of an approaching or a continuing session, hearing everybody, without having time to make investigation and making a more or less rule of thumb tariff. Hoping that we might do what was the best in the main but hardly ever sure, and basing it upon no careful analysis of the conditions. I do not doubt for a moment, that if Mr. Fielding were here, he would rise in his place and say that his experience was much like mine. Out of that, the ministers began to feel, and the people of this country, especially the business interests, began to feel, that there was a better way to get at the basis of a tariff, namely to choose men whose whole business it should be, not to make schedules, not to lay down percentages, not in any sense to recommend that this should be protected or that should be protected, not to tell you that you ought to have a tariff here and you ought to have a certain tariff there, not to intimate to you what protection they thought was necessary in this case or that case; but men whose sole business and duty it was to get at the whole facts of the case, and place those facts before the government, before parliament and before the people at large. You say sometimes that this is to relieve the government. It is a very poor idea of it, that, if you say it is to relieve members of parliament, it is a very poor idea of it, that. The business of making tariffs will be just the hardest, and most delicate, and responsible business, when you have a basis of facts that a good commission has gathered, that it has ever been in this country. No minister or ministry will hereafter be able to shield themselves behind generalities. Parliament itself will be put in possession of every fact that the ministers possess; every one of the 220 members of parliament will be an efficient check upon the ministerial quota that are laying before them what they propose to do in the matter of the tariff, and in the matter of charges. They will be able to judge. Heretofore a minister has been able to escape behind generalities, he has been able to shield himself behind the ignorance of parliament with reference to the real conditions of every item upon which it was desired to act. After this, if this commission is rightly appointed, and if it rightly does its duty, not only the members will be judging the ministers, not only will the ministers be put on their mettle, because they have got to come to the touchstone of facts, but the intelligent country outside will have a chance of judging of a tariff such as it never had before.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Is it my hon. friend's idea that these reports will be brought down to parliament?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I never had the least idea that they would not.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Is there any objection to making the Bill definite in that respect?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). All these reports given in the line of what is called for, in getting information which is the basis of tariff measures, is the property, not only of the government, or of the minister, but of parliament and of the country. Nobody, I think in this House, has ever had any other idea of it.

Mr. EDWARDS. The Minister of Finance distinctly stated that yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think we elaborated this matter in council. So far as I am concerned, I never had any

other idea of it than that. So I say that that will be the position of things. No one will be able to shield himself behind an ex parte statement, or behind lack of knowledge when the knowledge will be there, and every intelligent man will be able to draw his own conclusions.

Now I consider this to be another great effect of a Tariff Commission of this kind. A basis of facts is what we want to get at. It is invaluable for the legislator, it is invaluable for the minister who is framing a tariff, it is invaluable for the business man; it is invaluable in this respect, that it prepares and puts before the country a touchstone where competent and incompetent men meet, as it were, on common ground, when grievances are raised or are alleged. To-day men honestly think that the tax upon agricultural implements is too high, that the men who are making them are making fortunes, and that this tax ought to be lowered.

They get the best information they can and they cite that information as a proof that their assertion is right. The man who is making implements, knowing, perhaps a little more about the modus operandi and about the business itself, combats the farmer and says: No, you are wrong in your information; it is thus and so. Both of these are ex parte statements, whatever else you may say about them. The farmer never wants to get rid of any fair proportion of taxes that he ought to contribute to the government and upkeep of this country. The farmer is willing to pay his proper proportion of taxes, but he wants to know that he is not paying more than his proper proportion of taxes. He does not want to shirk his taxes, neither does any other good citizen of this country. Now, in a dispute like that, is it not invaluable to have the absolute facts, as near as you can ascertain them by a commission or a committee of men, whose duty it is to get at the facts, who become skilful in getting facts and skilful in placing them in the way in which they can be most easily read and understood? Surely it is the touchstone to the farmer and the agricultural implement maker and their grievance is settled by reference to a standard of fact. But, if it is proved that, taking into account the whole business, its costs and charges, the tariff is too great upon that article, down it comes and no ministry can keep it up, because it is shown by the facts and the ministry could not find support in parliament unless they were right in that matter. Show that and it comes down. Show the opposite and every fair-minded man who believes in keeping the industries of Canada intact, will surely say, if it is not enough, let a little more be added. But no commission dare say whether it shall be lowered or whether it shall be heightened, whether it shall be 17 per cent, or 25 per cent, or 10 per cent. It is not their business and they go outside of their business entirely when they attempt to do anything like that.

In addition to that, such a commission must have some directive power. It must have guidance. Who shall guide it? Shall parliament guide the commission? You could not have a more bulky unmanageable guide than parliament to guide the commission. Parliament cannot discipline itself, cannot agree within itself; it is actuated by two entirely different ideas. The only way you can have correct guidance for a commission of this kind is by a committee of parliament which is responsible to parliament and responsible for its guidance of this commission. Why all these fanciful views as to what the government purpose to do or as to what will be done by this commission? The government cannot shield themselves behind incorrect or wrong methods or methods which are not thorough in regard to this matter. Your commission is moving through the country in the sight of the world and of parliament, its results come to parliament through the report which has been made to the minister. No ministry could successfully delegate their work to a commission.

But remember that the minister is a politician. He is a Tory; he is a Grit; that is a fact, but there is neither Toryism nor Gritism in absolute facts, and this commission is told to go and get absolute facts. A commissioner may be a Tory when he starts or a Grit when he starts, a protectionist when he starts or a free trader when he starts, but when he comes to the cost of cotton everybody knows that there is neither Toryism nor Gritism in determining the cost of cotton or wool, or leather, or the cost of the processes which are put upon them. Toryism or Gritism, free trade or protection, will have nothing to do with the matter; yet, you know that the men who get the results of the investigations of the commission will go to work and place upon these articles a tariff of so much per cent here and so much per cent there. It will be so whether they are protectionists, whether they are tariff reform men or whether they are free traders. This seems to me to be the simplest thing in the world. I do not want to give my hon. friends advice; they are older in experience and certainly older in wickedness than I am; they do not need any advice from me, but my wonder is that they have taken up this position of absolute opposition to getting the facts. Liberals are not supposed to fear the facts. The time was in the years not long gone by when we tried to lift the lid, but the lid

was nailed down tight and fixed by their parliamentary majority. Why? Because they feared the facts? Was that it? Is it this lingering fear in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite that when we get this basis of clean and clear and absolute fact there will be created a substratum upon which the industries of this country and the development of this country can be based and it will no longer be possible to talk protection and practise free trade or to practise protection and talk free trade as they have been able to do? It will be not theories but facts. We have had too many theories in this parliamentary life of ours so far. Let us get hold of good honest facts and then we can build better upon them than we can upon theories.

Now, what is troubling my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) anyway? I do not believe that he is troubled in his heart. I think he believes that this commission is the very thing it ought to be. It is the very thing that he once said it ought to be. No man can read the speech of the right hon. gentleman quoted by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) this afternoon without believing that the right hon. gentleman had in his head exactly the idea that we have in our heads, because it is the same word for word, principle for principle, and it has the same object to be attained. What is the difference? Only this, that my right hon. friend is now on the other side of the House.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Mr. Chairman, I only want to make a very few remarks on this important question and if I did not feel my responsibility in connection with the people that I have the honour to represent I would not perhaps trouble the committee at all. My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) came west last fall and made the declaration that he would give the people a Tariff Commission. The more I have heard this question discussed in the House and the more I have thought over it, the more convinced I am that we are going to solve the problem of distrust between the two great divisions into which we might say the citizens of this country are divided. We can almost say that these two divisions are composed of the manufacturers on the one side and the agricultural class on the other. So far as my experience goes, I think I can say without fear of contradiction that there has been for a great many years a feeling of distrust, of want of confidence, between these two great classes of citizens. Speaking for the west, I think I can say that we are almost tired and weary of the word 'tariff.'

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

Since I came to this House, the tariff has been a potent factor in our discussions. We read in history that one of the queens of England said that after her death the word 'Calais' would be found written on her heart, and I believe, Sir, that if a post-mortem is ever held on the members who have been sitting in this House for several years past, the word 'Tariff' will be found written in their hearts. And, why is it that we have been so long in coming to a practical conclusion in connection with this great question. I have said that I believe there is distrust and want of confidence between the manufacturing and the agricultural classes in this country, and, personally I believe, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said, that that feeling has arisen simply because we fail to understand each other as is the case with regard to other questions which engage the attention of the people of this country. We in the west think we pay too much for our agricultural implements; I am mighty sure that the farmers in my constituency think so, at any rate. The manufacturers of Canada say, I suppose, that we are not paying too much, and who knows? I do not know, and one of the duties of this commission will be to find out. If we have the right kind of a commission, and I am strong on that point of having the right kind of a commission, one of the utilities of that commission will be that they will give us such definite, such fair, and such independent information that you can place it before the farmers or any other class of the community and allow them to judge for themselves whether they are paying too much, or whether the manufacturer is asking too much. I have always listened with a great deal of pleasure and interest to the remarks of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) but I never heard him labour so, as he did the other day in this House, when he was trying to read into this Bill something which it absolutely does not contain. I say, Sir, if it contains what he and other hon. gentlemen opposite say it contains, I am opposed to it, and I go further and I say that if it contains all that was read into it by my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) I am also opposed to it. The great question is: who is this commission to serve. Hon. gentlemen opposite say it is going to serve the manufacturers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: 'Hear, hear,' to that, but my belief is that it is intended to serve all classes of the community, and that is the kind of commission I want, and if we are honest about it, that is the kind of commission it will be. Once this Bill passes, then the most important question is as to

the personnel of this commision. The Minister of Finance told us that no man would be appointed because of his occupation, and while that was a good thought, I would like if he had gone a little further, and said that no man would be kept off the commission because of his occupation. We want broad, big men on this commission, and, if the commission is going to do what I believe it can do, and what I hope, it will do, then we must have at least one member of it, whose environment has been amongst the great agricultural classes of this country. I believe that the men appointed on that commission will be fair, and will try to be fair, but in order that we may get out of that commission all there is in it for the best interest of Canada, we must have some man who understands the great agricultural classes of the community, and who is in sympathy with them. Now, as to whose charge this commission should be under. I have something to say, and there is no doubt that there must be somebody to run it, and by that, I do not mean to say that it is a machine.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am afraid it is.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff), is very suspicious, but I say to him that if we are to act in the best interests of all the people of Canada, we must get out of our minds this suspicion, and deal with the question fairly and squarely, as it presents itself to us.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) has himself expressed more suspicion than any gentleman who has yet spoken on the Bill.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. All right, if you believe so, but I am saying what I think. Of course, this commission comes very properly and very logically under the Minister of Finance, who has to do with tariff matters. The Minister of Finance must direct the commission, but, when I say that, I do not mean to be understood as saying that when this commission goes out to investigate any particular industry, the Minister of Finance is to direct the commission what to do. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, if he goes that far, and if he does, I am opposed to it. Supposing, for example, the farming industry of this country comes to the conclusion that something in connection with the tariff is bearing on them too heavily, and believes that it should be investigated, I do not take it that the Minister of Finance could or would prevent this class of the community from having this investigation into what they want to have investigated. I do not think he goes that far.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The Bill goes that far.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not believe it does. The Bill says that the commission shall be under the direction of the Minister of Finance, but what part of the Bill goes any further than that?

Mr. OLIVER. Subclause 4 of section 4.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What that clause says is this:

> It shall also be the duty of the commission to inquire into any other matter or thing in relation to the trade or commerce of Canada, which the Governor in Council sees fit to refer to the commission for inquiry or report.

Is that what the hon. gentleman refers to?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Suppose the minister does not direct, what happens then? We want to give the commission power to investigate that without the minister.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am not very familiar with responsible government; but it seems to me that the strongest point in favour of this commission is that it will remove the distrust to which I refer. While I am quite willing that the minister should direct the matter, I think that the agriculturists of this country who form a large proportion of the population, should be able to go to him and ask him to investigate any matter that they think should be investigated. I think that is a fair proposition, and I cannot think that the Minister of Finance would refuse such a request, whether it is provided for in the Bill or not. The whole object of this Bill, as I understand it, is to get information. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the Bill. I think it is the most progressive piece of legislation which has been introduced into this House since I entered it, barring perhaps the Railway Commission, and I do not know but it is broader than that. I have always been in favour of the Railway Commission, and in my constituency I have given the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition the greatest credit for establishing that commission, and have always recognized the good work it has done; and I believe that is an example of the good this Tariff Commission will do. I think that on both sides of the House we are reading into this Bill far more than it contains, because broad and big men are not all in the manufacturing institutions, the railway institutions or any other particular institution. A broad and big man means a man familiar with the great work in which he is engaged, whatever it may be; and the personnel of this commission should be composed of men from at least two of the great classes in this country.

Mr. BORDEN. I think there has been on the other side of the House a great deal of misapprehension as to what these

words, 'under the direction of the minister' are intended to convey. In subsection 1 of section 4, the character of the information to be obtained by this commission is set forth in considerable detail. Then, subsection 2, in order to make the scope of the commission thoroughly comprehensive, declares that 'the commission shall make inquiry into any other matter upon which the minister desires information, in relation to any goods which, if brought into Canada or produced in Canada, are subject to or exempt from duties of customs, and shall report to the minister.' The third subsection deals with inquiries under the Customs Act. The fourth subsection enables, not the minister but the Governor in Council, to direct the commission to make inquiry into any other matter or thing in relation to the trade or commerce of Canada. No one can deny that the scope of the commission is pretty comprehensive. In the first subsection the character of the information which the commission is to obtain is stated in considerable detail. The subjects in respect of which the commission is to obtain that information are not enumerated. Take, for example, the item of agricultural implements, which has entered into every tariff which we have had in this country for many years. In some section of the country an agitation might arise with respect to the duties on agricultural implements. The commission might be going on in the ordinary course, without any particular direction from the minister, to make inquiry into this or that or the other item of the tariff. It would be competent for the Minister of Finance, by virtue of those words 'under the direction of the minister,' to say to them: Drop everything else, and investigate the conditions with regard to the production of agricultural implements in Canada, and ascertain whether or not, having regard to the conditions of production in this country as compared with the conditions in other countries, the tariff is too high. It is precisely for the very reason to which my hon. friend calls attention that these words 'under the direction of the minister' have been inserted in the Bill. The ministers of the Crown are responsible to parliament, and responsible through parliament to the people of this country; and if the people of any particular district in the country should find themselves pressed by conditions which prevail under the tariff as it may exist at any time, it should be open to them to make representations to the Minister of Finance, and it would be proper for him, having regard to those representations, to direct an inquiry into that particular grievance to the exclusion of everything else for the time being. That is the object of the Bill; and, as I apprehend the matter, the omission of those words from the Bill would prevent the Minister of Finance from directing the attention and energies of the commission to the matter to which I have alluded or to similar matters that might at once demand the attention of the government and the inquiry of the Tariff Commission. That is the whole theory, as I understand it. The people will have a commission which can make these inquiries, it will be the right of the people at all times to make representations to the government through the minister in charge; and it will be the duty of the minister in charge, upon these representations, to direct a proper inquiry to be made by this commission into all the conditions both in this country and in other countries which ought to control the framing of a tariff in that regard.

Mr. GERMAN. Will the right hon. gentleman confirm what the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated, that the reports made by the commission would be laid before parliament on request?

Mr. BORDEN. That is entirely my apprehension of the matter.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) is well advised in looking upon this Bill with some measure of suspicion. There has been so much protest as to what the Bill did not contain as to lead those of us who are, like my hon. friend from Souris, inclined to be suspicious, to think that perhaps after all there is something in it that is not disclosed on the surface; because often a Bill is important from what it does not contain rather than from what it does contain. I agree with my hon friend from Souris that the purpose in the mind of anyone who spoke in this country on behalf of a Tariff Commission was that it would give all classes of people in the country a fair deal. The hon. gentleman was particular to inquire as to where the farmers of the west came in, under the terms of this Bill. The right hon. the Prime Minister undertook to show him, but he did not find it and does not find it in the four corners of the Bill.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. He said he did.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has just given this House an example of what this Bill is intended to do; as I said on the second reading, its purpose is to humbug the people of this country.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not think so for a moment.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is at liberty to have his own opinion, but I think the very statements he made to-day as to his understanding of the Bill and

as to what he understood the Prime Minister to say, is the evidence of that.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is your opinion.

Mr. OLIVER. Because there is not within the four corners of the Bill anything to show that there is any provision or that provision will be made or can be made under that Bill for considering the interests of the farmers in the matter of the tariff. It was open to the Finance Minister as to the Prime Minister to show where that is contained in the Bill. It is not contained.

Mr. EDWARDS. In section 4.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a question as between my hon. friend and myself as to the knowledge of the English language, and I declare that in section 4 there is nothing which contemplates the consideration of the interest of the farmer by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then there is no part of the section that contemplates going into the consideration of the condition of any class, it contemplates a consideration of the condition of the farmer as well as of any other class.

Mr. OLIVER. That is where my hon. friend is entirely mistaken and it is another evidence of the success of the Bill and its promoter in humbugging the people of the country. My hon. friend has said no class is specified in this Bill. If he can find in the first eight subsections of section 4 anything but a direct allusion to the interests of the manufacturers of this country I will concede that he is right.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think I can.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no need of our discussing the matter, I have expressed my opinion, my hon. friend has expressed his and our opinions are in the judgment of the House and of the country.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Has my hon. friend's attention been called to the interpretation clauses of the Act:

'Goods,' means products, wares and merchandise,

And to the phrase in section 4:

In respect of goods produced in or imported into Canada,——

In other words, to the fact that goods means products, the products of the farmer? I desire to tell my hon. friend that products were put in in order that there might be no doubt that this Bill applied to the products of the farmer as to the products of the manufacturer.

Mr. OLIVER. We are very glad to have the statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) on the subject, but I would call his attention to the fact that this is the first time that any such interpretation has been put upon any provision of the Bill from start to finish.

Mr. EDWARDS. In the interpretation of the word 'goods' has he overlooked the specific mention of horses, cattle and other animals?

Mr. OLIVER. I am dealing with section 4 and with the discussion that has gone on in regard to this Bill, and I say that by neither the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Trade and Commerce nor the right hon. the Prime Minister, my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) or any other member of the House, who has spoken in regard to this Bill until the hon. member for Souris, has the question of the interests of the farming community been discussed or alluded to. It has been taken for granted by every one who spoke in regard to the Bill that this was a Bill to deal with the manufacturing interests and with nothing else.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). As they affected the farmers too.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct his statement. At the beginning of my speech he will find this:

Read the definition at the beginning of the Act. Goods are treated of throughout the whole Act, and what do goods include? They include products of the farm, horses, cattle and other animals, and everything that the farmer produces is just as highly subject and likely to be subjected to the inquiry of this commission in the interest of the farmer as are the goods which the manufacturers themselves produce.

Will my hon. friend please withdraw his remarks that I have not referred in any way to the farmer.

Mr. OLIVER. I regret that I had not the privilege of hearing my hon. friend speak, so I must apologize for having made that allusion to him, but I heard his speech quoted by other speakers, and I took it for granted that that expressed the leading idea of his speech, as I am certain it did.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Might I remind him too that the other day I also referred to the same matter?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course I accept what my hon. friend has said, but I must admit that the fact is not in my mind as he has stated it. However, this Bill to provide for the appointment of a so-called Tariff Commission is a Bill to lay the foundation of a revision of the tariff upwards and everything that has been said on the other

side of the House on behalf of the Bill, must lead us absolutely to that conclusion. There has been no suggestion that anything was likely to come out of the work of this commission that would tend to tariff revision downward. It is the farmer who is interested in tariff revision downward, and it is the man who represents the farmers and speaks for them, who is taking serious responsibility in supporting and advocating a measure which has no other purpose than to lay the foundation for a tariff revision upward, to lay more heavily than they lie to-day, the burdens of the tariff upon the farmer.

I am sorry my hon. friend from South York is not in the House. I wanted to agree with him as well as with the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner). The committee will remember how strongly he insisted on the desirability of retaining the responsibility of government, he thought we were paying too much attention to detail in discussing this Bill and that what we should do, was to provide a short Act that would place all power in the hands of the minister. We on this side are exactly at one with my hon. friend in this desire. What we want is that the minister shall take full responsibility for collecting such information as he sees fit to collect and shall place it before the House on his responsibility when called upon to do so.

That is our idea of the proper way of collecting information upon which the minister is to base his revision of the tariff—to collect that information on his own responsibility and that of the government, and place it before parliament when called upon as a report of the department and the government, for which he and his officials are responsible. But that is not what these hon. gentlemen want. What they want is that parliament shall take the responsibility for the collecting of information which shall be presumed to be independent and comprehensive information, and which shall to that extent be a fraud upon the people of the country, which shall, be partisan information collected at the direction of the Minister of Finance, taking such as he wishes to be taken, leaving out such as he does not wish to have taken. This information is to be placed before the country and before parliament, as occasion arises, as the report of a commission of parliament.

We do not object to information; we want information; we want the governmetn to get all the information it can, and we want parliament to have all the information it can get, because in the last resort, although the government brings down a tariff measure, parliament has to support or oppose that measure. Each individual member must declare himself on that measure upon his responsibility to his constituents. Therefore, every member of parliament is just as much entitled to the full information collected by a commission as the government is. And it is because this means which is being taken by the government to collect information, is being taken in the name of parliament and under the name of a commission, when it is really, to all intents and purposes, departmental information, that we object to it. We say that if it is to be departmental, let it be departmental; and if it is to be a commission, let it be a commission. Let it be on the responsibility of parliament for the information of parliament, if this is to be a commission. But, if our friends opposite do not wish to give us a commission of that kind, then let them get their information as a department on their responsibility which it is within their right to do and which is just as proper a method of collecting information as the other;—under the responsible system of government it is a more correct method. Let them get their information that way; but let them not come before the country assuming to give the country an independent commission. An independent commission, if you please; when it is, in the last degree, a partisan commission directed by the minister, and reporting to him alone as if they were the hired officials of his department. We say: Play fair; Play fair with the people; If you want to get credit for appointing a commission, if you want to claim that the information collected by this commission is impartial information, then let it be so. But do not come before parliament and the country claiming an impartial commission, when, as a matter of fact, you are doing neither more nor less than collecting information as though it were under the control, absolutely under the control, of the officials of the department.,

I would like to know how the position which is taken can be justified. They say that this commission is to be merely statistical. If so, there is no justification for the salaries that are to be paid. We are to have three commissioners drawing the same salaries as the members of the government—nay, the chairman draws a higher salary than the members of the government. And these commissioners, we are told, are to collect information; simply to collect information. I say the price is too high; if the work is only to collect information they should not be paid ministerial salaries. But, if they are to be paid ministerial salaries, then their responsibility ought properly to be greater than merely to collect information. The position taken by the government is illogical and untenable in that regard.

But I want to have a word to say on my own account in regard to the provisions

of the Bill contained in section 4. And I want to insist that there is something else to be considered by the government in connection with the tariff than merely the interests of the manufacturers.

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

Mr. OLIVER. There is something more to be considered than whether a manufacturer is making a dividend or not. If this to be the purpose of the commission, then this commission is simply a means to enable the tribute-takers to increase their exactions. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that we are in this country at a very serious stage in the evolution of our affairs. We have had great development during the past few years, and with that development has come about a condition which is new, so far as this country is concerned, a condition which calls for the most careful attention of all representative men and certainly of the government of the country. I speak of the aggregations of capital which have come together as mergers, a new feature in the development of our country, a feature that has grown so rapidly and has become of such stupendous proportions that it claims the attention of our government; and particularly claims this attention in connection with any tariff adjustment that may be made. I find on reference to the 'Monetary Times'—and it is a good authority—that in the past three years there has been an increase of industrial capitalization by means of mergers from $125,000,000 to $335,000,000, and of this increase no less than $100,000,000 is capitalization that represents no actual investment. Now, the purpose of the merger is to earn dividends on the capitalization—otherwise there is no purpose in issuing that capital. And one way to secure the dividends is by manipulation of the tariff. And if this Tariff Commission, appointed by a government which owes its existence to these very combines——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER——which owes its very existence to these very combines——

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Where were the Massey-Harris interests in the last fight?

Mr. OLIVER. The Massey Harris Company were with you, strongly.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Does the hon. gentleman seriously say that Senator Jones and Senator Frost were supporting the Conservative party, and if so, where and when did they speak?

Mr. OLIVER. I will say certainly that they did not support the Liberal party.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Who is the head of the cement trust he has so severely criticised in the House?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say at the moment, but it does not make any difference who is at the head of any trust. I am not discussing persons, I am discussing facts and conditions, and I am trying to draw to the attention of the government the serious nature of these conditions.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman not remember that one year ago yesterday, when this subject was under discussion in the House a member of the government in which he had a place practically defended these mergers, and declared they were for the good of the country?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not really see what my hon. friend's allusion has to do with the question. I am dealing with a condition not with a theory; I am not dealing with what somebody else did at some other time or at some other place.

Mr. MEIGHEN. You were a party to it.

Mr. OLIVER. Never mind. My hon. friend, if he votes for this Bill, is a party to an undertaking to give value to the over-capitalization of these mergers.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I would be glad if you would show that now.

Mr. OLIVER. I have said that there is a hundred million dollars of stock issued for which not one dollar in money has been paid, and it is the purpose of the merger, by every influence it can bring to bear, to secure earnings on that common stock, that stock for which no money was paid. It is the business of mergers, and it is their interest, to secure such adjustment of the tariff as will bring about that result; and if section 4 of this Bill does not contemplate that inquiries of this kind shall be directed especially to the purpose of finding out just how far the taxation of the people can be increased so as to give earnings on that valueless stock, then I will admit that I do not understand the meaning of the English language.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Just read the words.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the section provide for ascertaining the facts, whatever they are?

Mr. OLIVER. For ascertaining the facts as directed by the minister. And who put the Minister of Finance in this House? Who does he represent in this House?

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). South Leeds.

Mr. OLIVER. He represents the interest of the mergers, he represents that section of the Liberal party which was Liberal as long as Liberalism meant profit; but as

soon as Liberalism meant principle was with the other side.

Mr. PELLETIER. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell us at what time Liberalism ceased to represent profit and began to represent principle?

Mr. OLIVER. The day that the Hon. Mr. Fielding announced the result of the reciprocity negotiations in this House so far as these people were concerned. It is to the Minister of Finance that we are to look for protection against the exactions that will be demanded from time to time by these mergers. The minister will excuse us if we have some suspicion as to the consequences. And we say again to him, he is in the saddle, he and his friends have secured the price, the responsibility is upon them. Let them take their price, but give us fair-play; and when he brings a Tariff Bill into this House let him do it on his responsibility as to the information upon which he bases it. Don't let him come here and ask this House to legislate to provide an independent commission that will be absolutely under his thumb. We want fair-play, nothing more; we want fair-play for the farmers as well as for the manufacturers.

Now I want to say that I am not here to represent the interests of the farmers as against the manufacturers; and in order to relieve the mind of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), who wants to know what my opinion is with regard to tariff questions, I will take the liberty of giving it. I believe the tariff is levied for the purpose of raising a revenue, and if it is not, it ought to be. That is the foundation purpose of a tariff, and when we have a tariff that is adjusted for the purpose of raising a revenue, it is not unreasonable that such protection as is incidental to that tariff should be enjoyed by whoever may be fortunate enough to come under it. What I wanted to say was that the tariff, in my judgment, ought to be established not for the purpose of raising a revenue, and when the tariff is established not for the purpose of as the Minister of Finance suggested in his speech, of developing our resources or increasing our industries, then, in my judgment, that is a perversion of the proper purpose of a tariff; because you cannot develop resources, you cannot increase industries by increasing taxation. I hope I have made my position clear in regard to the tariff. Hon. gentlemen on the other side declare that we on this side stand for free trade. For my own part I believe that free trade is the ideal way of carrying on the trade of the country, and that the revenue should be raised by direct taxation. But because I have a certain ideal, that is not to say that I expect that ideal to be attained. I must accept conditions as they are, and I have stated to the House, frankly, exactly what my views are, and what are the views of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. gentleman says he believes in protection incidental to a revenue tariff.

Mr. OLIVER. No I did not.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am in the judgment of the House. Will the hon. gentleman repeat his sentence in which he used the term 'protection' incidental to revenue tariff?

Mr. OLIVER. I say, I believe in a tariff so adjusted as to produce a revenue, and I am willing to concede, and it is not unreasonable to concede, that the incidental protection should go to the advantage of such interests as may be affected by it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that there should be any protection incidentally, or does he agree with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that there should be a tariff for revenue without any incidental protection.

Mr. OLIVER. I have tried to put to my hon. friend that my ideal is exactly the same as the ideal of the hon. member for Red Deer, but, having tried to show my hon. friend exactly how I looked at this question from a practical standpoint, I hope I have made myself clear although I cannot hope that I have altogether suited my hon. friend by my expression.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What does my hon. friend understand by an ideal that we cannot enforce?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will pardon me if I just emphasise this point that when we have declared from time to time that there was such an ideal in our minds, we have not by any means, declared that that ideal is our policy. Our hon. friends have been trying to humbug the public in trying to place us in that position. We are dealing with practical matters in a practical way, and I have told my hon. friend exactly what my view is in regard to that matter, a view which will, I think, be accepted by the large majority of the people in this country.

But what I want to deal particularly with is, the position in which our farmers in the western country are at present, by reason of the accession of our friends on the other side to office. I do not intend to go into the matter fully, but I just intend to give one or two facts to the House and to show to the Minister of Finance that it seems to me that, in the face of these facts and if he has due

regard to the welfare of the country, he will be well advised to have his Tariff Commission go into these facts with the view, not of revising the tariff upward, but of revising the tariff downward. The committee knows that the reciprocity arrangement provided for the free entry of agricultural products into the United States markets. That privilege was secured by reason of certain concessions granted on this side. I do not know that it was ever contended that the concessions granted on this side were unreasonable, improper or injurious, but it was declared that it was not in the interests of the party that my hon. friends belong to that the agricultural products of Canada should secure free access to the markets of the United States. I will not trouble the committee at any great length on this matter, but I just want to place a few figures in the possession of the committee so that hon. members will know just how hard this country has been hit by the tariff policy that they stand for to-day. I have here the record of three shipments of barley from Carman, Manitoba, over the Great Northern to Minneapolis and the sale of the grain there. They are as follows:

Bushels	Price in Minneapolis.	Duty.
804..	$727 64	$241 22
1253	1240 15	375 92
1243	1155 54	372 96

I find on looking at the records of the Department of Trade and Commerce that something like a million and a half bushels of barley have gone through the elevators at Fort William this season that the 1st September to the 11th December. If that barley had all gone to Minneapolis instead of to Fort William it would have netted the producer just $450,000 more than he got. On every million bushels of barley produced and sold in the west the men who produced that barley lost $300,000 by reason of the success of the tariff policy of our friends.

Mr. GOODEVE. Is the hon. gentleman contending that the farmer would have got the additional price represented by the amount paid in duty for his barley?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I am contending that absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODEVE. Then, the producer, not the consumer, pays the duty?

Mr. OLIVER. The producer in this case is paying the duty; there is no question about that. If there had been reciprocity the duty would not have been paid and the duty would have remained in the farmer's pocket. Then, to show what the farmer has lost on his wheat, let me give a few figures showing comparative prices:

No. 1 NORTHERN WHEAT, JANUARY 8, 1912.

	Winnipeg.	Minneapolis.	Spread.
May	$1.00¼	$1.07⅞	.07⅛
July	1.01⅛	1.08¼	.06⅛
Cash	.94¾	1.08½	L13¾

I should mention that No. 1 Northern in Canada is not the same as No. 1 Northern in the state of Minnesota.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Can the hon. gentleman tell us what the spread was on the 19th and 20th of September last?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is very important. It was about a cent.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think it is very important. What is important is that the spread is what it is now and what it is going to be. Just to establish my point that the price of No. 1 Northern as quoted in Minneapolis is not in proper relation to the price of No. 1 Northern quoted in Winnipeg, I want to give the facts with regard to a number of cars sold in, on the Minneapolis sample market, samples from which cars were brought to Winnipeg, examined and valued by members of the grain exchange, the result of which is as follows:

Car No.	Price Minn.	Grade Ft. Wm.	Price Ft. Wm.	Spread.
	$ cts.		cts.	
34554	83	No. 5 tough.	64	19
71558	96	No. 6 "	59	37
17052	83½	No. 5 "	69	14½
46593	1 00	No. 4 "	79	21
11786	99	No. 4 "	79	20
23040	1 01½	No. 3 "	85	16½
10918	87	No. 4 "	79	8

This gives the committee some idea as to what is the actual difference in the actual price of wheat between Minneapolis and Winnipeg, and what the farmers of

the west have lost by reason of not getting free access to the markets of the United States.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

PATENTS OF THOMAS WADGE.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 16), respecting patents of Thomas Wadge—Mr. Aikins.

Mr. OLIVER. It is quite apparent that the ordinary member, having this Bill placed before him after it has passed the Private Bills Committee, is hardly in a position to decide on its merits. Therefor, I think whoever is in charge of the Bill should make a full statement of the reasons for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am not in charge of the Bill, but, in the absence of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), I desire to state to the House what I understand to be the reasons for the Bill. It appears that Thomas Wadge purchased patent No. 73,790, being an improvement in grain separators, commonly called fanning mills. When Mr. Wadge purchased the patent through his solicitors in Winnipeg, Messrs. Metcalfe, Sharpe & Stackpoole, he had an investigation of the title made. Mr. Wadge understood, when he purchased the patent, that it had been taken out for the usual period of 18 years. This I understand was the statement of his solicitors. It was not until very recently, when he took possession of the actual letters patent, that he ascertained that an error had been made in the office of his solicitors, and that the fees had been paid for only 6 years. Under the patent law a patentee may pay the fees for a 6 years term, and, on the expiration of that term, may pay the balance of the fees for the whole life of the patent, which in Canada is 18 years. Consequently Mr. Wadge is under the necessity of applying to parliament for the continuance of the patent for the full term of 18 years. I have the affidavit of Mr. Wadge to the effect of the statement I have made to the House. I think I need not read this to the committee. It has been read in the Private Bills Committee, and they accepted it. I simply make this statement, from which it appears to me that Mr. Wadge is entitled to the relief asked for.

Mr. McKENZIE. When did this patent first issue?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I cannot give the date of issue. There are two patents—No. 73,789 and No. 73,790. It was on the 29th of March, 1904, that Mr. Wadge purchased them from the Twin City Separator Company, and he at once proceeded to manufacture, and has been manufacturing on a large scale since, and it was not until July, 1911, that he ascertained that his patents had lapsed by reason of the error I have stated. So that it would appear that the patents were taken out only shortly before 1904.

Mr. OLIVER. Where does Mr. Wadge live?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The city of Winnipeg is the place of manufacture.

Mr. EMMERSON. Has this Bill been examined by the Department of Agriculture? It has been customary in the past to have a report from that department in respect to Bills of this class, and that report has always had great weight with the committee. In connection with every Bill, so far as my observation has gone, the attitude of the committee has been: we should not do this, and it ends by saying, we will do it this time, but we will not do it again. But we have always required from the Minister of Agriculture some statement to the effect that the Bill is satisfactory to his department, which usually inquires to see whether there is some interest that may be affected, or whether there are patents of a like character that may become in some way prejudiced by the proposed renewal. While we certainly want to do justice to the one, we do not want to do injustice to the other. It seems to me we should have some representation from that department.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). As a member of the Private Bills Committee, I remember the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. O'Halloran, being present, and being asked his opinion with reference to this and other Bills of a similar nature. His reply was that the policy of the department was adverse to the passing of private legislation of this character, but that the Private Bills Committee, and the House invariably overrides the policy of the department in that respect, where the negligence is that, not of the individual, but of the solicitor.

Mr. EMMERSON. Suppose we tried the experiment of refusing to pass this Bill and forced Mr. Wadge to go back to his solicitors, would it have a good and salutary effect? Would that not have the salutary effect of reducing the number of these Bills coming before parliament, would it not remind solicitors that they might be called upon to respond if they did not give attention to such matters?

Mr. CARVELL. I understood the deputy Minister of Agriculture to say that once

you admit the principle of renewing expired patents there was no reason why this one should not be renewed. From the evidence there is no doubt that this is a going concern manufacturing large quantities and the proprietors would be damaged to some extent if this was not renewed.

Mr. OLIVER. We should have from the Department of Agriculture a statement on their responsibility that this is a going concern and that there is no conflict of right between this establishment and some other of which we have no knowledge. I would be strongly in favour of passing the Bill on the merits as stated, but I think we should have some such assurance from the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It has not been the habit of any department in relation to the Bills within its purview to go into the questions of fact and make itself responsible for such statements as that the concern is a going concern. That fact appeared to be established by evidence before the committee. The solicitors in charge of the matter are a very responsible, good and careful firm in Winnipeg. The head of the firm was recently appointed a judge of the Court of King's Bench by the late government. I would not like to have it go out from anything I have said that they were guilty in this case beyond what is inevitable in a large office occasionally. I think it would be a hardship to Mr. Wadge if the relief were not granted. As to the conflict of rights no one else could manufacture lawfully until the expiry of the patent and any one who has commenced the manufacture since its expiry is protected under section 2 of the Act.

Bill reported.

PATENT OF THOMAS D. RAMBAUT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 84) respecting certain patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—Mr. Ames.

Mr. OLIVER. I would again suggest that the member having charge of the Bill should make an explanation for the convenience of the committee.

Mr. AMES. This Bill which was very carefully considered in the Private Bills Committee is one for keeping alive a patent now possessed by Thomas D. Rambaut. The circumstances in this case are very exceptional. The original patent was granted to William Ernest Cook, who in due course undertook to transfer the patent as he had a right to do, to Thomas D. Rambaut. Rambaut on legal advice concluded that his title was not altogether good. He went back to Cook to get his title made good, but found Cook seriously ill, in fact on his death bed, unable to sign his name, or in any way deal further with it. Cook died shortly afterwards and there then followed considerable litigation as to who were the heirs, and during this time Rambaut, not being certain that the patent was his, did not want to spend money on it. By the time he found that his title to the patent was valid, the period in which manufacture must be commenced in Canada had expired. He, therefore, made petition to the committee, the committee heard the claim and unanimously decided that the case was so exceptional that a further opportunity should be given to him to manufacture. No one has done any manufacturing or used the patents in Canada so it does not in any way infringe on any rights.

Mr. EMMERSON. What is the device?

Mr. AMES. A patent process for dessicating vegetables, and we have documentary evidence that if this patent is kept alive an important company is prepared to come into Canada, build a factory, and at once give employment in the manufacture of dried vegetables in the method herein described. We felt it would be an advantage to have the industry giving employment to workmen and giving an opportunity to farmers to sell their vegetables. No objections were taken to the Bill, even the departmental officers said that while they took generally an attitude of uncordiality towards requests of this kind there were no special reasons why in such a case as this the application should not be granted.

Mr. EMMERSON. I see that Rambaut is a citizen of New York. Is there any suspicion underlying this that would in any way affect our constitution?

Mr. AMES. I do not think there is any fear of the subversion of the constitution in this particular case.

Mr. CARVELL. What was the result of the litigation, was it decided that Rambaut had the legal title to the patent, or would we be legislating away the rights that might belong to Cook's heirs?

Mr. AMES. It was subsequently found that the transfer was legal, and it was with the full consent of Cook's heirs that Rambaut undertook to commence the manufacture. Then, after his death, when the estate was settled up, it was, with the full consent of the heirs that Mr. Rambaut proceeded to utilise the patent which came to him by regular transfer.

Mr. GUTHRIE. When did the patent expire?

Mr. AMES. My recollection is that it expired on the 16th February, 1911.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That is the expiration of the period for commencing manufacture?

Mr. AMES. It was registered in the Patent Office, 16th September, 1911.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is this legislation being secured with the knowledge and consent of the heirs of Mr. Cooke, the original patentee?

Mr. AMES. Such were the representations made to us in the committee by the promoters of the Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON. What was the character of the evidence submitted?

Mr. AMES. I think the solicitor for Mr. Rambaut had with him documents to that effect. I know he said he was prepared to submit evidence for every allegation he made in connection with the Bill.

Mr. CARVELL. I must say as one member of this committee, I am not altogether satisfied with the explanation. This is a matter which is so perfectly plain. Mr. Rambaut controlled this patent from Mr. Cooke, and had the documents whatever they might be. There is no reason why Mr. Rambaut should not have begun manufacturing in Canada within the two years allowed, or have obtained the necessary extension of time which the department has the right to give under certain conditions. He did not do it. He remained asleep on his rights. This is not at all in the same category with the case of Thomas Wadge. In that case, we have a citizen of Canada, carrying on a legitimate business, who finds that, through the fault of his solicitor his patent has expired. But here we have a bunch of New York fellows. We don't know whether they are genuine or not. They have not spent a dollar in Canada, and probably will not. But they want to sell out and make some money. Why, if I had half the nerve that my hon. friend has shown, within the last year I could have made a lot of money. A man from the state of Maine came to me and wanted to get legislation to renew a patent which had expired under circumstances not nearly so barefaced as this. But I was so modest that I told him I could not ask parliament to renew his rights when those rights had been lost through his own carelessness. I do not think that the parliament of Canada has a right to grant such concessions to these people. Why, Mr. Chairman, you know we do not love Americans nowadays——

Mr. EMMERSON. Under which flag?

Mr. CARVELL. I think there is strong reason for opposing the passing of this Bill.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). As I read this Bill, it does not affect the rates as between Cooke's heirs and Rambaut; it leaves the legal status of the parties where it was, simply revives the patent rates involved. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture was present in the committee and gave the same opinion with respect to this Bill as with respect to the previous one. Rambaut acted upon the advice of his solicitor which was that this assignment was valid. It is true that, under these circumstances, he slept on his rights. But when the matter was investigated, he found that he was out of court unless he could get this special legislation. It seems to me that this is on all fours with the previous Bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think that this is not on all fours with the previous Bill. In that case manufacturers had already taken action to a very large extent, with a large capital outlay, and every evidence of bona fides. In this case, it looks a little like a speculation in patent rights, a kind of speculation more common in the United States than in Canada. It would appear to me that Rambaut had made a speculative purchase of certain rights, and, after the deal had gone through simply slept on his rights, not thinking it worth while to comply with the Canadian law, even to the extent of getting the necessary extension of time. I suppose that now he sees the chance to transfer his patent to some one else and make something out of it. He has spent no money in Canada, has done nothing to make good on this patent; and I for one take the ground that patents are not to be lightly renewed under these circumstances.

Mr. AMES. Let us see what will be the logical outcome if the advice of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) were followed. Here is a concern that is prepared to come to Canada and make an investment for the manufacture of an important article, establishing an industry that will employ Canadian Labour and give a market for Canadian producers of agricultural products. Through no fault of his own, but through an error of his legal adviser, he finds he is debarred from using the patent which he has had assigned to him for valid considerations. Are we going to say that on that technicality we will deprive him of the opportunity of coming to Canada and manufacturing as I have suggested? Is it wise to do so? On the other hand, what interest is going to be injured by passing this Bill? No one has attempted to use this patent in the country. Either this man will use it or it will not be used. And by granting this legislation no one else's rights are infringed upon in the slightest degree.

Mr. NESBITT. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) say that he personally knows that these people are coming here to manufacture?

Mr. AMES. There was filed with the commission by a thoroughly responsible party, a written statement to that effect, and that satisfied the committee unanimously, so far as I could see.

Mr. NESBITT. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) does not know personally?

Mr. AMES. I know Thomas D. Rambaut personally, and I know him to be a thoroughly responsible party.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) would make this committee believe that if this man's patent is not revived, he cannot enter into the manufacture of this article. Why, it is the very reverse. Not only can Rambaut manufacture the article, but any man in Canada can manufacture it. I would point out to my hon. friend that a man has the right to manufacture an article exclusively, under patent only when the law gives him that right. In the absence of the patent, everybody has the right to manufacture it. This is an improvement that is well known to the public. I presume it is patented in the United States; it has been patented in Canada for five years. So, the public know about it. How do we know how many men are standing up with capital ready to enter upon this manufacture and build up a business in Canada? I think the hon. gentleman is trying to prevent the carrying on of industries in Canada, rather than encouraging them. The strongest reason I have heard for opposing the Bill is the reason my hon. friend has given why we should pass it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would suggest that we act in this matter as the Railway Commission frequently acts; where there is a pledge as to what they are going to do we require them to put up a deposit. We will take 'greenbacks' in this instance, we won't require a gold deposit.

Mr. AMES. I can't see what good object can be served in treating this Bill in a different way from what you are treating other Bills of the same character. This person has acted in perfect good faith from the outset. It was erroneous advice given him by his advocate, which he afterwards discovered to be inaccurate, that led to his losing his rights in the matter. He was under the impression that his patent was not altogether valid, and that it was necessary for him to secure additional signatures on the part of the original owner of the patent, Mr. William Cook. Immediately he discovered this fact he sought Mr. Cook, but Mr. Cook was in extremis and was unable to sign the papers necessary therewith. If Mr. Cook had been alive and well and the additional papers had been signed, the result would have been that everything would have been complied with by Mr. Rambaut, and there would have been no necessity for this Bill. But that is the way the case stands to-day. It seems to me that we would be creating a precedent in this Bill quite different from that we have followed in other cases, if we said that this Bill should not go through. I may say that the departmental officials that were present with us from the Department of Agriculture raised no serious objection to this Bill, any more than they would raise to any other Bill of a similar character. I have seen much more strenuous opposition to other Bills than was taken in this particular case. I do not see why the opposition should deem it advisable to single out this particular Bill for slaughter.

Mr. NESBITT. I think we had better let it go through.

Mr. OLIVER. I take exception to the statement that this Bill is on all fours with the Bill we agreed to a few minutes ago. The conditions are absolutely different, and the reasons that made it proper to pass the other Bill are reasons which make it improper to pass this Bill. If this committee has any responsibility at all it should not permit legislation of this character to go through, unless there are better reasons given for it than we have heard. As has been suggested by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), however good the intent of the applicant may be, on the face of the Bill it would appear to be purely a speculative investment, that he has not shown good faith, and is not entitled to consideration. The refusal of the committee to pass the Bill will not in any way injure the industries or the welfare of Canada, although it may do some injury to this man, who is responsible for his own undoing if he does not get what he wants.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the previous case, the man had made an investment, he was manufacturing, and if you did not give him legislation, he would have been seriously interfered with, and perhaps his investment would have been depreciated in value. In this case, you do not affect any such right, but by refusing to this man the privileges which he seeks, you do not give him an advantage over others, who apparently, have just as much right to the privilege of manufacturing this particular commodity for preserving vegetables, as would the gentleman named in the Bill, Mr. Rambaut. This becomes a serious matter when you consider that you may be depriving Canadian citizens of a privilege which certainly will be theirs if this legislation does not go through.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not want to block the committee in coming to a conclusion, but I think if ever, in my experience in this House, a case has been presented for the renewal of a patent which absolutely lacks

merit, it is this case. It is true that in the past we have been rather lenient in granting applications for renewal, where rights have lapsed. But in all the cases I can recall, there has been some merit to the application, there has been some investment of money, something has been done by the owner or the promoter. But here is a case, where people deliberately slept on their rights for four or five years, did not take enough interest in the matter to see whether they were the owners or not, until the time has lapsed during which they are entitled to manufacture goods in this country under a patent. If we grant this renewal, we grant to a body of United States patent speculators and promoters the right to come into Canada and manufacture on the basis of a monopoly, under a patent right, at all events. They have not made out any case strong enough to justify such action in this parliament, and I do not believe that hon. members opposite think they have either. Had they gone ahead with an investment, had they placed their money here within the last two or three years, as they might have done, and shown some bona fides in the matter, the case would have been entirely different. But if you grant this patent right to those New Yorkers, it excludes Canadians from entering into that line of manufacture in Canada, and I am opposed to it on that particular ground. If other patents come up with no more merit than the present one, I will have no hesitation in opposing them also.

Mr. CARVELL. On more careful reading of the Bill, I want to give another reason why I oppose it. It seems to me that it is the most vicious renewal of a patent right I have ever seen since I have been in parliament. This man some years ago bought a patent. He says, according to the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), he was afraid that his rights might not be perfect, and he tried to get a new document from Mr. Cook.

He had rights in that, however, under which he could justify the manufacture of these goods in Canada. He did not do so. He went on for five years. Now, they come in with this Bill and they propose not only placing this man in the same position as he was in when he got the right from Mr. Cooke, but they give him two years in order to exercise the right of manufacture, and they do more than that because I am satisfied that, under clause 2 of this Bill, they are giving him rights which are not in his patent at all. They are bringing him under the provisions of that section of the Patent Act which gives the commissioner the right to excuse him from manufacturing the article so long as he holds himself in readiness to grant the license to some other man to manufacture it and pay him a royalty. The more you examine this clause the more you see that it is something which ought not to be granted to a Canadian citizen, let alone to a foreigner. You are placing this man in the same position as if he had come to Canada to-day for the first time, was the original inventor of this process and applied to the Patent Office in the ordinary course of business to get his patent. If he had done that they could not have given him one day longer, they could not have given him one more advantage than they are giving him under this Bill. They are allowing this man to have slept upon his rights for five years, they are preventing the people from enjoying this invention, they are preventing people from entering into the manufacture of this article, they are placing this man in the same position as he would have been if he had been the inventor of this article and they are giving him rights and privileges which the original patent did not give at all. But, they give him something that is provided in the amendment which was made to the Patent Act in 1907. I think that if there ever was a case in which an American citizen has come over here and presumed upon our innocence it is the case of this man coming here and wanting this patent renewed.

Section agreed to: Yeas 44; Nays 42.

On section 2, power to receive petitions and to make orders.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 2 be adopted?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

On section 3, saving of rights acquired.

Mr. CARVELL. Are you discussing clause 2 or 3?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 3.

Mr. CARVELL. The chairman is sometimes so rapid in getting through these Bills that we have not time to object. I think, if it is necessary we may have to ask the Chairman to read the clauses. We do not like to be driven to that. I object to clause 2 particularly.

Mr. AMES. Clause 2 is passed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARVELL. No, I will take the ground that clause 2 has not been read, if my hon. friend wants to lock horns.

Mr. AMES. The Chairman has declared clause 2 adopted and we cannot go back to it without the consent of the House.

Mr. CARVELL. Clause 2 has not been read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that it is not necessary to read the clauses.

Mr. CARVELL. But the rule of parliament says that they shall be read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Unless the Chairman is asked to read them.

Mr. CARVELL. I am asking now to have clause 2 read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As I understand it has been passed and I was not asked to read it.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) believes that I cannot talk for three minutes, I think perhaps he is mistaken. I do not want to do this. I want to discuss clause 2 because I have a valid objection to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can move to reconsider clause 2.

Mr. CARVELL. I will then move to reconsider clause 2.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CARVELL. Now I will state my objection as briefly as possible. I would like the promoter of the Bill to give me some information as to whether the original patent is entitled to the provisions of the latter part of clause 2. Section 44 of the Patent Act is as follows:

On the application of the applicant for a patent, previous to the issue thereof, or on the application within six months after the issue of a patent of the patentee or his legal representatives, the commissioner, having regard to the nature of the invention, may order that such patent, instead of being subject to the condition with respect to the construction and manufacture of the patented invention hereinbefore provided, shall be subject to the following conditions.

Without taking time to read these conditions I may explain that they mean that the commissioner can absolve the manufacturer or the patentee from the necessity of manufacturing, so long as he will agree to grant a license to other people to manufacture. I would like to know if the original patent comes under that provision of section 44 of the Patent Act, chapter 69 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. AMES. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman that. I can only say that this is the standard clause which you will find in a great many other Bills of a similar character.

Mr. CARVELL. That was not in the Thomas Wedge patent which we just revived a few moments ago.

Mr. AMES. It was not necessary in that case.

Mr. CARVELL. It was not in it, and it seems we are giving this man rights which he is not entitled to. We are giving him a better patent than his patent really calls for. Surely, if we place him where he was before his negligence, he has no right to come to this country and ask for more; he has no right to ask us to put him in a position in which he may never manufacture this article in Canada or in which we may never have that industry so long as he holds himself ready to permit the manufacture and reap the benefit of the royalty from it?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a matter of serious moment as to whether or not we should place this man in a better position than he was entitled to at the inception of his patent.

(The hour for private Bills expired.)

APPOINTMENT OF A TARIFF COMMISSION.

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

On section 4.

Mr. OLIVER. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was discussing section 4, and pointing out that there were matters of serious importance in connection with the tariff that, in my judgment, were not contemplated to be dealt with by the commission appointed under this Bill. It was stated by the Minister of Finance that these matters did, as a matter of fact, come under the provisions of this section, but even admitting that statement to be correct, I still hold that so far as the reading of the section on its face is concerned, and so far as the discussion upon the Bill has gone, there is no indication whatever that this Bill was intended in any degree, to cover that side of tariff legislation, present or prospective, to which I was drawing attention. I was drawing attention to the loss that has been suffered by the producers of the west in the defeat of the reciprocity arrangement, under which they would have secured free access to the United States market. I gave a statement of the difference in price on barley and wheat as between Fort William and Minneapolis, and in the case of wheat I gave the price of nine cars actually bought on the Minneapolis sample market, and the samples examined in Winnipeg by competent men and the grades and prices attached and it would appear that the spread or loss to the Canadian farmer between Fort William and Minneapolis ran from eight cents to thirty-seven cents per bushel. Assuming that the average loss is fifteen cents per bushel, and assuming on the statement of Mr. Thompson of the Ogilvie Milling Company that there are some fifty million bushels of grain in the west still to market, the western Canadian

farmer stands to lose by failure to secure free access to the United States market for his wheat, seven and a half million dollars.

Mr. EMMERSON. When?

Mr. OLIVER. Since the 21st of September. This, it seems to me is a matter of sufficient importance to warrant the attention of the government and of the Minister of Finance. A dead loss of seven and a half million dollars, not in watered stock, but in actual cash value, cannot be contemplated without serious thought by any one who has regard for the wellbeing of this country. This loss of seven and a half million dollars on one-third of the farmer's crop which he has for sale in this bad year is equal to the prospective profit on the one hundred million dollars of common stock representing no value which has been loaded upon the industrial activities of Canada by the merger interests within the past three years. The farmer is actually losing in this one year, on one-third of his wheat crop as much money as these people hoped in their wildest dreams to make on these stupendous speculative organizations that they have been going into for the past three years. I have said and I verily believe that the purpose of the government, the purpose of the Minister of Finance, and the purpose of the Bill, is to find some way whereby interest can be earned on that one hundred millions of watered stock of absolutely no value. The Minister of Finance is bending all his attention to that end; he is going to appoint a commission that will cost this country in salaries alone $24,500; which will cost no doubt an equal amount in ordinary expenses for the members of the commission, and there will have to be a staff added at what expense we do not know. In the case of the United States body, which he takes for his example, the latest report that we have is that their staff numbers over seventy, and if the Minister of Finance continues to follow along the lines of that organization, this country will be lucky if it gets out of this precious Tariff Commission with an expenditure of less than one hundred thousand dollars a year; and all with the ultimate purpose of giving value where no value was, and of laying that much of extra tax upon the shoulders of the people of this country. Now, he does not need any Tariff Commission, and he does not need any one hundred thousand a year expenditure; he does not need any expert evidence to find a means to save to the farmers of the west the seven and a half million dollars to which I have called attention.

There is to-day on the statute-books of the United States a law which says that if and when the Canadian government makes provisions which are parallel to those of that law, it shall come into effect, and the effect of the law would be to put $7,500,000, at a minimum calculation, into the pockets of the producers of the western prairies, and through their pockets into the currents and channels of trade and industry and commerce and transportation all through the Dominion of Canada. May I believe that the suggestion is at any rate worthy of some consideration, which, so far as the form of the Bill or any indication of intent on the part of the government is concerned, has not entered into their calculations at all. But wheat is not the only grain affected. I might mention a little item which I gathered from the 'Pioneer Express' of Pembina, North Dakota, which makes this statement:

From November 1 to December 20 there have been imported into this district from Canada 138,062 bushels of barley, which paid duty at the rate of 30 cents a bushel, which duty amounted to $41,418. The most of this barley is marketed direct by Canadian farmers who are contiguous to the line.

The barley crop of the western prairie provinces is estimated by Sir Byron E. Walker at 37,000,000 bushels this year. It is not to be supposed that the whole of that crop is for sale. A large part of it is grown for feed purposes, but it is a well-known fact that this year a considerable amount of the wheat of the western prairies is only fit for feed, while the barley is of good quality, and it would be a happy condition if we were able to send our barley to the United States markets free of the 30 cent duty and use our feed wheat for the purposes for which barley would otherwise be used. I am informed that last year the United States used 150,000,000 bushels of barley, and there is every reason to believe that its market would absorb every bushel of barley the Canadian west could spare, and at prices which would not only give our people the United States only, but a handsome profit over and above the duty.

Mr. CLARK (North Bruce). Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. We are discussing clause 4, and the rule says that speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the clause under discussion. I submit that the hon. gentleman has for the last ten minutes been out of order.

Mr. OLIVER. We have been discussing the question of the responsibility of the government in regard to the commission, and I have been pointing out that the government, in the discharge of its responsibility, is not taking consideration of one of the most important features of the tariff. I think I am quite within the limits of the section, but I have not com-

pleted my argument, and if my hon. friend will only have patience, I think I will demonstrate to him and the whole committee that every word I have said is absolutely pertinent to section 4.

Mr. CLARK (North Bruce). I would ask the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the point of order is well taken. It seems to me that the hon. member for Edmonton has travelled pretty wide of the scope of the question, and I would ask him to keep his speech strictly relevant to the question.

Mr. OLIVER. I certainly will bow to the ruling of the Chairman if he says that I am not entitled to use the arguments I am making, but I certainly am well within the example of other members who have spoken on different sections of the Bill, and I would respectfully ask that I be not restricted more than other members. I claim the same privilege as other members, but no more.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must admit that some hon. members have gone too far, but my attention has not been drawn to their cases. In the present instance, as my attention has been drawn to the matter, I have to rule.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, if I am not permitted to conclude my remarks, I shall have to bow to your decision, and give place to some person else.

Mr. EDWARDS. As I have the honour to represent one of the most strictly agricultural counties in the Dominion of Canada, I may be permitted to say a word in regard to this Bill. The Bill presented to this House by the hon. Minister of Finance is one of the most important as well as one of the most logical pieces of legislation which has ever been presented to the parliament of Canada. I believe that the carrying out of this idea of the appointment of a Tariff Commission as outlined in this Bill will result in great good to the agriculturists of Canada.

Hon. gentlemen opposite throughout this debate have endeavoured to make it appear that this Bill was designed entirely for the benefit of the manufacturers, that they were the only class who could be referred to by the Bill. The hon. gentlemen from Edmonton, Humboldt and Assiniboia, have all advanced this idea and they have an object in view, that of trying to create the impression in this country that the Conservative government is here in the interests of the manufacturers and is opposed to the farmers.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I rise to a point of order. I assume that you are anxiously waiting for some gentleman to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the clause before the committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to refer to the Bill. He is apparently discussing the principle of the Bill. I would remind the hon. gentleman that he must speak on clause 4.

Mr. EDWARDS. I fully expected this little act of courtesy from my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). I should have referred to section 4, which is a very important section, it must be a very important section because it has been discussed at such great length by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have been surprised at the conclusions arrived at in the discussion of section 4 of this very important measure. Some hon. gentlemen have drawn from section 4 of this Bill the conclusion that it was designed solely in the interests of the manufacturers. The hon. member for Humboldt made this assertion notwithstanding the statements previously made by the Minister of Finance. The minister said:

> We do not desire to be relieved from responsibility with regard to the tariff, and all the Tariff Commission does, is to enable us to obtain information on which to act.

That was very explicit. He said further:

> I think the report of the Tariff Commission should be available to every member of this House as well as to the ministers, and then no doubt it will carry great weight. But that is far from saying that it is absolutely conclusive.

The Finance Minister further said:

> I would be the last man to suggest that the House of Commons should be denied the information obtained by means of the expenditure which they have authorized. There is no intention of that kind in this Bill. My hon. friends have been simply raising spectres with regard to this Bill.

Notwithstanding these very clear and specific assertions on the part of the minister, hon. gentlemen opposite have stated repeatedly just the opposite of what the minister has said. The hon. member for Edmonton could not see wherein this clause of the Bill had any reference to the farmer. One would infer from his remarks that farmers were not even thought of when the Bill was brought before the House, that there was no possibility of the farmer getting consideration of his wrongs. I do not think the hon. gentleman was justified in coming to that conclusion. Take the various sections of this clause, they clearly set out that in respect of goods produced in or imported into Canada, and you will note it does not say in respect of some goods, but, in respect of goods, which has

the same meaning as if the word 'all' was prefixed to goods—in respect of goods produced in or imported into Canada the commission shall, under the direction of the minister, make inquiry, &c. The word 'goods' is very clearly defined in the beginning of the Bill and the definition makes it clear that this Bill is not confined to the consideration of manufactured articles. There is a great chance for the farmers to be benefited by the appointment of a Tariff Commission. Take, for instance, the question of wheat. There is a duty at present of 12 cents a bushel on wheat. The United States has a duty of 25 cents a bushel on wheat. Is it not right that information should be obtained as to the cost of production, the cost of transportation, to the place of consumption; is it not right that the Canadian farmer should have, in fairness to himself, some protection against wheat produced, for instance, in Argentina?

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Did I catch a whisper from the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that sounded like 'hear, hear?'

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. And yet the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) strongly supported on the 21st of last September a proposal which would have denied to the farmers of Canada the very thing that he says 'hear, hear' for now.

Mr. OLIVER. In order that the hon. gentleman may not be under any misapprehension, I meant the 'hear, hear' sarcastically.

Mr. EDWARDS. I suppose the hon. member wishes me to regard even a little sarcastic reference from himself in the way of a compliment.

I assure the hon. gentleman that I have not that estimate of him, and cannot accept a word of his, even sarcastically spoken, as a compliment. Now, let us take the question of the production of wheat in Argentina—rate of wages, 64 cents a day. Is not that a reason which, in all fairness, should be considered in framing a tariff for Canada. Is it fair that the farmers of this country who have to pay the rate of wages they do should be asked to compete on even terms with the farmers of Argentina who pay wages at the rate of 64 cents a day?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask what is the difference, in regard to propriety under the rules of order, between my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) discussing the question of the cost of raising wheat in Argentina, and basing thereon a question of the duty on the wheat from that country, and my discussion of the duty on Canadian wheat going to Minneapolis?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. OLIVER. I asked for the Chairman's opinion.

Mr. EDWARDS. I wish to know what the point of order is.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, if necessary, I raise the point of order that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) is not keeping within the proper discussion of clause 4, according to your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. Discussing the point of order, let me call to your attention that clause 4, and I assume that that includes the subsections—provides that the commission shall investigate price and cost of raw materials in Canada and elsewhere. Am I within my right in discussing in the debate on that subsection, the cost of materials in Argentina? They are to investigate the cost of production in Canada and elsewhere. They are to investigate the cost of transportation from other countries to Canada. Am I within my right in referring to the cost of producing wheat in Argentina and transporting it? If I am not in order in doing this, it seems to me we cannot discuss the question at all.

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is vastly different from wandering from Halifax to Victoria as the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was doing.

Mr. OLIVER. If my information is correct, Argentina is much further away than Minneapolis. I ask your ruling on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. It may be further if you measure it in miles. But in application to this section, it is much nearer.

Mr. OLIVER. We will have the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that if the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) goes no further he will not be out of order.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not catch the ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. So far the hon. member is not out of order, provided he does not go further.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am glad to have been the humble means of providing a little much-needed information for the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). I may say, lest he take that as a compliment, that I only mean it sarcastically.

Mr. OLIVER. May I make a suggestion?

Mr. EDWARDS. If I am out of order, I will sit down. But, if I am not out of order, the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) is out of order.

Mr. OLIVER. May I make a suggestion to my hon. friend, with your permission, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. EDWARDS. I have the floor, and with all due regard for the hon. member for Edmonton, I do not think that any suggestion of his will add very much to my knowledge or information in this debate. I trust he will not regard that as discourteous—it is spoken sarcastically. Now, I submit that there is every chance for the farmers of Canada to be benefited by the appointment of a Tariff Commission. The subsections of section 4 to which I have referred, at once direct the attention of any member of this House, coming from a rural constituency to the possibilities of good from a commission of this kind. As I pointed out, it does seem to me that, in investigating the position of the farmers of Canada they will consider the cost of producing wheat, for instance in Argentina—as they will have the right to do under the subsection—the rate of wages in Argentina—as they will have the right to do under the subsection—and the cost of tarnsportation from that country as they will have the right to do, under the subsection. And I firmly believe that when this Tariff Commission gets its information as to the various countries with which the farmers of this Dominion have to compete, their work must result in benefit to our farmers. There are many articles produced by our farmers on which, I maintain, they are not treated fairly, and have never been treated fairly by either party in this country,—and in making that statement, I only repeat what I have said before. I submit that it would be the right of the Tariff Commission, under the subsections of this section to inquire into the reasons why, for instance, American bacon should be allowed to come into this country paying 2 cents duty, while the duty on our bacon going into the United States is 5 cents; why eggs, butter, cheese, and various other commodities—

Mr. OLIVER. I must ask for your ruling again on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. I maintain that this is directly in line with the subsections of section 4 and with what these subsections call upon the Tariff Commission to do.

Mr. OLIVER. May I insist upon my point of order. I was discussing exactly what my hon. friend is discussing and in exactly the same way, and I was called to order. And I must ask for the same consideration at your hands for my hon. friend as was accorded to myself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) is arguing that under section 4, the commissioners will have the right to investigate such and such matters. But I understood the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) desired to make a long argument on the effects of reciprocity.

Mr. OLIVER. If I may be allowed, I beg to say that my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is discussing the question of the mutual duties between Canada and the United States on farm products. And that is exactly what I was doing.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). May I make a suggestion? I think the hon. member for Frontenac is perfectly in order.

Mr. OLIVER. So do I.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). And I think the hon. member for Edmonton was perfectly in order. I think it would be fair to permit the hon. member for Edmonton to resume his remarks.

Mr. OLIVER. No, Mr. Chairman, what I wished to say to the hon. member for Frontenac a few minutes ago was that I believe the discussion will be seriously hampered under your ruling, Mr. Chairman. Of course, I accept your ruling, and I do not wish to be disrespectful. As I think the discussion would be seriously hampered under that ruling, my suggestion would be that the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) be perfectly free to make his remarks as he sees fit on the Bill and that I be accorded the same privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) is in order.

Mr. EDWARDS. That last suggestion of the hon. member for Edmonton was more in keeping with what should be expected from one who occupies his position than some of his previous remarks. I thank him for his suggestion that I should be allowed to continue without these frequent interruptions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will assume that hon. gentlemen opposite, in discussing this very important Bill, are sincere in their expressions of opinion; I want to think that of them, although I frankly confess it is a difficult thing to do sometimes. I was trying to point out wherein the farmers might be benefited by a Tariff Commission, and I was referring to certain commodities which they produce. I assume that under the powers granted to this commission by section 4, they will take into consideration the cost of producing these various commodities raised by the farmers, together with the cost of producing the same in the United States and other countries. I feel satisfied that if

the Tariff Commission does turn its attention to these things, they will see to it that the farmer, on these various commodities, is allowed a higher protection than he has at the present time. I do not think the farmer is properly treated at present, I think he is entitled to more protection on these various commodities I have named than he is getting. I think if you will look carefully into the matter you will find that it really costs less to produce many of these commodities on the other side of the line, and in other countries, than it does here; and if we are to maintain our standard of civilization, our rate of wages, and all that sort of thing, the Canadian farmer must get more protection on many articles than he is getting at the present time Therefore, I say that under section 4 of this Bill I do not know of any class of the community who are more likely to get justice from this commission than are the farmers of the Dominion of Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen on the other side have assumed quite a lot in discussing this matter. They have assumed that the Bill was designed exclusively for the benefit of the manufacturer, that the manufacturer was the only man who could possibly benefit by it. They have tried to make it appear that the Conservative party was antagonistic to the agriculturists of this country, that the Liberal party was the great friend of the farmers, and was the party to which the people would have to look for protection against the encroachment of the manufacturers. Now that contention is not borne out by the history of the Conservative party, or by the history of the Liberal party. I could refer to many acts and expressions in the history of the Liberal party to show that that was not the case. The duty on agricultural implements, up to 1907, was 20 per cent, and it was left there by the Liberal party as they found it in 1896. In 1907 the Fielding tariff was brought down, that was the year before a general election, and they reduced the duty on agricultural implements from 20 to 17½ per cent. But at the same time they raised the value for duty purposes of binders, for instance, whereby they collected a duty of 17½ per cent which amounted to more than they previously collected with a duty of 20 per cent. At the same time they appealed to the farmers for support on the ground that they had begun to carry out the policy they had advocated for 18 years previous to 1896, the policy of destroying protection entirely. That is only one of many instances that could be cited. When the manufacturers' delegation came down to Ottawa to interview the late government, the right hon. leader of the opposition, in answering those gentlemen, said that there was one thing at least the Liberal party prided itself on, they were proud of the fact that they had been very careful not to do anything to disturb the manufacturers of this country. Yet we find hon. gentlemen opposite getting up here and trying to set class against class, trying to make out that the manufacturers are the enemies of the farmers, that the present government is disposed to favour the manufacturers to the detriment of the farmers. I remember the leader of the opposition stating in this House that the best friend the farmer had was the manufacturer. He will find that in 'Hansard' of 1911, page 8459. That was his opinion then. Now the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), in speaking all around, or about, or at this Bill, made use of this expression, a very remarkable expression, even for that hon. gentleman.

The Liberal party in this country is a unit on the tariff question.

The amusing part of it is that he made that statement after listening to several hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House. Let us see the position. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) believes in a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, of course. Then the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) says:

I am for reasonable protection.

That is quite elastic. Then we have——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must remind the hon. gentleman that he is out of order and is not speaking on the Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then I will not continue that matter any further, as I do not wish to trangress the rules of the committee. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing absolutely clear, there has been ample evidence during the last few years that the people of this country want something definite in regard to the tariff. For instance, there was a deputation of six or seven hundred delegates representing the dairymen of eastern Ontario and western Quebec asking certain things. There was another deputation of seven or eight hundred farmers from the west making certain requests. That was followed by a delegation of ten or twelve hundred fruit and vegetable growers. Then the meat packers also made representations to the government. All these delegations, it seems to me, warrant us in concluding that the people have not been satisfied with the tariff in the past, they have not been satisfied with the way the late government handled the tariff.

I claim as evidence of this, the large deputations which have come here. In considering whether it is advisable to appoint such a commission, take an article that I

have it in my mind to mention. I may hold the view, and I will candidly say I do hold the view, that the duty on agricultural implements might be substantially reduced. That is my candid opinion. I have expressed it in this House before. I am sincere in holding that opinion, but I can conceive that there are hon. gentlemen in this House, who may be equally sincere in holding the opinion that the duty should not be reduced. How are we going to arrive at a conclusion as to what should be done? This very Bill and this very section which we are now considering, gives to the Tariff Commission the very powers which we want them to exercise in arriving at a correct conclusion in regard to the duties on agricultural implements as to whether these duties should be lowered or not. It seems to me that when they get that information, their figures will show that these duties should be reduced. Possibly I am wrong. Possibly those who hold the opposite view may be right, but it seems to me to be reasonable, right and proper that a commission should be appointed to collect valuable information and especially when the responsibility of the government is not lessened thereby. They will be held responsible, and when the information gathered by this commission, is placed before the Minister of Finance and before the members of this House, and we have had the very emphatic and distinct statement to the effect from the Minister of Finance and other members—it does seem to me that we will be in a better position to judge with regard to this great question than we have ever been at any time in the past. I do not think it is worthy of hon. gentlemen opposite to assume the attitude which they have been assuming, in the discussion of this measure. From first to last on the face of it, in its very language, there is the utmost candour and the desire plainly manifested by the framer of this Bill, to give the widest opportunity to any and every class in this country, to the farmers as well as to the manufacturers, that justice may be done to all. I submit again that it seems to me that a measure of this kind is along the right lines. In stating that I am stating precisely what I said when my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Mr. Borden), last year in this House suggested the idea of a permanent Tariff Commission. I thought at that time that it was a wise suggestion. Personally, representing a farming constituency, I am more than ever impressed, especially after the able presentation of the case by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and other gentlemen who have spoken, that this Bill providing for a Tariff Commission is one of the wisest and most logical measures that has ever been introduced into this House. There are several other things that I would like to take up without getting out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, go on.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to refer to some of the arguments made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) in regard to barley, wheat and a few of the other items which he referred to. I would like to call his attention to cement and to ask him to look up and see what his party attempted to do by the reciprocity pact with regard to cement. They proposed a reduction of 1½ cents per 100 pounds—that is all, notwithstanding the fact that there was strong evidence in favour of more decided action in the rise in price of from 40 to 50 cents a barrel while they had matters in their own hands. When these hon. gentlemen are out of power they interest themselves on behalf of the farmers. Yet, during all the years they were in power they did not avail themselves of the standing offer of the United States for free trade in agricultural implements. The offer was there, they could have accepted it, if they had chosen to do so. They had the power and the opportunity. Did they do so? Not at all. Their record shows very clearly where these hon. gentlemen have stood for years, preaching, when in opposition, free trade, the destruction of the last vestige of protection and then, coming into power, and giving the lie to all their professions for the previous eighteen years by maintaining the policy which they had up to that time condemned. We had some gentlemen in the course of this discussion getting up and professing to be free traders while others favoured a tariff for revenue, and incidental protection. Such a conglomeration of political thought, or want of thought, on the other side I do not think this House has ever seen. They do not seem to know where they are at in regard to tariff matters; yet the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) says that the Liberal party is a unit in regard to the tariff. The hon. gentleman shakes his head but I am in a position to be able to prove by 'Hansard' that he said just what I allege he said.

Mr. TURRIFF. Just read it will you please?

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman discussing this very matter yesterday——

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to hear it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. It was about the last speech in yesterday's 'Hansard.'

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman need not look through my speech, because I did not make the remark.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not wish to misquote the hon. gentleman. I would not do so intentionally. I am quite sure I read

it in some of his remarks. It may have been the hon. member for Humboldt; I would not be certain as to that. It is immaterial at all events. One hon. gentleman on the opposition side certainly did make the statement and if the hon. member for Assiniboia did not that is one sin less that he will have to answer for.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is true all right.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to confine myself to section 4 as closely as my hon. friend from Frontenac has done and I hope I will have your permission, Mr. Chairman, to discuss it within these limits. First of all as to the bearing of section 4 on the agricultural industry my hon. friend from Frontenac corrected me this afternoon when I said that on its face section 4 had not any bearing on the agricultural industry, and, I think, pointed me to the interpretation clause.

I shall deal with this interpretation clause and its application to section 4 and the committee may then judge how far I was justified in my view. The interpretation clause says:—

'Goods' means products, wares and merchandise or movable effects of any kind, including, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, horses, cattle, and other animals.

Then, under section 4, the duty of the commission shall be, under the direction of the minister, to make inquiry as to:—

The price and cost of raw material in Canada and elsewhere, and the cost of transportation thereof from the place of production to the place of use or consumption.

If the contention of my hon. friends is correct, we are to read into that subsection 'wheat,' and 'horses,' but I must say that when I undertake to read these words into the section, they do not make very good sense, and I find the same disability in regard to the other subsections. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that it is possible to read into the first clause of section 4 references to the agricultural industry, I think everybody must admit that the references are very remote, and are not in any degree indicated by the nature of the wording of the section. Clearly, the section is intended to apply simply to the manufacturing industry, that is to say, to define the duties of the commission as being for the purpose of inquiring into the conditions surrounding the manufacturing industry, and the words introduced into the interpretation clause are simply, so far as the face of the section is concerned, inapplicable and out of place.

Mr. BORDEN. Why?

Mr. OLIVER. Because they are inapplicable and out of place.

Mr. BORDEN. I think they are not inapplicable.

Mr. OLIVER. I bow to my right hon. friend's judgment.

Mr. BORDEN. But I would like to understand your meaning?

Mr. OLIVER. I am only giving my hon. friend and the House the benefit of my poor opinion.

Mr. BORDEN. But what is the reason?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that it is pertinent to discuss the reasons for my arriving at the conclusion. That is the conclusion at which I have arrived and I am taking the liberty of informing the House to that effect. I hope I have that privilege. I say that when I undertake to read these words into subsection A, for instance, the result does not seem to me to be pertinent or applicable, and in my humble judgment the other sections of clause 4 are in the same position. So much so, that on the face of it, according to the wording of the section, the intent and purpose of it, and the instructions to the commission, are instructions to make inquiry in regard to manufacturing industries only. That is the purpose as I read section 4. The commissioners are to be appointed by the government to work under the direction of the minister, and to report only to the minister, and every word uttered by the minister and by every member of the House supporting this Bill (until the speeches of the last two or three members who have spoken to-day), absolutely recognized that that was the purpose of the Bill, and that it did not have even the most remote connection with the agricultural industry, or the adjustment of the burden of taxation on the agricultural industry so as to be for the benefit of that section of the community. What I further wish to point out is that this agricultural industry is of such importance, and the conditions surrounding it, at the present moment, are so urgent, that if the intention of the Bill was to consider the agricultural industry on the same footing as the manufacturing industry, it should have so appeared on the face of the Bill, and it should not and would not have been necessary to hunt for it in the interpretation clause, and to put, as it appears to me with all deference, a strained interpretation on that clause, in order to bring in any reference to the agricultural industry. I was trying to place before the committee the facts in regard to the extreme conditions prevailing and the urgency of those conditions in connection with the agricultural industry, as my argument why this clause should be framed differently if it was to convey the

intention of dealing with that industry as I wish to see it dealt with, and, in pursuance of that purpose, I was showing that in the case of wheat there was an opportunity before the government to secure access to the markets of the United States for the wheat of our prairies, to the benefit of the producers to the extent of seven and a half million dollars on that part of this year's crop that yet remains to be marketed. I was discussing the advantage that would accrue to the producer from access to the United States market for the surplus barley of this year, and if I might carry the matter one step further I would draw attention to the fact that on January 19th last, sixty thousand bushels of Canadian oats were sold in the New York market, paying the duty, and thus showing that there is a market for Canadian barley and for Canadian oats as well as for Canadian flax in the United States, and that to-day our oats and our barley are going to the United States to a limited degree and paying the duty, and that the demand in the United States for the products of our farms is such that if the duty were removed, as the duty might be removed so far as we can judge by the action of this government, that benefit would result directly to the producers of that region, and to the trade, and commerce, and finance, and transportation of this whole Dominion of Canada.

I have said something as to the magnitude of the case; may I say something now as to the urgency of the case. The Manitoba 'Free Press' has been making an investigation of the conditions as to the marketable wheat in the prairie provinces, and I have before me the issue of February 10th instant, in which I find a despatch from Harris, Sask., a portion of which I shall read. I think when I have read it the House will agree that the matter is urgent and is worthy of the attention of the government in the most marked degree. The article reads as follows:

Harris, Sask., Feb. 7.—This afternoon at Harris I saw a sight that has surely seldom been witnessed on the western prairies. I saw 100,000 bushels of wheat piled in the railway yard like coal. It was in rough bins made of lumber. The bins have been built on the ground with no foundation but mother earth, and the only roof is a mantle of snow. Most of the bins contain from 500 to 1,000 bushels, but one of them, which looked from the outside something like a roofless rink or a large cattle pen inclosed 50,000 bushels of wheat. This wheat a local lumber company had had to accept from the farmers in lieu of cash. Besides the bins there were in the yards about a dozen grain wagons all full of wheat, and I am informed that every available nook and corner in Harris is stored with wheat.

A large quantity of lumber has been used in the construction of these emergency bins. None of them could have been erected for less than $50, while the large one must have cost very much more. The idea of erecting the bins is to have the wheat in hand the moment anything in the shape of a freight car presents itself at Harris. To-day the yard was as bare of cars as Minitonas was of gold, and I understand that that has been the condition of things for some days past. There were 141 cars on the order book to-day, but that by no means represents the number wanted. Many farmers need three or four cars, but cannot order more than one at a time. About 308 cars of grain, practically all wheat, have been shipped from here since the season opened. Last year only 192 cars were shipped from this point.

Since the middle of December all cars with the exception of four have been loaded from the temporary bins above described. Much of this wheat is tough. Worse still, there are at least 75,000 bushels of wheat lying on the farm in heaps, just as it came from the separator. Most of it is tough and will spoil if it is not got out during the next few weeks. At present the cars are coming into Harris at the rate of four or five a week, a rate which is entirely inadequate, and which will mean heavy loss unless it is speedily increased. The three elevators have been full continuously. It is claimed by the railway company that only 7,000,000 were estimated for the Goose Lake line, whereas the actual crop has turned out to be nearer 14,000,000.

The business men of Harris are weary of waiting for cars which come not. In the meantime, there is financial constipation, or as one should say, 'nothing doing.' In all the stores and in the hotel notices are up, 'Positively no credit. We have closed our books.' If the grocery store adhered strictly to this rule, there would be actual starvation or suffering in the neighbourhood, but it does not. In other stores the rule of 'No credit' is closely followed. Clerks have little to do and pass the time chatting with farm hands who are waiting for the farmers to sell their grain and pay them their wages. I talked to-day to Thomas A. Stevenson, a Harris farmer, who told me that he finished threshing 2,000 bushels just before Christmas. His wheat had quite a bit of ice in it. After threshing it was placed in bins in the field. The wheat was still in the bins. He had put his name down for a car immediately after threshing, and there were still two pages of the order book ahead of him.

Now, I think I have established that the condition is one of stupendous magnitude, that it is a case of extreme urgency; and if our hon. friends say that the tariff has nothing to do with that condition, I can only reply that the tariff has everything to do with it—that had it not been for the tariff it would have been possible to have delivered every bushel of the wheat that is now left without shelter on those western prairies, safely at some terminal point, either Fort William, Duluth or Minneapolis, before the spring came that

would destroy all the damp wheat that remained at that time.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not that wheat permitted to go into the United States in bond to be ground for export free of duty?

Mr. OLIVER. No. At the present time the duty is paid, and it is refunded after the wheat is ground; but up to the present time the railway rates, in addition to the duty, have been such as practically to prevent that being done on any large scale. If the railway rates were suitable, no doubt a great deal of the grain could be absorbed in that way. But that is a very inadequate remedy for the terrible condition that prevails to-day. What was needed was that every possible avenue should have been opened, not only the privilege of grinding in bond, but the privilege of grinding for home consumption, and, what is more urgent, the privilege of entry for feed purposes. But that has not been done, and the condition which I have described prevails all over the western country. And my hon. friend the Minister of Finance brings down a Bill which absolutely ignores on the face of it the interests that are represented in that condition of affairs. I cannot agree that such a provision is satisfactory or is in accordance with the wellbeing of the country.

Mr. MORPHY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a part of that grain was cut but unthreshed?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. MORPHY. Well, how could you have got that grain out, no matter what the conveyances were like?

Mr. OLIVER. That could not have been got out until it was threshed; but will the hon. gentleman tell me what purpose a farmer would have in threshing grain that was standing in the stook when, after having threshed it, he would have to put it in a bin where it would remain until it was heated and destroyed, because he could not transport it?

Mr. MORPHY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him again—

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman answer my question?

Mr. MORPHY. I am not answering questions. What government was in power that permitted such a disgraceful condition in the west without providing transportation facilities for carrying the wheat away?

Mr. OLIVER. It is the government which my hon. friend supports, which has been in power since the 21st of September, and since this condition began to exist, and I have placed before the government to-night a course which they could and should have taken in order to have remedied that condition.

But even yet if they would take that course it could well be remedied in some measure. However, I have no hope from anything I see in this Bill or from anything I have heard here spoken from the other side of the House that any such action will be taken. While the wheat, which is practically the gold of our country, upon which not only the western farmer but the trade and commerce and industry and finance of this whole country depend, is depreciating in value, and may, in large measure, be actually lost, this government brings in a Tariff Commission Bill upon which they propose to found a tariff at some time in the distant future, and that is their answer to this condition that exists. My hon. friend thought that opposition to this Bill was something of a pillow fight, that there was not any sincerity in it. May I return the compliment to him, and may I say that the government and the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), who sits comfortably here in Ottawa, who spends more or less of his time in adjusting offices in the various departments of the public service while the country is in the condition that I have described, and it is in the power of the government to remedy that condition, stands in much the same position as Nero fiddling while Rome burned.

I do not want any member of this House to think that the conditions are exaggerated by me. I want the House to understand that these conditions are so serious that neither newspaper nor public man has dared to give full effect to the facts in regard to these conditions up to the present time, and I am at a loss to understand a government which sits quiet and still, knowing, absolutely knowing, that these conditions do exist.

Mr. STANFIELD. If conditions are as bad as the hon. gentleman stated, how is it that the merchants in the west are ordering more goods to-day than they did a year ago?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that at all; it may be that the people are hopeful for the future, and it is a matter of fact that there has been an immense increase in population and an immense increase of acreage in the past year. An enormous crop has been raised, even with the damage. But that does not affect the case of the thousands and tens of thousands of men who did not have a crop that they were able to ship out. My hon. friend reflects the attitude of mind, I am afraid, of the government in this matter. They say, as long as business is good, as long as we are able to collect interest on our mortgages, and as long as we get returns on the goods we have sold,

times must be good and things must be good in the west. But I am trying to give them actual inside information in regard to it; no, not inside information, information that is absolutely contained, letter by letter and word by word, in their own government reports, so that they cannot claim lack of knowledge, and my hon. friend, I say, actually reflects the attitude of mind of the government when he says: How can business be in such a condition when the people are ordering more goods? I do not wish to lay too much stress on this feature of the case, I do not think it is wise. I only want to take this opportunity in the discussion of this Bill to say to the government how far they have fallen short of their duty in this case, how far this Bill falls short of meeting the requirements of this country in regard to tariff adjustment.

I said this afternoon that we feared the influences particularly behind the Minister of Finance in connection with tariff adjustment. I think I am not going out of the way when I say that one of the strongest institutions behind the government of the day is the Ogilvie Milling Company, and that the milling interests of Canada, speaking generally, are amongst the strongest stays and supports of this government, I find that in an interview given in Montreal on January 11——

Mr. EDWARDS. What particular subsection of section 4 has this reference to?

Mr. OLIVER. I think I was fair to the hon. gentleman and he should be as fair to me. I am discussing section 4, I am trying to show that it falls short of the requirements of this country in regard to tariff legislation and that we are fearful, we are suspicious of the danger to the producing classes from this legislation. I am surely permitted to do that.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was not permitted as much latitude as the hon. gentleman by several miles.

Mr. OLIVER. It was no member on this side who called the hon. member to order or interfered with him. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance was surprised at the suspicion with which this Bill was viewed on this side of the House. I am going to give the House a reason for this suspicion on behalf of the interests for whom I have been speaking, and I wish to give what Mr. Thompson of the Ogilvie Milling Company said in the Montreal 'Gazette,' on January 11, speaking of the crop condition in the west. He said:

Export Duty Suggested.

Even Canadian millers may experience considerable difficulty in getting sufficient high grade wheat to fully meet their requirements and the question of an export duty on the high grade wheats as a matter of protection to home requirements and seed may with every justification be seriously considered.

I think that we who represent the interests of the people of the west who raise the wheat and who need the money that the wheat will bring, are justified in viewing with grave suspicion a Bill which proposes to place in the hands of the Finance Minister and of the government the fullest authority to collect information that would help to maintain them in the position they have now taken in regard to the wheat situation in the west. And for all we know, establish a position such as is suggested by the representive of the Ogilvie Milling Company, one of their strongest and best supporters, and one who, I presume, is high in their councils in this matter.

In regard to this Bill and this section of the Bill, I have heard my hon. friends from Peel (Mr. Blain), Halton (Mr. Henderson), Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), and Souris (Mr. Schaffner), all declaring their support of the principle of the Bill because they hope to get that which, as they declared, they never got from the old government—a lower tariff. The purpose of the Bill is more important than its matter; the purpose of the section is more important than its form. If I could see in this section, or in any part of the Bill, any prospect of tariff revision downwards, I would be willing to forego many objections that might otherwise be raised. But I think my hon. friends will have some difficulty in convincing their constituents that they had any reason to suppose that this Bill was an indication of a revision of the tariff downwards. This Bill, and particularly this section, is an indication of tariff revision upwards. On that point let my non. friends make their minds easy. They may have been able to becloud the issue for their electors in the past; they may have been able to do, as my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) very cleverly did yesterday—take one, two or three items of the tariff which had been increased by the Liberals and put these forward as proving a general increase. I have no doubt that these hon. gentlemen won their elections on that campaign. I will not give my opinion of the political morality of such a campaign—let that go. But I want to warn them, that, after this debate and after the passage of this Bill, they will not be able to becloud the issue any more. For this Bill defines the issue clear and square between tariff revision upward and tariff revision downward. The Bill gives power and authority to a government elected on a policy of higher taxation and trade restriction. And any one who thinks he can get the people to believe that such a government is going to use the power of this Bill

for the purpose of giving them lower taxation or trade expansion, is too innocent for this world. I do not think he ever was a voter anywhere or ever will be. So, my hon. friends from the west and from the rural parts of Ontario and from the rural parts of Canada generally, may have been able to fool the farmers in the past and before this Bill was brought in; but I give them warning now, that they will not be able to fool the farmers any more. And, more than that, they will not be able to fool the seventy-five per cent of the people who are really the burden-bearers for this country. They have not yet shown, and they will not show, how increased taxation and restriction of trade, how the boosting of the tariff at the dictation and in the interests of the mergers, trusts and combines, is going to help the labouring man to keep his family or the farmer to cultivate his land to better advantage. Cleverly though the Bill is drawn, smoothly though it is introduced, it is still a declaraton of policy; it is the challenge of the special interests to the people of Canada; and as such, it is accepted.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Coming back from what may be considered a little digression from section 4, though on a matter of the greatest importance to the House and the country as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), I have one or two amendments which I propose to move to section 4, and which I think I may now place before the committee, the matter having been pretty well discussed. But before doing so, I would like to make one or two references more particularly to the speech delivered this afternoon by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster, North Toronto). I am sorry that hon. gentleman is not in his place to-night. He rushed in this afternoon, flashed a few bright thoughts on the discussion—illuminative thoughts they were—rushed out of the chamber again and has not reappeared. But he discussed the section now before the committee in a manner in regard to which I can only congratulate him. I agree with the Toronto 'Globe' of the 6th of January last, in part of the item, read last night by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), in which the 'Globe' goes out of its way to congratulate the Minister of Trade and Commerce on the stand he has taken throughout the whole discussion on the appointment of a Tariff Commission, as the buffer between the desire of the majority of his colleagues in the Cabinet to establish a Tariff Commission, giving it full power over our fiscal policy, and the more modest Bill which has been brought before the House. It is currently rumoured, and the newspapers have commented upon it, that but for the strenuous efforts of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a much more drastic piece of legislation would have been presented, one which would have deprived this House of a great many more of its functions than does the present measure. I stated that the address of the Minister of Trade and Commerce was illuminative. It was. And I think it was instructive to his own colleagues. Fortunately or unfortunately the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster, North Toronto), had not heard the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds), speak or the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Borden), this afternoon; and when asked by myself his interpretation of section 4 of this Bill, he gave an answer which coincided exactly with what I had said this afternoon, which had been challenged or contradicted by the hon. the Minister of Finance and by the right hon. the leader of the government.

That was in regard to the question as to whether this commission, when reporting was to report to the minister or to parliament. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said distinctly it was to report to parliament, for the use of members of parliament. That is the suggestion which I asked the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister to accept. When challenged on it, the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, certainly, that was his understanding of it when he discussed it with his colleagues. Passing from that point, the Minister of Trade and Commerce said to the House: Let us go to the genesis of this movement in favour of the appointment of a Tariff Commission, let us see where this demand comes from. Now I ask any hon. member of this House to state where the demand does come from. Is there a demand at all, apart from one source? The Minister of Trade and Commerce premised his remarks by saying that there was a demand, and I will ask the Prime Minister now, where is the demand from? I ask the Minister of Finance, where does the demand come from? The only answer they give is the resolutions and various discussions of the Manufacturers' Association. My right hon. friend says that he has spoken some forty times throughout Canada, and has mentioned it in his speeches. But I submit there is no demand, and there has been no demand; and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to give us a chance and adjourn this debate for even two or three weeks, to allow the country to become familiar with the terms of the Bill, because I take it that ninety per cent of the electors know nothing at all about it, and ninety per cent of the newspapers of Canada have never discussed it. If we could only have a respite of two or three weeks, the government would know what kind of a demand there was for or against it.

Now how does the Minister of Trade and Commerce justify clause 4? He says that

in his time, back before the year 1896, he and a number of his colleagues were sent from province to province to gather information, to hear deputations, to hear ex parte statements through deputations, accompanied by lawyers, by huge piles of documents and reports of evidence. He says that when he concluded his peregrinations he knew less about the tariff than he did when he started, and was less able to produce a perfect document than when he commenced his investigation. Then he says he came down to the House with a tariff made by rule of thumb. That was the predicament he was in. He has never made the confession before, but he has been challenged to do so. Hitherto he has always justified that tariff, and told us how, with one stroke of the pen, he wiped out four millions of taxation. Now he says that after three or four months travel throughout the country he came down with a tariff made practically by guesswork. Is it any wonder that conditions detrimental to Canada followed such a tariff as that, that the revenue went down and the expenditure went up, that there was business stagnation throughout the country under a tariff made in the manner described by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, made, as he says, by rule of thumb. Then he had the audacity to say that if Mr. Fielding was in the House he would admit that his tariffs were similarly made. I challenge that statement. If Mr. Fielding were in the House to-day there would be no stronger opponent of this measure. Mr. Fielding's tariff was not made by any rule of thumb, it was made after careful and critical investigation. It was made, it is true, after a prolonged course of travel throughout the country, after much thought and consideration. It was made after obtaining the facts and information which any Minister of Finance should obtain. His tariff stood practically from 1907, until the present moment, and take it year by year from the date upon which it was passed, and all classes of this country I believe will accord it united praise. It left Canada on the 21st of September last in such a good condition that the Prime Minister was one of the champions of that stock in trade remark during the last election, 'let well enough alone.'

Now the Minister of Trade and Commerce did disagree with me in regard to striking out the words 'under the direction of the minister.' I still hold to my opinion that these words should be stricken out; I still hold that the Tariff Board should be an independent board. If the Finance Minister will put in an alternative clause there, I will be perfectly satisfied, though still protesting against the general principle. If he will allow an alternative clause enabling, say, five or ten individuals to request the Tariff Board to make an investigation into this, or that subject, I will be satisfied. But if he leaves it in its present form it is most highly objectionable, because any board he may see fit to appoint will be his own creation, subject only to his own direction, men who cannot in the very nature of things make what may be called an independent finding. Now, if the Minister of Finance is sincere, he will admit some alternative clause, or will consent to strike out these words, and rely upon clause 2, which gives him every power imaginable over the board. Then leave the commissioners free under subsection 1, or put in an alternative clause allowing five or ten individuals, who make a bona fide application, to have this, that, or the other investigation held by this Tariff Commission. I have taken advice of the Speaker with regard to this, and I understand I can move several amendments. My first amendment then will be to strike out the words I have mentioned in subsection 1; 'under the direction of the minister.' Then coming down to clause (g) of subsection 1, my amendment will be to strike out the two last words 'the minister,' and insert the word 'parliament.' At present it reads 'report to the minister,' and I think the wisdom of the House will be with me in my suggestion that the report ought to be made to parliament. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says that was his idea from the discussion he had with his colleagues in council.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). How would my hon. friend reconcile subsection 6 with section 5, where it speaks of confidential evidence that must not be made public?

Mr. GUTHRIE. We will have a good deal to say on that section.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). Does the hon. gentleman expect confidential evidence to be submitted to the House?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have a good deal to say on confidential evidence. I do not believe in confidential evidence in a matter of this kind. I believe the facts on which the government is going to act should be made public to everybody. But I do think, in all fairness to the individual members of this House, outside of government circles, that the report should come down to parliament to enable us to judge, and not be in the nature of secret departmental information to be given solely to the Minister of Finance.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) proved my case. He said that this was the forum for disputants to come to, both parties could meet, thresh

the matter out, all parties would know what the facts were and the facts would be public and come down to this House so that we could all examine them. Why not abide by that? The request is reasonable and if the request is not granted it makes me feel that there is an ulterior motive in the mind of the Minister of Finance in regard to this Bill and that our criticism that there is something behind the Bill is only too well founded.

Then, I come to the next amendment that I am going to move and that is to strike out subsection 3 altogether. Subsection 3 is the provision that this commission may investigate trusts, mergers and the like. If we pass the subsection in its present form we are placed in this peculiar position; we have not less than three forums in this country authorized to investigate trusts, combines, mergers and the like. We have the proceeding prescribed by the Tariff Act which provides that an investigation into combines and mergers may be held before judges and these investigations may be held upon the recommendation, appointment, or order of the Governor in Council. I think it would appeal to any reasonable man that the proper forum for such an investigation would be before a judge or judges of the courts of this country. I think the whole House will agree with me that the judges from one end of Canada to the other are men in whom the public have every confidence and for whom the whole nation entertains the very highest regard and respect. I believe that we could all submit such a matter as this is to the judges with absolute confidence that their views will be unbiased by any feeling of partisanship or by any school of thought in regard to tariff, high tariff, low tariff, tariff for revenue or free trade, and that before the judges and perhaps before them only, you can have, from beginning to end, a fair, square inquiry that will go to the root of things and a fearless finding of results. I think that the section in the Tariff Act is broad enough to provide for this inquiry taking place as it should take place. My suggestion a day or two ago was that a reasonable amendment to that particular clause of the tariff law would suffice. Appoint some gentleman as counsel on behalf of the people or the government and make him the active agent of the government in the prosecution, or in the inquiry, or examination into the affairs of these mergers and combines. That is the forum which I would approve. But, there is another forum. Under the combines Act, I believe, it is provided that any five or seven persons—I think it is seven—may make application for an inquiry. There are two forums. Now comes this proposal for a third forum. Is a third forum necessary or essential? Is there any reason why one or both of those now existing should not be used in preference to the third? The third forum is to be the Tariff Commission appointed by this government and I have no doubt in my mind that the hon. member for St. Antoine, was quite fair, quite candid, quite accurate in his statement as to the qualifications of the men who will sit on that board. I do not think he took advice from the members of the government when he made the statement but I have not heard any of them repudiate the statement and I am satisfied that he stated the fact when he said that the commission will be conservative and protectionist. The commissioners will have to be men in sympathy with the protectionist feelings of the present administration. Would you not rather have a board of judges? Would it not be fairer to have a board of judges to inquire into this matter? There are so many mergers to-day that one is almost afraid to count them up or to imagine what the actual capitalization of these concerns is as apart from the watered capitalization. When one considers the effect which they may have, or which they have to-day, upon the great question that is agitating the public mind in regard to the cost of living one sees the necessity at once of going before the tribunal which is most likely to go into the question fearlessly and fairly and to reach a proper result. Would it be this board of tariff commissioners or would it be a board of independent judges in the courts of this country? I have no hesitation in saying, as I said before, that the mergers of Canada would laugh at your Tariff Commission. Give them a chance of selecting the forum to conduct this investigation and they will select the Tariff Commission and not the judges.

Something has been said about mergers —I do not know that I shall go into it now —perhaps at a future time I may have an opportunity—but there is this to be said that, notwithstanding the statement made last night by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, who I believe, said that if it could be demonstrated that the effect of the merger of the Ames-Holden and other companies had been to increase the cost of boots and shoes, the product of these factories, to the consumer, he would readily consent to have the present tariff wiped out.

Mr. AMES. No.

An hon. MEMBER. No, reduced 25 per cent.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Reduced. Well, I do not think it is necessary to prove that. My view of it is that with the over-capitalization of that and other companies and prices are too high to-day, it is not the question of increasing the price

or reducing the price to the consumer, who is the wearer of boots and shoes. It is so apparent on its face, that one hardly need state it in this House, or to make anything more than a passing remark with regard to it. Take a company—I do not mean the Ames-Holden Company,—but take any company in which there is an actual capital of $100,000 invested—that money has been paid into it—and the effect of these mergers that take place is to double, treble and multiply that capital, not by new money, but simply by the issue of new stock. A company with $100,000 invested in actual cash, may be recapitalized by the modern process into a company with $1,000,000 of bonds preferred stock, common stock and you see the result. In order to obtain five per cent. on the nominal capital, you have to earn $50,000 on the $100,000 that went into the business. You have to earn $50,000 on the actual investment in order to pay five per cent on the capitalization.

Mr. AMES. I suppose the hon. gentleman is quite aware that many of these companies pay no dividend whatever on their common stock and will not pay any dividend until the water has been entirely squeezed out.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I know there are all sorts of processes in connection with these schemes and I will admit that the hon. member from Montreal, St. Antoine, is more familiar with practices of this sort than I am. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will give us both pointers.

Mr. AMES. The only thing I object to is that this is criticised by men who know very little about it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I am trying to give a few plain, blunt facts that appeal to me and it certainly appeals to me on the face of it, to be wrong in every sense of the word, to see the Ames-Holden Company, or any other company into which a limited amount of capital has been placed, being capitalized up to two or three times that amount. That is a fraud on the face of it. While I do not know the various processes by which these ends are attained, I state plainly and bluntly that an investigation in regard to them should take place and while the Ames-Holden merger would very gladly submit their affairs to the Tariff Commission, they will be very reluctant to submit their affairs to a board of judges that were appointed under the Canadian Combines Act.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. member allow me to give him one piece of information, because I know he always tries to do what is just and fair in debate, and I have not had occasion hitherto to criticise him on that point. He repeatedly has referred to this company with which apparently I have the misfortune to be connected, and I shall make one statement for his benefit because it is a statement that will be applicable to the allegations made by other honourable gentlemen on that side of the House. My statement is: Every dollar of the bonds and preferred stock of the Ames-Holden-Mc Cready Company represents actual money invested. So far as the common stock is concerned, there has never been a dollar of dividend paid upon it, nor is there expected to be a dividend paid upon it until that also represents actual assets.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Well, Mr. Chairman, so much for that clause——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I know there are a great many gentlemen on the other side who applaud these mergers. I cannot find it in me to do it, and I know there are seated in this House many personal friends of my own who are very deeply interested in the question of mergers.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? Does the hon. gentleman not remember that a year ago, the day before yesterday, a motion was made in this House to investigate such mergers, and the government that the hon. gentleman supported, and he himself amongst them, voted that motion down.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not remember the question to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I can tell you.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I say it is no part of the duty of parliament to investigate mergers; we have a law which provides a way in which they should be investigated and why not put that law in force now or at any time.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Why not put it in force then?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Who made the complaint?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. GUTHRIE. What merger does my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) refer to?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I refer to the motion made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), now the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not remember it at all. I do not know whether I was here, but even if I were here I probably would have voted against the motion because I have no doubt the motion was wrongly brought or it would not have been voted down by parliament. But, I find to-night, from the generous applause that greets the

question of mergers from the other side, that there is a tremendously strong feeling in their favour among the Conservative ranks in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Well, I have noticed the marked applause that greets the mergers from hon. gentlemen opposite. I heard the Minister of the Interior a few days ago make a distinct statement in regard to mergers, on the question of the cost of living. It was a very excellent statement. He said that no question had given the government so much trouble or called for so much consideration from the government as that very question of mergers and the cost of living. I thought at the time that the Minister of the Interior was serious, but I do not know that he will make very much headway against mergers, trusts and combines with the present representation on the Conservative side of the House of Commons, because evidently there are only two questions brought before this House which they will applaud. One is: whenever the question of mergers is mentioned there is applause loud and prolonged, and again, the only real cheer hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House can get out of them is when the sacred word 'protection' is used; 'protection' cheers from the government side; 'high protection' more cheers; and 'highest protection' loud and prolonged cheers.

Mr. BLAIN. If my hon. friend will permit me—

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not wish to be interrupted again. There have been occasions in this House, recently, when there was anything but a government cheer. We did not hear much united cheering from the government side when the Ne Temere was up; we did not hear any united cheer when the government's naval policy, or lack of naval policy, was before this House, but you talk of trusts and mergers, then my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is cheered to the echo by his friends, when I am almost prevented from speaking because of interruption. When you talk of protection, or higher protection, or highest protection, then cheers from the government supporters ring throughout the walls of this Chamber. However, these remarks are a little beside the question and I shall get back to the clause. I now beg to move, seconded by Mr. Carvell:

That the words 'under the direction of the minister' in line 2 of subsection 1 of section 4 of the Bill, be struck out.

Amendment (Mr. Guthrie) negatived, Yeas 40; Nays 76.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Carvell:

That the words 'to the minister' in the last clause 'g' of subsection 1 of section 4 be struck out and the words 'to parliament' be substituted therefor.

Amendment (Mr. Guthrie) negatived.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I beg to move seconded by Mr. Carvell:

That subsection 3 of section 4 of the Bill be struck out.

Mr. TURRIFF. Before that amendment is put I want to point out this phase of it. It is proposed now to put the trying of these mergers and combines practically out of the hands of the judges in whose hands it is at present.

Mr. BORDEN. It is not so proposed at all.

Mr. TURRIFF. The object of this Bill, if it means anything, is that this commission shall be in a position to try such cases as have previously been tried by the judges. You appoint this commission for five years, and let us suppose that just before those five years are up, one of these combines or mergers is complained of, and it goes before this commission for trial. This commission knows very well that the government is in favour of these combines and mergers, and is it likely to be in as good a position to try the case impartially as would be one of the judges of the Superior Courts? I think this clause ought to be struck out. We have already two tribunals before which these cases can be tried, and why appoint a third? To take the matter out of the hands of the judges and to put it in the hands of a partisan commission seems to me to be absolutely unfair.

Mr. BORDEN. We are responsible for the Bill, and not for the hon. gentleman's understanding. There is nothing in the Bill that takes away the present power to have any such matter investigated by the judges. There is simply power to send it to this additional tribunal if so desired.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But no reason has yet been given why this second tribunal should be added to what we have already, or to show that it would be more in accordance with the public interest. Up to the present time we have had a law on the statue-book declaring that under certain circumstances an investigation, if it took place, should take place before a judge. Has any reason been given to show that the public interest would be better served or more justice done to the people at large if such an investigation took place before this commission? Although this is a new jurisdiction, I say it is not an improvement, but rather a deterioration. It is not possible to expect that men who would be of the character stated by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames),

that is to say partisans, men in sympathy with the policy of the government, will do more substantial justice than men who are out of politics altogether. This is a very good reason why we should adhere to the present law and not adopt this amendment.

Mr. BORDEN. We have explained in the House, at least six times, that this tribunal, having practical knowledge and experience of such matters, is a very desirable tribunal to add to those already appointed under the Customs Act. It does not seem to me that it would require a great deal of intelligence to understand that. The right hon. gentleman asks questions about it. He might just as well ask, why did you add the judge of the Exchequer Court to the judges of the other courts ? The question would be just as relevant and just as intelligent. There is nothing taken away from the power to send an inquiry to any judge at the present time; but because a commission is to be established which will have knowledge and experience in these matters, we have thought it desirable to give power to send an inquiry to that tribunal if it should be thought best. Nothing is taken away. Additional power is granted to the government, which is responsible for these matters, and which will be responsible as to the tribunal to which they send them. That is all that is comprised in the suggestion that this commission shall be created as an additional tribunal; and there are other reasons which could be given.

Mr. CARVELL. My right hon. friend is trying to draw a herring across the path of this Bill when he intimates that anybody is suggesting that he is trying to take away from the judges the power to investigate these combines. Nobody has made such a suggestion. My right hon. friend knows that the judges have no power to investigate combines until he and his council ask them to do so, and he knows that he is providing a tribunal to which he can send these complaints instead of to the judges, and that is what we are finding fault with. I wonder if the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) would not rather have his boot and shoe merger investigated by a commission of good Conservatives well grounded in the principles of protection, than to have it investigated by a non-partisan judge, who will render a finding in accordance with the facts. I wonder whether there is a trust in Canada which would not rather have its case investigated by a partisan commission such as this Bill provides than by the judges of the land. There is no use in trying to cloud the object of this Bill from the members of this House or to make the country believe that we do not understand what we are talking about. We know exactly the object of this Bill, and we are trying to make it plain. We know that the object of this Bill is to take, not the power, but the actual fact of the investigation of these combines away from the judges of the land, and place it in a partisan commission which will without doubt give the kind of answer the hon. gentleman wants when he sends it to them.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It is most amazing to me that all the mergers, combines and trusts in Canada have sprung up since the 21st day of September last. If they existed before that date, why did not the late government take advantage of this clause in the Customs Act, and take steps to dissolve them? We have had a good deal of talk from hon. gentlemen opposite, but better evidence of their real opinion is offered by what they did or refrained from doing than by what they say. All the capitalizations that have been spoken of to-day existed prior to the 21st of September last, and did the late government take any action on their own initiative to investigate these combines for the purpose of ascertaining whether prices were unduly enhanced or not? I heard some one say something about a paper combine. After 15 years of power, that was the solitary instance of governmental action in regard to combines. All I have to say is that no matter what hon. gentlemen opposite may say to-day, they were not, when in power, on unfriendly terms with the trusts, mergers and combines of this country.

I say that their actions then do not correspond with their words now, and I prefer as between words and actions to rely upon their actions rather than upon their words, although I do not mean in any way to be offensive, because I understand this is a debate and they are trying to give an appearance to this Bill that it does not fairly bear. We have heard talk about almost everything in the Heavens above, and the earth beneath and the waters under the earth in reference to this Bill. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has traversed almost the known universe but has failed to debate this Bill on its merits and he knows it. I would do injustice to his intelligence if I believed that he was in his own judgment fairly interpreting that Bill this evening. He said that this Bill had been drafted without regard to the farming population. He is an intelligent man, and as I pointed out this afternoon in the interpretations clause here, which is taken from the Customs Act, the word ' products ' was deliberately added to the wording of the Customs Act in order that it might include the product of the farmer. I ask whether the word products does not include the products of the farmer. Is not ' agricultural products ' an every day

expression, is it not an ordinary use of the word 'product' which. was put in expressly for the purpose of meeting the case of the farmer? I say that of all the people of Canada who will derive advantage from the information that will be collected by the Tariff Commission the farmers stand to benefit the most. Take the interpretation clause:

(d) 'Goods' means products, wares and merchandise or movable effects of any kind, including, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, horses, cattle and other animals.

Is there any merger or trust in horses, cattle and other animals? Are they not products of the farm? Do they not come within the provisions of this Bill and are not the farmers who raise these animals entitled to the benefit of the information which will be obtained by this commission? I would do injustice to the intelligence of the House if I assumed anything else.

Take subsection 4, in respect of the cost of production, and compare it with the interpretation clauses. It refers to the product of the farmer as well as of the manufacturer or of the company or combine, and the farmer is represented there. What do we wish to obtain? The cost of production in Canada as well as elsewhere for the farmer as well as for the manufacturer and merger. The cost, efficiency and conditions of labour in Canada and elsewhere in order that we will know what the farmer pays for his labour as compared with farmers in other countries. 'The prices received by the producers, merchants, &c. This clause includes farm products.

Mr. OLIVER. Is the minister going to fix the tariff on farm products on the basis of the prices paid by the farmer for the labour he uses?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I say that labour enters into the price of the products of the farm just the same as of any commodity or the products of any factory in Canada, all conditions and factors which affect or enter into the cost of products. One of the great questions of the last campaign was the price of horses and the advantage of the man on the plains over the Ontario farmer for the supplying of horses for northern Ontario. Is that not pertinent and important to the farmers who raise the horses? It is an absolute perversion to say that this Bill does not provide for the case of the farmer. This Bill meets the case of every class of people in Canada. It is designed to meet the cases of all the population of the country and it is an absolute perversion to read anything else into it.

My hon. friend this afternoon paid me the compliment of again saying that I was the representative of interests. Let me tell him that I am a representative of interests, I am here as the representative of the public interests, I represent the interests of the people of Canada, and while I am here I shall endeavour to discharge this trust and if the hon. member keeps as free from sinister influences as I do he will do well. I said before and I say now that I never have had and I have not now any connection with any trust, merger or combination, and I defy any man in Canada to prove that I have. Hon. gentlemen may find some fault with my capacity but I want them to understand

Mr. OLIVER. I never made any insinuation against the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). He said from his place that I was the representative of the interests, of the trusts, mergers and combines.

Mr. OLIVER. I never made any insinuation against the hon. gentleman of having any interest in any trust, merger or combine.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). You said I represented the interests——

Mr. OLIVER. And I adhere absolutely to that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I say I am not the representative of such interests, and that I am quite capable of discharging my duties in an impartial manner, and I think he might very well omit these suggestions although I take it from him that he has withdrawn anything in the nature of a personal allusion.

Mr. OLIVER. I never made any or wished to make any.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). You said it.

Mr. OLIVER. Not personally, no.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). To come down to the matter of this particular case with regard to the investigation of trusts, combines and mergers, as I have said, hon. gentlemen opposite lament that we are about to withdraw the privilege of submitting these cases to the courts. We are not withdrawing them, we are simply adding a tribunal. While hon. gentlemen speak in this way, yet in 15 years of power one single solitary instance is all that can be cited by hon. gentlemen opposite of their having recourse to the courts with regard to trusts, mergers and combines. They say it is a tremendous national loss that the courts should be lost to them, and

yet to what extent did they use the courts? Let me state what my predecessor, a very able man, of whom I shall always speak with the greatest respect, said about trusts, mergers or combines:

In that shape the resolution passed the House, and is part of the tariff law to-day. While it imposed a check on the government, it had this disadvantage, that it provided a somewhat slow piece of machinery. Justice in the courts is somewhat slow; judges are busy, and men who thought there were combines, were slow to take advantage of the provision.

That answers my right hon. friend, it is from his righthand man, who said that justice is slow, and I add to that that justice is sometimes technical. We are not taking away from the court the hearing of these cases, not for a moment; we are adding a tribunal which can hold an inquiry in a very informal manner, which is not so bound by technical rules and which from the nature of the investigation into industrial conditions would be the best possible tribunal to inquire. That is all that we have in view in regard to this Bill. All this afternoon we have listened to iteration and reiteration as to keeping knowledge from parliament and yet if there is anything that has been made as plain as daylight, by every man who has spoken with responsibility, it is that parliament is to be entitled to all the information we may obtain. Nothing could be clearer than that.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said that the Minister of Trade and Commerce had agreed in the view that this information should go to parliament. So he did, but it was precisely in the same sense that the rest of us agreed, it must come to parliament because my hon. friend said in his trenchant and clear way that parliament was not disciplined and organized to take the initiative at all and if any one will consider for a moment the principle of responsible government, he must realize as a matter of fact that the government which has to take the initiative, must have the information given to it in order that it may take the initiative. It is the government that takes the initiative, that brings down its tariff Bill.

The very purpose of this legislation has been explained time and again in this debate. Over and over again it has been stated that the government wants to get information on which it may rely when it is considering the tariff law. Now, I said the other day that my hon. friends opposite were creating bogeys. I say so now. They are reading into this Bill what does not exist in the Bill, what never was intended to exist in the Bill, and what I think most of them know, does not exist and was not intended to exist in the Bill. But they wish to make things different from what they are—it is not what things are, but what they may be made to appear, that counts. These hon. gentlemen were so long in power that they grew skilled in that kind of thing. They have not lost this skill, and they are using it to-day to try to give a false appearance to the Bill. The Bill is precisely what it purports to be, a means of obtaining information, a means which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) endorsed in his speech before the manufacturers in Montreal, as I proved before. These hon. gentlemen are fighting bogeys which they themselves have raised. But all this will fail of effect when the work is in hand. It is measures and acts that count; and when the Tariff Commission is in action, my hon. friends will see that this is a beneficial measure. They will find it used for the best interests of the country. And, if it is not so used, the government is responsible, and the people will take care that a government is placed in power that will act in their interests through the Tariff Commission, and otherwise. That is the principle, and that principle has not been departed from in the least in connection with this Bill.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). It seems to me a very significant circumstance that we have just heard from two ministers of the Crown, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds). I am not naturally the best tempered of men myself; but I really cannot congratulate either of these ministers on the temper in which they have addressed the committee. My right hon. friend the leader of the government, whom I have always regarded with almost affection, referred to me and to other members on this side in terms that were hardly respectful. He said that 'any man of intelligence surely could see that.' The imputation was that nobody on this side of the House had intelligence.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He misunderstood me. I thought my hon. friends opposite did see it.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Yet the right hon. gentleman knew they did not see it, for they had so declared. The Minister of Finance has shown an amount of temper that is a perfect surprise to me. He has been wreathed in sweet smiles since he came to this House. That hon. gentleman also is a lovable personality. Yesterday, he was complaining that we were only engaged in a pillow fight. Well, when at boarding school, I had pillow fights, but I am bound to say that I never saw a boy in a pillow fight get into such a state of

temper as my hon. friend has shown. There was no need for temper, no need for defending his personal character, because there has been no imputation on his personal character.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). That is a pretty general interruption, but it is somewhat inarticulate. If I were charged as a farmer in this House with acting in the interests of the farmers, I should not take it as a charge that I had a personal object to serve or that I was occupied by my own personal desire for gain, being personally tied up to the farming profession. A public man—and really one has to say these things, for after all is said and done, we are all public men here, and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who is a very young parliamentarian must not take every charge made against him in his public capacity as a charge upon his personal character. I venture to say that to the hon. gentleman; and I think if I had had the opportunity to speak some such words before he rose, he would not have got so angry. I do not know what the cause of anger is in this case. But I must say it makes me apprehensive. If it be the statement of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) well, that hon. gentleman always makes his statements emphatically. If it be that hon. gentleman's statements about trusts, mergers and combines that makes the Minister of Finance so angry I am apprehensive. For there is an old French proverb: Qui s'excuse, s'accuse. These hon. gentlemen are defending themselves with too much warmth on this subject of mergers for a western farmer to be quite comfortable. They make me fearful—not of their debate, because the man who loses his temper in debate is done—but fearful that there is a closer connection between the mergers and themselves, than they are willing to admit—I mean a public connection; the hon. gentleman must not be angry with me.

As to the amendment, the law as it is at present puts the initiative for examining these conditions into the hands of the people; that is my understanding of it. The anti-combines Bill enables any seven people to make an application to the Governor in Council for a court, and action is taken. The initiative is in the hands of the people, and that seems to me a very good thing. But I am afraid that the people are not going to get the consideration in these matters that they should have. I have explained in regard to the general matter my fears upon this question, and I have not heard in any of the subsequent parts of the debate anything which has cleared my mind of these fears. From the time of Magna Charta to the Lloyd George budget—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). The interruptions are still somewhat inarticulate, Mr. Chairman. From the time I first mentioned until the other day—perhaps it suits my hon. friend better to have it put that way; his knowledge of history may be a little limited—the British people, who, after all, have laid the foundation of free institutions and parliamentary governments the world over, have fought for the right of taxation as the inalienable right of parliament. They have been most jealous of any interference with that right. They cut off a king's head to take away from him the power to interfere with them in that matter. And in the next generation they drove a king from the throne, still fighting for the power of the people to tax themselves through parliament and the executive government. And the other day, in Great Britain, the House of Lords had taken from it forever the power of veto of an Act of the House of Commons and the power to interfere with a money Bill at all. I take it that this reference, being met with laughter or smiles in many parts of the other side of the House, is an indication of the hollowness of the professions of hon. gentlemen opposite of affection for the mother country and its institutions. My attachment to those institutions cannot be questioned,—never has been questioned; my attachment to the flag has never been questioned. But I am bound to say that there are hon. members here who seem to regard these institutions in another light from that in which I regard them.

Now the initiative in this thing arises with the people. It has been contended that the Tariff Commission is meant to get the information. Analyse the taxing power of the people a little further, and our information has been got to guide parliament and government in their taxing power. What is the constitution of Canada, as in the United Kingdom? It is that on a wider or narrower suffrage parliament is elected, and from that parliament an executive government is appointed. In Canada there is a little difference. We appoint our Cabinet ministers in a different way than in the old country, and I cannot think that the innovation is a good one. But that is the constitution in both countries. In various departments of the government you have the whole power of the people, for the time that you are in office, to make each of your departments as powerful as you want them to be, to spend all the money you like, to get what information you like. That has been the method of government from time immemorial in every country that forms a portion of the British empire. Now why have the British people gone through with that fight? Because

the power of the purse resting in parliament is the only thing which guarantees the liberties of the people. We fought in the past against the despotism of kings, we fought until the other day against the unrestricted despotism of the House of Lords; and it is a sad thing to me that I come here to be subjected to another despotism, forsooth of the representatives of trusts and mergers. I must say that the tyrants of the past had some dignity about them. They had some tradition, but the conscienceless millionaires of this country have neither dignity nor anything else; they are guided by one consideration and that is the support and strengthening of their own interest at the expense of the general public.

Now what do you propose to do in this clause? Both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have said that you are not restricting that power, you are introducing a new power, it is an added power, and it is the knowledge of British history and of what we have had to do to establish the power of parliament that makes me fear this additional power. The Anti-Combines Bill, I did not know that it was likely to do much. When it was discussed in this House in the last parliament I described it as a pill to cure an earthquake. A bludgeon is the only cure for the diseases that arise from a tariff, and so far as this went it was thoroughly constitutional. What does the Minister of Finance say about this added power? I hope I am quoting him correctly. He says: 'The power we have added, we think, will be the best possible tribunal.' Why, that is an extraordinary confession, it is a confession which justifies everything that has been said on this side in support of my hon. friend's amendment. If it is the best possible tribunal, why is it so? It is not that in the light of history, it is not that in the light of establishing the taxing power of parliament, it is the best possible tribunal because it is the instrument of the government. I am afraid to utter the next sentence, but I do it without any personal reflection; it is the best possible tribunal and the best instrument of the government, because the government is, I fear, the instrument of another power, another despotism—care I say trusts? The word might make them angry. It is the best possible tribunal, I repeat, because it is a tribunal which the government themselves are creating, it is their instrument, and I very much fear that they are using the forms of the old constitutions of this country, and of Britain, to put a buffer between themselves and the people, to put a buffer between themselves and their responsibility. That is why I most heartily support this amendment.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance said that actions count Well, I admit it. But after all, in discussing parliamentary measures we have to talk some. I remember an instance in British history of a great statesman who held the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer, a position analogous to that held by my hon. friend the Finance Minister. That statesman was William Pitt, he got there in a year and a half, and he got there by means of three speeches which at once marked him out as the most brilliant parliamentarian that had been seen in England for a century. So he went on and proved himself to be. I must say, for a man who discards any belief in words, as my hon. friend did, he is a pretty good talker himself. He speaks extremely well, and frequently. If he goes on as fast as he has since he came to the House, we will be able to remind him of his saying that it is actions that count and words are nothing. I told my hon. friend yesterday that I feel an interest in him, I ventured to describe him with the best of good temper as a man who had entered upon a rake's progress. I hope I was thoroughly wrong, and that his political history will turn him out as a man who will restrain those men behind him who are at present cheering protection to the echo. But I have my fears. However, I am here as a representative of the western farmers—who have no interest in this commission, of course. The real fact is that you cannot protect the farmers of this country, the great bulk of the farmers, for the simple reason that they produce far more than they can use, and have to send the overplus abroad. No protection to them is possible, that is why they are excluded from the operation of this Bill.

As a representative of the western farmers I can only say that I take the statement of my hon. friend that actions count as equal to an assurance of good conduct on his part. I take it as almost equal to an assurance that he will show us—I do not say in his next budget because he has not got his commission into working order yet—but in the budgets of this parliament some real and substantial reductions of taxation. I hug that hope to my heart and I need some soothing of my alarms because I am very much afraid that the result of this measure will be the raising of the tariff and not the lowering of it. In the meantime I will get such consolation as I can from the assurance of my hon. friend. I have very great pleasure in supporting this amendment.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. One would hardly be human if he did not feel stirred by the outrageous abuse which has been hurled from the other side for many hours past at all men who may be considered as at all

connected with the manufacturing industries of Canada. I do not wish to pursue the argument in the vein in which hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued it but all I can say to them is that they are barking up the wrong tree in my judgment and that no party will stay long in power that attempts to pull down that which during the last thirty years has been built up—the vast industries of Canada. I want to tell these hon. gentlemen—and I have specially in my mind the two hon. gentlemen who are sitting on the second bench, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, Mr. Clark (Red Deer) and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie)—that they are not speaking for the people of Canada to-day. They say that the manufacturers number two or three thousand and that all this is for their benefit. These manufacturers are employing about 500,000 workmen who are dependent upon the manufacturers for their daily bread and they are just as much entitled to respect and to honour as are the farmers of Red Deer. I want to say to the hon. member for Red Deer—I have not had an opportunity of speaking with him before—that he is not speaking for the whole people of England to-night. I know a little about England as well as he does. I have taken part in two campaigns in England and I want to tell him that half the people in England are against his economic principles. I want to tell him that there is a greater chance of protection being introduced into Great Britain than there is of the policy of free trade being introduced into Canada. There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman has free trade at heart, but there is a doubt whether he understands the people of Canada to-day. We have been engaged for thirty years in building up this nation. We have employed in the factories to-day 500,000 workingmen. There are only 700,000 upon farms with 900,000 workers of all kinds who are not upon farms. Do not run away with the idea that this is a purely agricultural country and that every other industry must hide its head because the farmer says so or because those who profess to represent the farmers say so. The hon. gentleman has just told us that the farmer cannot be protected. Let me refer him to the pages of the Ottawa papers last week which quoted potatoes at $2.50 a bag. Is not that a fit subject to be investigated by the Tariff Commission? What is the cost of producing potatoes in Canada? Is it any thing like $2.50 a bag? The workmen have to pay that price and they pay it uncomplainingly. I take the ground that we are going to be a united people from end to end, a people who will give and take and this cry of mergers combines and so on is not going to down long the people of Canada. These gentlemen sat for fifteen years with these mergers and combines at their back and they did not make the least effort to put them down. But, as soon as they begin to pull down the industries of this country, they will find that the farmer of Canada will suffer along with other citizens. We are all bound together in one common interest, and I say to these gentlemen who would endeavour to strike at the manufacturers because he only represents two or three thousand people, that when they hit at the manufacturer they hit at every man who is working for him, and I am proud to-day that the workmen of Canada are much more contented and much happier than are the workmen of the country from which the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Clark) comes. Let him explain what is the matter in Great Britain to-day, when every great industry is threatened with strikes. What about the coal strikers who have voted by four to one to go on strike? What is that for? The hon. gentleman has given us no reason, and he cannot say that free trade has banished all industrial and economic ills. They have tried all kinds of quack nostrums in England under Lloyd George to cure the evils by which they were oppressed—their pension Bills, their old, worn-out insurance against unemployment, and that sort of thing—everything but giving an honest day's wage for an honest day's labour. The first right of a citizen is the chance to have an honest day's pay for an honest day's labour. Still, we have this hon. gentleman coming out from England to tell us that for thirty years we have been on the wrong track, that we do not know how our people are being wronged by tariffs, and taxes, and mergers and combines. These words flow glibly from the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), the hon. member from South Wellington and others. The people of Canada are being well served by the manufacturers and the workman, and with all this howl about the farmer we have not heard one single word in the debate about the interests of the working men. They are struggling just as hard as the farmers. They have just as much right to live, and I believe that when the people of Canada look this question over they will tell these men that they are wrong. They will tell the hon. member for South Wellington, at least the people of Guelph will, if I know them, that he is not preaching sound doctrine. I do not wonder that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) drew the line at allowing them a trip hammer the other day when they wanted one brought in without paying duty. There is a trip hammer there now and the Minister of Customs did not want another to get in without paying duty, and therefore my hon .friend will have to

pay the duty, and rightly so. If the manufacturers in other centres have to pay duty on trip hammers, why should my hon. friend be permitted to bring his trip hammer in free? What I ask the hon. member for South Wellington, the hon. member for Red Deer and the people of Canada to do is to look this question in the face. This measure has been brought down to better conditions. I am not prepared to say whether, in its working out, it is going to do all the things that are expected, but it means the searching for information, and if information is going to make any difficulty, it is the first time I have known it to make difficulty. The information that is to be searched for is to enable us to have a scientific tariff. Unlike free trade, a protective tariff is a science, not a fixed science, but an applied science, and the beauty of the tariff is that you can apply it to the conditions. Then the hon. member for Red Deer said that goods ought to be brought in more freely because the revenue is too high. That will produce more revenue. A reduction in the tariff has been known in times past to produce more revenue, and it may do so again. Why reduce the tariff if you want to reduce the revenue? Increase the tariff and stop imports, stop the hundred million dollars excess that is spent on imports from going out of this country to the other nations of the world and keep money in our own pockets. It is not as the hon. member for Red Deer or as the hon. member for South Wellington says, oversea commerce that counts—not by a long way.

To-day the test of a nation's success is the degree of efficiency and economy with which it can supply its own wants. Compare the United States, that great protectionist country, with Great Britain, that great free trade country, if you can call her so, and I say that the condition of the workingman and of the farmer in the United States is far superior to that of the corresponding classes in Great Britain. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) may question that, but I can point to the report of a commission which recently came from England to investigate the conditions in the United States, and which on its return sets forth that the workingman of the United States, with all your high cost of living, and your high tariff, is better off than the workingman in so-called free trade England. I tell the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that there is a great probability that in the near future, we will see a tariff for protection in the British Isles, and that no longer will it be pointed out that there is one great free trade nation, and, equally true there is not likely to be any more. For fifty years free trade has been tried and found wanting all along the line. If you take Great Britain as a sample of free trade, you will find if you look at her taxation, that she raises millions of dollars on tea and coffee and many other such things that are regarded as absolute necessaries of life, and which are staple articles of consumption by the workingman. Let me ask the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), and I hope he will be honest enough to admit it, what class in Great Britain to-day is anxiously demanding tariff reform; who cry the loudest in Great Britain for protection? Is it not the agricultural classes that are demanding tariff reform? I tell my hon. friend (Mr. Clark) that tariff reform in the old land is coming without doubt, and that when it does come Great Britain will see an era of prosperity such as she never witnessed before. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to now let this Bill go through, they have fought it for hours and hours and it is time for them to cease vain argument. These gentlemen opposite tell us that this Bill is for the manufacturers only, but we have not asked for it as manufacturers. I am glad to know that under this Bill the cost of living will be investigated, because if potatoes are sold at two and a half dollars a bag when they should be sold for one dollar or one dollar and twenty-five cents, the workingman may have a remedy; if eggs are selling too high at fifty cents a dozen, and if wheat, oats, and barley are sold at too high a price, there may be a drop, and so we will see to it in the cities that if you get after the workingman we will know what is the matter with the farmer also that he does not produce at a lower price than he now sells for. I tell hon. gentleman opposite that the whole thing is a question of live and let live. I would advise hon. gentlemen opposite to cease their denunciation of the manufacturers and the workingmen of Canada; I would advise them to let this Bill go into force, and then, if they have any complaint against it, I am sure it will not be found in the measure itself but in the working of it. I believe here will never be any fault to be found with this measure if the men who are appointed as commissioners are the right kind of men. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) shed big tears because no room could be found on that commission for a free trader. Certainly not; my view is that the man who goes on a board to handle tariffs must be a man who believes that tariffs must be handled.

My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) says that a bludgeon is the only thing that ought to be used on a tariff and my answer to him is that the man who sets out to handle tariffs, must be a believer in tariffs, and must not be a man who would use a bludgeon on tariffs. I

would ask the Minister of Militia if, when he is going to arm the militia of Canada, he would select Andrew Carnegie or the Rev. J. A. MacDonald to select a fit and proper rifle to put into the hands of the defenders of our country. Surely not, because they believe in complete disarmament, and they would pick out a gun that would not go off. And, that is exactly what would happen if you put men of the calibre of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) on a Tariff Commission; you would be arming the commission with a gun that would not go off, and that is exactly what we don't want to do. There is no chance of the Minister of Militia asking the Peace Society to step in and pick out weapons with which to fight our enemies, and there is no chance of anybody who would use a bludgeon on the tariff being able to decide as to what is a proper tariff for this country. I would appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to let the Bill now go through, and let the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) think overnight on it before he moves any further amendments.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I am sure the House, during the time I have had the honour of sitting in it, has not had to complain of my occupying on the whole, more than my share of its time, and I ask for an opportunity to utter what I hope will be a few goodnatured sentences in answer to such direct appeals as have come to me from my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt). I might tell the House, if I wanted to be critical or to get angry, that I found the speeches of my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) very useful campaign literature when I first fought for a seat in this House in 1908. I had recourse to 'Hansard' and I found on the whole no more useful speeches to me for securing my seat in the House of Commons than the speeches of my hon. friend. Now that I have heard him, I can understand that. I appeal to the right hon. the leader of the House to say that there has been no undue delay in the discussion of this measure. We must admit that this legislation is in the nature of an innovation; it is a new thing; it is a very large measure, and I do not think the time that has been spent over it has been unduly long as yet. I should be the last man to countenance in any way any form of Parliamentary obstruction. I know the fight we had against it years ago, in the mother of parliaments, and I should be the last to counsel it. But, I contend, there has been no need for such an impassioned appeal as I have just heard from my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) for the immediate settlement of this question. That impassioned appeal reminds me that I will need a large stock of soothing syrup, if I have first to administer it to the members of the Cabinet and then to take up private members afterwards. When my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) began in so stormy a tone, I thought we were getting from bad to worse, and really my duties in the way of soothing hon. members opposite will soon come to be very onerous indeed. I want to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) that there is no man in Canada who wants to set class against class less than I do. I am a farmer; he is a manufacturer. I had explained in the few remarks I made to the House that, as a farmer, I make my living without protection. I have no protection. It is economically impossible for you to give it to me. I produce, or help to produce, more of the material of the farm than is needed in Canada, and I cannot be protected. I have got to sell every year what I produce; every thing that is ready for the market must go.

The manufacturer is in a different position. But the only point I want to put to my hon. friend is that I am protected, and I ask him, if he be so strong a man as his voice would indicate, to put himself alongside of the feeble Briton that he sees before him and live without government pap. Of course, I am under no illusions as to the early arrival of free trade in Canada; I know too much about fiscalities to expect anything of the kind. I have argued again and again that the benefit of the western farmer is the benefit of the whole of Canada, and I honestly believe that what I am supporting is good for the whole of Canada and not simply for any class of the community. My life-long connection with the British Liberal party is a guarantee that I stand for the masses, and not for minorities of any kind, and my whole argument in this House will support me in that modest claim. I do not know whether my hon. friend was present when I spoke last night. or whether, if he was not present, he did me the honour of reading what I said.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I read it.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). It has not had a very good effect up to the present. If he read it at all carefully, he would have found one statement which after all was an emphatic contradiction of something he has just said. He said he had not heard anybody mention the consumers in the country.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I said the workingmen.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Does the working man not consume? I have known a number of workingmen who had excellent appetites. I tried to make my argument clear that the consumers included everybody in the country. I would be loath to go into a discussion as to the com-

parative merits of the old country and Canada. A great many of us in this House love and respect both lands, and I do not think an acrimonious comparison of the two countries would be a good way to promote the sane imperialism in which we all believe. I would like to say in conclusion that I have never, in private or in public, said one word against Canada which was not justifiable criticism; but in parliament, as on the platform, we must discuss measures for the public good of the country in which we live, and it is only in that spirit that I criticise. If I did not do that, I would not be doing my duty to my constituents.

Mr. VERVILLE. For the first time in this House we have a manufacturer proclaiming himself to be a great friend of the workman. He has not been a great friend of the workman all his life, if I am well informed. As he has said, there are about 500,000 workmen in the different industries of the country, and as he has brought the question before the House, I am in duty bound to say a few words in support of the workmen of the country. We have heard a great deal about a scientific tariff. I believe the 500,000 workmen that the hon. gentleman has mentioned regard that scientific tariff as a one-sided affair, because it is entirely in favour of the great manufacturers of the country. Protection, if I understand it aright, has the object of preventing goods from another country coming to this country without paying a heavy tax; that is for the benefit of the manufacturer. But what about the labour to manufacture those goods? Is there any protection for that labour? My hon. friend from Brantford knows that there is not. If there is no protection for labour, I claim that the tariff is a one-sided affair. In this House, and elsewhere, I have often heard men rise and say what good friends they were of the labour classes. In Brockville at the present time we find law-abiding Canadian citizens put out of work and strangers from the other side of the line put in their places.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is there not an alien labour law that protects the labourer?

Mr. VERVILLE. I will cite to my hon. friend a case which was before the Montreal courts. The manufacturer, who was the Canada Car Company, stated that they could not get competent men in Montreal, which was untrue, but the presiding judge said that that statement by the manufacturer was enough, and we lost our case. There is the kind of protection we have, and it is a one-sided protection. My hon. friend is not satisfied with the expression 'trusts and mergers.' It is not my intention at present to discuss this question in detail, because I hope to do so in the near future. We talk about legislation, but if we were spending one-fourth of the time of this House to make legislation and three-fourths of the time to see it carried out, we would be doing better for the country. We are passing one piece of legislation after another, because I understand that this is an addition to existing legislation, and then we will probably have another piece added to it, to make it so that nobody can understand it.

My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has no right to say that the working people of this country are satisfied, and the very remedy for tariff evils, the very remedy against the trusts and mergers, was presented before the people last year, on the 21st of September. Whether it was carried or not makes no difference; it was presented, and if it had been presented and left bare as it should have been, without any waving of the flag or cries of all sorts, in fact if you were to take a referendum on that question alone to-day, I am convinced that a strong majority would pronounce in favour of that measure. I declare that nobody has the right to say the working people are satisfied. My hon. friend knows that very well, and if he had not said what he said to-night it was not my intention to take part in this discussion. I am not discussing the Bill, I am not a law maker, God forbid me from being a law maker of that kind. I am here representing the very finest division in the Dominion of Canada and the largest one. I have any number of manufacturers in my riding and it is not their fault that I now sit in this House. I claim that you can send your Tariff Commission all over Canada and abroad to make investigations as to the conditions of manufacture, but most of the information desired is now to be obtained in the Labour Department. The government will find there information on the hours of labour, on the wages paid in different industries, on the wholesale and retail prices of goods. If it is desired to obtain information on the value of the plant of a manufacturer, will they be able to determine whether the manufacturer is overrating his plant? The fact that practically all the manufacturers and the mergers and combines were wholly against the measure submitted to the people in September last, is enough to show that that measure was in favour of the people. The hon. member speaks about potatoes at $2.50 a bag. What about butter at 40 cents a pound that was bought at 25 cents and put in cold storage until the merger raised the price to 40 cents? You can go to Ottawa stores and buy eggs

at 50 cents, out of cold storage. One grocer told me to-day that he had to sell the fresh eggs at the same price because the people could not afford to pay more. Does the farmer derive any benefit from the butter which he sells at 25 cents and which is retailed at 40 cents out of cold storage or from the eggs which he sells at 15 cents or 16 cents a dozen, which are now being sold at 40 cents? Where is the profit of the farmer in that? What about the third party in that case, the man who is responsible for the enhanced price? We don't seem to touch him at all.

I claim that this is done through the mergers and the trusts and when the time comes I shall produce figures to show that we have 30 or 40 mergers and to prove their over-capitalization. I do not want a commission to find out the cost of living, I go from store to store and I have found exactly the real conditions of the cost of living in Montreal and Toronto, I will compare that with the cost in the United States and then we will have something to show to the members of the House the effect of the merger whether that merger has a right to exist, and whether the investigation that we are now going to make into mergers will be beneficial to the masses or not.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I have been astonished that any opposition to this Bill is received with great surprise by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that they have not exhibited the best of temper in replying to any objections urged against it. Supporters of the government speak of this measure as if it were of divine origin, as if it was perfect and not open to criticism and amendment. The motion before the House is that clause 3 be struck out. The right hon. gentleman who leads the House stated in reply to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that the reason for subsection 3 of section 4 being in this Bill had been explained three or four times, but he did not give a single reason for its existence in the Bill. Nor did the Minister of Finance give any reason for the presence of that particular clause. The House is entitled to some logical reason for the existence of this clause in the Bill. The purpose of the clause is to empower the Governor in Council to authorize the holding of an inquiry by the proposed Tariff Commission under section 12 of the Customs Tariff Act.

Under section 12 of the Customs Tariff Act the Governor in Council was empowered whenever it deemed it to be in the public interest to inquire into any conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement alleged to exist among the manufacturers to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers in any article at the expense of the consumer. That clause of the Tariff Act empowered the Governor in Council to direct an investigation by certain judges.

If the judges reported that there was a conspiracy, the government had the power to remove the tariff upon the particular article. I would point out that a conspiracy in restraint of trade, a condition of things such as was contemplated under section 12 of the Customs Tariff Act, is a violation of the criminal law of this country. And the party guilty of any violation of that part of the criminal law is liable to a penalty of $4,000 as a maximum, and $200 as a minimum, or two years imprisonment. I contend it is quite clear that an investigation of this kind should take place before judges of a court, parties competent to make an investigation.

It may be said that under section 12 of the Customs Tariff Act, the penalty is not the one described in the Criminal Code. But, if the judges report that there has been a violation of the law, that a conspiracy exists, it becomes the duty of the Crown to prosecute the conspirators criminally. This is a serious matter and those powers should not be delegated to the members of this commission. We do not know who they may be. They may not be members of the legal profession, or qualified to take evidence under oath or to reach true findings on the evidence. I am not trying to delay the course of the Bill, but I submit that there is fair room for a debate about this section, and the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance should not treat it in the way they do. The whole question is: Shall the commission have power to conduct inquiries or shall they not? The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) urged that the clause be struck out and that the power of investigation be left as at present under section 12 of the Customs Tariff Act. I submit that in all fairness, the amendment of the hon. member is a reasonable one and I think it should be supported by the committee, at least until some reason is given stronger than any we have heard from members of the government in support of the clause as it stands.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that this is a matter of really more importance than the Minister of Finance thinks it is. I was entirely unable to understand the reason why he objected so strongly to our criticism of this section and to our support of the amendment of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I think it much against the proper administration of the law to have two or more different tribunals to try out the same matter. As has been pointed out we have a provision in the

customs law that reference may be made to a judge of the Exchequer court, or the Superior court or of the County court, and if such judge finds that there is conspiracy under which prices have been unduly increased the Governor in Council may reduce or abolish the duty. We have also the very excellent provision of the Combines Investigation Act. Section 1 of that Act makes provision almost in the same words as section 12 of the Customs Act that where, as the result of the investigation that is provided for, it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that there is a combine to unduly enhance prices, the Governor in Council may reduce or abolish the duty on the article.

That is a statute which may be invoked by the people—any seven residents of Canada may invoke it—and investigation takes place before a judge of one of the courts of the land. The Minister of Finance proposes that an investigation of a matter of this kind may be taken out of the hands of the people, or a portion of the people, and handed over to the commission to be appointed under this Act. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) seemed to get very excited and urged that we were fighting the manufacturers, because we were supporting this amendment. What is the fair inference from the hon. gentleman's position? It is that he thinks that a tribunal like a judge of the Exchequer court or of the Supreme court will not be as favourable to the manufacturers as the commission which the government is to appoint under this law. And I have no doubt that there might be cases when such an investigation would not be so favourable to a combine as would be the judgment of this Tariff Commission. Surely the Minister of Finance must see how objectionable it is to have two tribunals with authority to inquire into the same matter. The hon. gentleman has provided what may be in the nature of an appeal, giving the Governor in Council power to take the matter out of the hands of the tribunal. This may lead to endless confusion. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman should show some reason why the courts cannot be trusted to make these investigations. It is only within the last two or three years that combines and mergers have existed to any large extent in Canada. These organizations create a new situation in the country. We know that under the late government, after the Combines Act was brought into force, an investigation of the United Shoe Machinery company was undertaken at the instance of a number of people, who complied with the law. That matter is going on to-day; I believe the Minister of Labour took it up where it was left by his predecessor. Everybody admits that the Combines Act is an admirable law, well calculated to inquire into these combines. That law is being tested. Nobody finds fault with it. We should not form another tribunal to take up cases which are already provided for.

Why should parliament be asked to ignore the tribunal which the law now provides, and give the Governor in Council authority to refer these cases to a tribunal which, from the very nature of its appointments, will be favourable to the manufacturers, to the producers, to the dealers, and against the interests of the consumers? I fail to see any reason whatever for this Bill. We ought not to enact a law simply for the fun of the thing, we ought to have clearly shown to us that some evil now exists, and that there is a prime need for additional legislation on the subject. The government has wholly failed to present any reasons to the committee why this section should be adopted. Therefore, I am in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie).

Mr. MARSHALL. I have listened with much interest to the discussion on this Bill. I must say that, although I have been in the House for five or six years, I never saw so much time lost over a Bill as over this. The Bill certainly points in the right direction. The Dominion canners have been mentioned as robbers and thieves. It is a strange thing to say, that we got our charter from a Liberal government and we operated under a Liberal government ten years. During all that ten years I never heard any fault found with the Dominion canners until this Bill was brought forward, and now we are styled as robbers. I want to say that the Dominion canners are doing a great business in this country, we are giving employment to about 9,500 people. We are also furnishing a market for the products of our soil, many thousand acres. Hon. gentlemen opposite are entirely wrong in what they have said against our industry. If you compare our prices with the American prices you will find that ours are much lower, our goods are better goods. Owing to the condition of the labour market, it is impossible for us to put up goods as cheaply as they were put up a few years ago. We are paying the farmers ten or twelve per ton more for peas than we were a few years ago, for the reason that they have to pay more for their help. It is this great northwest we have heard so much about that has taken away the help from our farmers, and we can scarcely get sufficient labour to harvest our crop.

Mr. OLIVER. They are the people who buy your canned stuff.

Mr. MARSHALL. Very true, and we are glad to sell it to them, and we are selling it to them at a reasonable price. The hon.

member for Regina (Mr. Martin) the other day said that we had raised the price of tomatoes to $1.75 a case. The committee will be surprised when I tell them that the canners sold their tomato pack last year for less than $1 a dozen. After the goods leave our hands we have no further control over the prices. We do not control the whole packing business. There are thirty or forty other canneries in the Dominion with which our company has to compete. I am strongly in sympathy with this Bill, because I think it will do justice to all. I am astonished at some of the arguments I hear from the opposition, they seem to me very unreasonable. Speaking for my own company, I am altogether in sympathy with the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 4 be adopted?

Mr. CARVELL. I had an amendment that I wished to propose to section 4. If I may have an opportunity of bringing it up at a later stage, I would have no objection to allowing the section to pass at the present time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Carried.

On section 5,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the time has come to adjourn.

Mr. BORDEN. We have had a great deal of discussion, and have made very little progress. If we are ever to get through the session we will have to get along faster than we have done. I would like to sit here for an hour or two longer and get something done, if it will be convenient for hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend knows that the discussion has been perfectly legitimate, at least on our side; there has been no intention of delaying the progress of the Bill. It is now one o'clock, and I think we should adjourn.

Mr. BORDEN. The discussion may have been legitimate, I am not saying that it was not. All I complain of is that the greater part of it has been repeated ten or fifteen times.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does that remark apply to both sides?

Mr. BORDEN. It applies to any gentleman who happens to have been guilty of it; I am not discriminating.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not apply to me.

Mr. BORDEN. If my right hon. friend is anxious that we should adjourn now, I will agree to it. But I want to say distinctly that if we are going to discuss matters in that fashion, we will have to sit later, or else the session will have to be prolonged, and I do not think any one wants to prolong the session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Nobody wants to prolong the session. But we have seen sessions lasting five or six months, and I think the hon. gentleman and his friends have contributed to prolong them. There has been no obstruction of this measure, only legitimate discussion. Our arguments may not impress the right hon. gentleman, and I am sorry for it.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not finding fault with the quality of the arguments, except so far as they may be controverted. But I do find fault with unreasonable repetitions. It is not only waste of time, but it is wearisome.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I know it is wearisome, but I have been listening to just such arguments for fifteen years.

Mr. BORDEN. I have no way of preventing it. The only result will be that we will have to sit a little later, or else have a longer session. I know we are all anxious to bring the session to a close at a reasonable date. The other alternative seems to be the only one, namely, that we must sit later. At the request of my hon. friend, I will move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, but with the understanding that if we are going to take so long with every one of the sections of this Bill, we must sit a good deal later.

Progress reported.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to give notice to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) that on the first convenient occasion upon going into Committee of Supply I wish to bring up the question of freight rates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What will be the business of the House to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. Order No. 20, Bill respecting National Transcontinental railway; Order No. 18, Bill to encourage and assist the improvements of highways; Order No. 17, consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 66) respecting the public archives; Order No. 13, Bill to amend the Civil Service Act, and after that Supply. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) will probably go on with his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.52 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 14, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

TOLLS ON GOVERNMENT WORKS.

Mr. MONK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) respecting Tolls on Government Works for the Transmission of Timber. He said: The object of this Bill is to correct a clerical error in the Revised Statutes of 1906. In former days the collection of these tolls was under the Department of Inland Revenue. Subsequent statutes transferred the collection to the Department of Public Works, but in the Revised Statutes of 1906, the interpretation clause is made to say that the word 'minister' means the Minister of Inland Revenue, whereas, in conformity with previous legislation, it should be the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate The British Western Loan Company—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 102) for the relief of Edna Wells—Mr. Beattie.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WAGES OF WAITERS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

What are the minimum wages paid and the hours worked by waiters in cities of fifty thousand or more of population, and what are the names of cities of such population?

Mr. CROTHERS:

(a) The minimum wages paid and hours worked fluctuate greatly from seasonal and other causes. The exact figures are not in the possession of the government. The Census and Statistics Bulletin No. 1, 'Wage Earners by Occupations,' gives information placing the average earnings of male waiters at $300, and of female waiters at $265.

(b) The names of the cities of 50,000 or more of population are Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal, Quebec, Winnipeg and Vancouver.

THE ST. JOHN VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has an agreement or understanding been reached between the federal government, or the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the government of New Brunswick, or the St. John and Quebec Railway Company, regarding the granting to the said company of a subsidy for the St. John Valley Railway, so-called, from the city of St. John to Grand Falls; or for the lease and operation of said railway from St. John to Grand Falls, as part of the Intercolonial Railway system; or for the granting of and toward the construction of bridges across St. John river at or near Andover, across the St. John river at or near the Mistake, so-called, and across the Kennebecasis river at or near Perry Point?

2. If such an agreement or understanding has been reached, will the Minister of Railways and Canals lay a copy of the same on the table of the House for the information of members?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Negotiations for an agreement are being carried on between the federal government and the St. John and Quebec Railway Company and the government of New Brunswick, regarding the granting to the said company of a subsidy for the St. John Valley railway, so-called, from the city of St. John to Grand Falls; and for the lease and operation of the said railway from St. John to Grand Falls, as part of the Intercolonial railway system, and for the granting of and toward the construction of bridges across the St. John river at or near Andover, across the St. John river at or near the Mistake, so-called, and across the Kennebecasis river at or near Perry Point.

2. As soon as the necessary documents are prepared a copy of the same will be laid on the table of the House.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—WORKSHOPS AT QUEBEC.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

Does the government intend to build the workshops of the Grand Trunk Pacific at Quebec, at the approaches to the Quebec bridge?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The matter is still under consideration.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—DISMISSAL OF AMEDEE BELANGER.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. Has Amédée Bélanger, watchman on the Intercolonial Railway at L'Islet been dismissed?

2. If so, at whose request, on whose recommendation and for what reason?

3. Has the said Amédée Bélanger requested an inquiry from the chief of his division?

4. Is it the intention of the Minister of Railways to see that this inquiry is granted him?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. Dr. E. Paquet, M.P., active political partisanship.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.

CANAL TRAFFIC.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

1. What was the total freight tonnage which passed through the Sault, Welland and St. Lawrence canals respectively during the season of navigation of 1911?

2. What was the number and tonnage of vessels which passed through each of these canals during the last season?

3. What was the nationality of the vessels which passed through each of these canals during the last season?

4. What was the origin and destination of the freight passing through each of these canals last season?

5. What quantities of American ore, coal and wheat passed through these canals last season, specifying whether in British or American bottoms?

1.—Sault Ste. Marie Canal ..... 30,951,709 tons.
Welland Canal ..... 2,537,629 "
St. Lawrence Canals ..... 3,105,708 "

	Number.	Tonnage.
2.—Sault Ste. Marie Canal	6,781	19,361,220
Welland Canal	2,480	2,297,179
St. Lawrence Canals	9,923	3,923,435

	Canadian.		United States.	
	Number.	Tonnage.	Number.	Tonnage.
3.—Sault Ste. Marie Canal	2,713	3,108,880	4,068	16,252,340
Welland Canal	1,664	1,541,548	816	755,631
St. Lawrence Canals	8,367	3,103,957	1,556	819,078

	Canada to Canada.		Canada to United States.		United States to United States.		United States to Canada.	
	Tons up	Tons down	Tons up.	Tons down	Tons up.	Tons down	Tons up.	Tons down
4.—Sault Ste. Marie Canal	644,899	1,585,279	22,157	915,601	2,236,880	23,282,492	2,057,685	206,716
Welland Canal	318,764	827,392	190,101	693	309,603	175,752	24,451	690,873
St. Lawrence Canals	629,642	1,086,547	328.732	38,085	194	12	392	1,022,104

	Sault Ste. Marie Canal.		Welland Canal.	
	Canadian or British Bottoms.	American Bottoms.	Canadian or British Bottoms.	American Bottoms.
5.—Ore (Tons)	275,831	22,295,886	31,197	4,483
Coal "	705,253	3,593,541	332,692	286,990
Wheat (Bush.)	None.	16,362,128	710,367	1,588,340

DISMISSAL OF WILLIAM A. GERRIOR.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was William A. Gerrior, the customs preventive officer at Larry's River, N.S., dismissed? If so, when and for what reason?
2. Who asked for his dismissal?
3. Was there an investigation? If so, with what result?
4. If not, will he be granted an investigation?
5. Who has been appointed as his successor, and on whose recommendation?

Mr. LAPOINTE.

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Mr. William A. Gerrior was dismissed by order in council of 16th December, 1911, for active political partisanship during the late Dominion election.
2. G. A. R. Rowlings.
3. He was dismissed on his own admission.

4. No further investigation is considered necessary.

5. William J. Murphy on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs.

FISHERY GUARDIANS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What are the names and addresses of the fishery guardians who acted during 1911 in the county of Guysborough?

2. Has notice of dismissal been given to any of said guardians? If so, to whom?

3. Have any of the said guardians been dismissed? If so, what are their names, why were they dismissed, and at whose request?

4. Have any applications been received, or recommendations made to fill vacancies in this branch of the service in Guysborough county? If so, what are the names and post office addresses of all parties either recommended or appointed?

Mr. HAZEN:

St. Marys River, G. W. Jollota, Murdock Whitman, Meles Whidden, John A. Kirk, Robert A. McLean, John Smith, Ed. Cumminger, David Mitchell.

County Harbour River, John A. Hudson, Henry Mason, Leander Mason.

Gaspereaux Brook, John Mitchell.

Indian River, John Cross.

Isaac Harbour River, Hector McLellan.

New Harbour River, Wm. D. Gillis.

Cole Harbour River, Elisha Williams.

Salmon River, Frank Cook, Stephen Grant, Joseph Lawlor, Patrick McKinnon, Wm. McKay, Patrick Keay, Allan Tait, Pierce Clancy.

Whitehaven, James Snow.

2. No, these guardians were employed for the season, and their engagement automatically ceased at the end thereof.

3. No.

4. The employment of guardians for next fiscal year has not yet been considered.

ALDER POINT LOBSTER HATCHERY.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Were tenders called for the building of the lobster hatchery at Alder Point, Little Bras d'Or, C.B.?

2. If so, what is the name and post office address of each tenderer and the amount of each tender?

3. Was the contract given to the lowest tenderer?

4. When was the work commenced and when was it completed and taken over by the department?

5. Was the work done under inspection? If so, who was the inspector, and by whom was he recommended?

6. If there was no inspector of the work, why was the usual custom in such cases departed from?

7. Did the representative for North Cape Breton and Victoria recommend an inspector for that work? If so, whom did he recommend, and why was he not appointed?

8. Is the hatchery ready for the propagation of lobsters, and will it be in operation next season?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. Only one tender received, which was from Peter McLean, Cannes, Nova Scotia. Amount of tender, $1,675.

3. Yes.

4. Commenced about October 5th., 1911. Completed about November 28th., 1911. Taken over by department, January 27th., 1912.

5. Yes. Joseph Dugas, John McCormick.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. No.

8. Interior fittings not completed, but hatchery will be in operation next session.

KIDSON'S ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Were tenders called for the erection of a new lighthouse on Kidson's Island, in the harbour of Baddeck, county of Victoria, Nova Scotia?

2. If so, what is the name and post office address of each tenderer?

3. Was the contract given to the lowest tenderer? If not, what was the reason?

4. When was the work commenced and when completed and taken over by the department?

5. Was the work done subject to inspection? If so, who was the inspector, by whom was he recommended, and when?

6. If there was no inspection of this work, why was the usual custom in such cases disregarded?

7. Did the representative for North Cape Breton and Victoria recommend an inspector for the works? If so, whom did he recommend and why was he not appointed?

8. Will the new lighthouse be in use for the opening of navigation next spring, or is it in use now?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. Lawrence Mury, West Arichat, N.S., $997.

Armagh Mury, West Arichat, N.S., $1,168.

P. L. McFarlane, Baddeck, N.S., $1,590.

3. Yes.

4. The contractor was notified on the 13th September, 1911, that his tender had been accepted. Inspector reported on the 15th November that work was completed with the exception of roof for lantern supplied by the department, which was broken in transit.

5. Yes. Mr. H. J. Alward, one of the regular departmental engineers.

6. See answer to previous question.

7. Yes. George McKay, of Baddeck, N.S. It was subsequently decided to have the inspection made by the resident engineer.

8. It will be in use for the opening of navigation next spring.

ST. ISIDORE DE PRESCOTT POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Has there been a request by petition or otherwise for a change in the postmastership at St. Isidore de Prescott, since the 21st of September last?
2. If so, who asked for the change, and who is proposed for the position?
3. Has the Postmaster General received any petition asking him not to make any change? If so, how many signed the petition?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes. Petition signed by 214 persons.

LAKE WINNIPEGOSIS FISHERY.

Mr. CRUISE:

1. Is it the intention of the government to open lake Winnipegosis for fishing during the ensuing summer season?
2. If so, will the quantity of fish to be taken by each fishermen be limited?

Mr. HAZEN:

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

WATHA INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. How many tenders were received by the government in 1911, for hemlock timber and hemlock bark on the Watha Indian Reserve?
2. Was the highest tender accepted?
3. What was the price received for such hemlock and hemlock bark?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Three tenders were received.
2. Yes.
3. $3.50 for hemlock, and $1.60 for bark.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all documents, papers correspondence, inquiries, evidence, reports, &c., relating to an accident sustained by Alphonse Madore, employed on the Intercolonial at Ste. Flavie, in 1888 or 1889, and to the settling of the claim then made by the said Alphonse Madore to the Department of Railways and Canals.—Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska.)

For a copy of all charges, letters, and documents of every kind with respect to the dismissal of John W. Bohan, from the position of Preventive Customs Officer at Bath, in the county of Carleton, province of New Brunswick. Also a copy of all references for an investigation on any such charges, if any, and a copy of all evidence adduced thereat, together with the recommendation of the official making such investigation.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, petitions, recommendations, complaints and other documents in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to the dismissal of fishery guardians in the county of Guysborough, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all letters, petitions, charges, complaints and other documents in the possession of the government or any department thereof, relating to the dismissal of William A. Gerrior, Customs Preventive Officer at Larry's river, N.S., and to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, &c., between the King's Printer, the superintendent of printing, and the King's Printer's representatives in Winnipeg regarding the printing and distribution of the voters lists of the province of Manitoba at the last general election.—Mr. Staples.

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolutions:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Post Office Act by providing—

(a) for the temporary employment of railway mail clerks for a period of not more than one year, at a salary of $500 and mileage allowance;

(b) for the appointment of temporary railway mail clerks as permanent clerks, with salaries not exceeding that which they received as such temporary clerks, but who shall not be eligible for an increase of salary until they have passed the necessary examination.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.—GRADES AND SALARIES IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. PELLETIER. moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolutions:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act by—

(a) changing the classification of the clerks in the City Post Office, offices of the Post Office Inspectors, office of Superintendent of Railway Mail Service, and in the Money Order Exchange Offices by abolishing the stampers and sorters class and fourth-class clerkships, and substituting therefor third-class clerkships, ranging from $500 to $1,000, and divided into two classes known as third-class 'A' and 'B.'

(b) abolishing the junior and senior second-class clerkships and substituting therefor classes 'A' and 'B' of the second-class, and increasing the maximum of the class formerly known as junior second, and now known as class 'B,' to $1,200, and increasing the maximum of class 'A,' corresponding with the former senior second-class, to $1,400;

(c) dividing the first-class clerkships into division 'A' and 'B' with maximum salaries of $1,800 and $1,600, respectively, and increasing the minimum of the first-class clerkships from $1,200 to $1,400, and creating a new class of clerks, to be known as chief clerks, in the city post offices, subject to certain restrictions;

(d) improving the position of office superintendents in city offices, and changing what was formerly a fixed salary of $1,800 to a minimum of $1,800 and a maximum of $2,500;

(e) providing for the employment of temporary clerks in the above named offices for a period of not more than one year, at a fixed salary of $500, and temporary helpers to meet the exigencies of the service at a salary not exceeding $2.50 a day;

(f) increasing the salaries of certain inspectors, assistant inspectors and superintendents of the Railway Mail Service in recognition of years of service;

(g) increasing the minimum of the salaries of inspectors and superintendents of the Railway Mail Service from $1,600 to $1,800.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I presume that the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) will make a statement to-morrow.

Mr. PELLETIER. Perhaps. But, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) thinks it well, we might have the discussion of the matter when the Bill is before the House.

Motion agreed to.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL—HOLLAND RIVER BRANCH.

On the orders of the day being called.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland). I desire to submit a question for the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden). I observe in the 'Newmarket Era' of February 2nd the report of a meeting of the town council which reads as follows:

TOWN COUNCIL.

A special meeting was held in the council chamber last Monday evening, Mayor Cane in the chair. Present—Councillors Roadhouse, Vale, Lyons, Cane, Wesley and Dennis.

The mayor stated that the meeting was called to consider the question of the government stopping the work on the Holland river branch of the Trent Valley canal.

The following resolutions, moved by N. J. Roadhouse, and seconded by Dr. J. H. Wesley, was carried unanimously:—

Whereas this council has learned with regret the decision of the Minister of Railways and Canals to abandon the Holland river division of the Trent Valley canal;

Whereas this work was undertaken at the request of a large deputation representing Aurora, Newmarket, Holland Landing and Bradford, also the township of North Gwillimbury, Whitchurch and King, which visited Ottawa and waited on the government asking that this work be undertaken for the purpose of obtaining reduced freight rates;

Whereas a large amount of freight is handled in this district, much of which would be supplied by water at a greatly reduced cost;

Whereas the route opened up by this canal was the old natural route to the north, the building of the Trent canal is again opening it up;

Whereas this work is almost completed—No. 2 section which contains the three locks and all the bridges is finished to the extent of 85 per cent. No. 1 section could be completed by a government dredge in a few months' time at a moderate expense;

Whereas the feeling here is strongly in favour of finishing the work;

Be it therefore resolved, that the Minister of Railways and Canals be requested to withhold his decision until further investigation has been made;

That copies of this resolution be sent to the right hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and the member for North York.

Several citizens spoke in favour of the resolution before the vote was taken.

Council adjourned.

I desire to ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) or the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) whether this matter has been brought to their notice in the form stated in this report.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have received a copy of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) has read.

Mr. BORDEN. A copy has been sent to me.

DISMISSALS FOR OFFENSIVE PARTISANSHIP.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) in the absence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) to an article of news which appeared in the 'Journal' of last Tuesday which is of considerable importance to the country. The article is headed 'Did they take active part', and is as follows:

The investigation of charges against civil servants who took part in the recent Dominion election was opened this morning in the Hull court house before Mr. M. Chauvin, of Hull, who was appointed by the federal government to inquire into this matter.

Joseph Piché, of the Public Works Department, appeared this morning in answer to the charge against him, of taking part in the election. Several witnesses were called and swore that he had talked reciprocity, and said that it was a good thing, and also that he distributed pamphlets which contained Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech on reciprocity.

Mr. BORDEN. Without desiring to prevent my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) asking any questions he may desire to ask, I would call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the practice of reading long newspaper articles with the desire of asking if the government have noticed them. I do not think this a desirable practice. I would ask you for a ruling so that we may have some consistent practice in this regard.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a very old practice.

Mr. BORDEN. But not a very desirable one.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Devlin) is indulging in a procedure not in consonance with our usual practice. It is permissible to ask a question at this stage, but, in my judgment it is not quite in order to read a long controversial article upon which an argument may be begun, or to ask a question that invites an argument. There is another feature of the case which appeals to me and on which the rule seem to be explicit, and that is that it is improper to deal with anything in this House that is before the courts.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this is simply a court of inquiry constituted by the government. But I submit to your ruling and will not proceed with the reading of the article. The question I have to ask is this: In view of the fact that Mr. Joseph Piché, who was an elevator man in the service of the Public Works Department and was charged with having taken an active part in the election, but was honourably acquitted as the court of inquiry declared, of taking any such part, I would like to know, before other gentlemen come before the court of inquiry, whether it is the intention of the government that these gentlemen who did not take part in the election but who have been dismissed and have been caused considerable expense to defend themselves will be reinstated in the public service?

Mr. BORDEN. I have not undertaken the administration of the various twenty-five departments of the government at Ottawa, but I assume that any man who had been dismissed without cause would be reinstated.

APPOINTMENT OF UNDER SECRETARIES.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Montreal 'Gazette' of yesterday contains an elaborate dispatch stating that it is the intention of the government to create under-secretaries for the various departments. Has the attention of the minister been called to that article, and is there any truth in it? Is it the intention of the government to appoint a Solicitor General?

Mr. BORDEN. I have not had the opportunity of reading the article in question. The subject has not yet been under the consideration of the government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The writer seems to speak authoritatively.

Mr. BORDEN. I presume he was stating his idea of what is likely to take place, but, as a matter of fact, the subject has not been considered by the government. I have nothing further to add to what I have said on former occasions with reference to the appointment of a Solicitor General.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Under consideration.

Mr. BORDEN. My right hon. friend, from reminiscences of the past, is answering for me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am very sorry to see that my hon. friend is copying so assiduously.

THE GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. DEVLIN. In view of the statement made by the Prime Minister in this House about two weeks ago that he would declare the policy of the government on the Georgian Bay canal last week, I would ask if he is yet in a position to declare whether the government has any policy on the Georgian bay canal scheme.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not remember the statement attributed to me. If my hon. friend will send me a reference to it, I shall give him an answer at some other time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

SALARIES OF COUNTRY POSTMASTERS.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to increase the salaries of country postmasters during the present session, or within a reasonable time?

Mr. PELLETIER. It will receive my most earnest consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If I may help the Postmaster General in coming to a decision, I may say that I had decided to do it.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the National Transcontinental railway. He said: When moving the resolutions preceding the introduction of this Bill, entitled An Act respecting the National Transcontinental Railway, I mentioned all the facts relevant to the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, mentioned in the Bill. I also furnished to all members of the House copies of the judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada and of the Privy Council. I also submitted an estimate showing the liability to date in connection with bond sales that have taken place and an estimate of future liability in connection with bond sales that will be made in the future on the assumption that no higher price will be realized than from the last sale. I assume, therefore, that the House is fairly in possession of all the information they desire. I wish, however, to make it clear to the public in connection

with this Bill of which I now move the second reading, that the responsibility for this very heavy obligation, in whatever degree such responsibility exists, must belong to the preceding government. So far as this government are concerned, we are merely taking authority under this Bill to discharge the obligation imposed upon the government of Canada by the contract of 1903, entered into between the late government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I stated that with regard to bond sales which have taken place the amount of liability under the implementing clause is about $5,000,000, and that a similar sum may be reasonably expected to measure the liability in connection with the sale of future bonds required for the construction of the road. The public have been shocked, I think, by the announcement of this very heavy liability. I think the onus is distinctly upon hon. gentlemen opposite, on behalf of the late government, to exculpate themselves, or to extenuate what appears, prima facie, at all exents, to have been a very great blunder. I reserve any further remarks that I have to make in regard to this subject until I hear what explanation is offered by hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the matter. I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, the second reading of the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have no exception whatever to take to the statement which was made by my hon. friend (Mr. White, Leeds), the other day, when he moved the resolution and now in moving the second reading of the Bill, as to the circumstances which have originated and made necessary this legislation. If blame there is to be it ought to attach to the parties who were in office when this legislation took place. This legislation is simply an incident of the construction of the Transcontinental railway which was decided upon by the government in the year 1903. When the Bill was presented for the construction of the Transcontinental railway it had not at that time struck everybody, as it struck us, that there was an immediate necessity for the construction of such a highway. On the contrary, it may be said that there was a cleavage of opinion and a good many members of this House and a good many people in the country thought, in good faith, I have no doubt, that the construction of such a railway was, at least, premature. If such an opinion existed at that time, and I quite admit it did exist, I think it has been dispelled long ago. There is no doubt now, I believe, that public opinion is unanimous that the Transcontinental railway which was undertaken in 1903 was an immediate necessity to the rapid development of the country and especially to the settlement of the provinces west of Lake Superior. We have evidences more than one of this fact. Indeed, public opinion is so much reconciled with the idea of having a Transcontinental railway such as was provided for by the legislation of 1903 and 1904 that, last year, when we introduced legislation into this House for assistance to a further Transcontinental railway, not a single word of objection was heard from anybody. I conclude from this that everybody was agreed then that the action we had taken was in the public interest. We have still at this moment another evidence of the wisdom of the legislation which we put upon the statute-book in the condition of things which exists in the northwestern provinces. We have to-day in the northwestern provinces three different railway systems, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway, every one of them is taxed to its utmost capacity, at the present time they are unable to cope with the requirements of the country and at least one-third if not more of the crop is now lying in the fields awaiting railway transportation. No better justification could be advanced of the necessity under which we were to provide for the immediate wants of the settlers and the wants of the settlers are connected with transportation above all things. Indeed, if we had more railway facilities than we have, if the railways were better equipped with storage capacity and rolling stock, a heavy burden would be lifted from the mind and the heart of the settler at the present time.

But, it was not an easy task to induce any company to enter upon what was, after all, an arduous undertaking, and, it might be, an uncertain one. After negotiating with the Grand Trunk Railway Company they undertook the task of providing for the construction of the Transcontinental railway and the House is familiar with the conditions which were imposed upon us and which have been described by my hon. friend in introducing this motion. In so far as it is necessary for the purpose of the present discussion it may be sufficient to say that in order to induce the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company to undertake the construction of this second transcontinental railway we agreed that upon the western section of the road, from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean, we would undertake to guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to the extent of three-quarters of the cost of the construction of the road, limiting the liability, however, upon the prairie section, to $13,000 a mile and, upon the mountain section, to $30,000 a mile. This agreement was modified, as has been

shown already by my hon. friend, in the following year and, as I said a moment ago, I have no reason at all to complain of the statement of the hon. gentleman in introducing the motion because I think he presented the case in a very clear and a very fair manner. I will quote his own words in introducing the motion the other day:

At the time this agreement was entered into, the 3 per cent stock of the Dominion of Canada stood at about par. Shortly afterwards there was a fall in that stock in common with other high class low interest-bearing securities, and as a result it was seen that the 3 per cent Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's bonds guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada would not realize nearly par. In order to meet that situation a supplementary agreement was entered into in the following year. Among other things it removed the limit as to the $30,000 a mile upon the mountain section, but allowed the $13,000 per mile as a maximum of bonds to be issued by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company on the prairie section to stand.

That is a very fair statement of what took place and of the reasons which induced us to make the modification which we made of the agreement of 1903. Shortly after we had introduced the legislation of 1903 the financial market commenced to decline and declined steadily. It was not supposed, however, that it would be permanent. It was expected that, on the contrary, the financial market would resume its buoyancy and that our securities, which, at the time we entered into the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in 1903, stood at about par and, which had declined would resume their former position. However, in this we have been disappointed as everybody knows. The financial market has been going down steadily ever since, not only in regard to Canadian securities, but in regard to the best securities in the world. English consols, for instance, which ever since the wars of Napoleon had been the most favoured stock in the financial market, and which, during the later years of the last century, stood not only at par but at a large premium, sometimes ranging as high as 10 per cent, have declined steadily ever since and if I am not mistaken—indeed I am not mistaken—in the month of December English consols went down to 77. I have not looked at the quotations recently, but I think they have been still declining. So that, if our securities have been declining ever since it is not on account of any want of confidence in our credit, but it is simply on account of the larger demands that have been made on the money market, the result being that the price of money has risen accordingly. Everybody knows that the impetus which has been given to the development of natural securities, especially electrical securities, has been almost phenomenal in the last ten years. This is regarded as a gilt-edged security, but the price of money has risen on account of the extraordinary demand to meet this new development in the industrial world. Under these circumstances, the value of our securities has been steadily declining. That is the origin of the legislation we passed in 1904, and which we are now about to implement by providing to meet the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, rendered on the agreement which was passed between us and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in 1904. I may say that I acquit the Minister of Finance and the government from all responsibility in this matter; the government in introducing the legislation is simply taking the proper steps to comply with the judgment of the Privy Council. Under the enactment of 1903 we guaranteed three-fourths of the cost of construction of the western section of the road, limiting our obligation on the prairie section to not more than $13,000 a mile, and limiting our obligation on the Mountain section to not more than $30,000 a mile. The modification we made in that is to be found in section 5 of the Act of 1904, which reads:

Notwithstanding anything in the said contract contained, the government may and shall, preserving always the proportions in the said contract provided as between the Prairie and Mountain sections of the eastern division, implement for the purposes and subject otherwise to the provisions of the said contract, its guarantee of the bonds of the said company to be issued for the cost of construction of the said western division, in such manner as may be agreed upon, so as to make the proceeds of the said bonds so to be guaranteed a sum equal to seventy-five per centum of the cost of construction of the western division ascertained as provided in the said contract, but not exceeding in respect of the Prairie section, thirteen thousand dollars ($13,000) per mile.

There were two provisions in this agreement, one, was that the restriction of the liability of the government with regard to the mountain section of $30,000 per mile was removed, and we also undertook to implement the difference between the face value of the bonds and the price they would bring in the market. Now, we did this because it became evident that at least some of the bonds which were to be issued from time to time could not realize par or anything like it. We were in hopes that the money market might become more buoyant, and that we would not have very much in the end to make up, but in this our expectations were not realized. The

money market has been steadily declining, and, as the Minister of Finance has very properly said some of them sold at 92½ and others sold at only 80, making a great difference between the face value and the selling price. Now, why did we make this arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company?

It seems to us that under such circumstances if the Grand Trunk Pacific company was bound to raise its money at that sacrifice, that its credit and its resources might be impaired, and the enterprise might be jeopardized. We thought on the whole, that it was worth every effort on the part of the Canadian government, on the part of the Canadian parliament, on the part of the Canadian people, to provide for this Transcontinental railway, which would be of such benefit to the settlers of the west, in enabling them to bring their products to the market. We all know that what has contributed most of all to make Canada prosperous, has been the rapid settlement of the western prairies, and that the more facilities were given to the settlers to dispose of their crops the more prosperous they would be, and the more prosperous would be the country as a whole. The government at the time placed itself in the judgment of the House and the House approved our action, and I believe the Canadian people also approved. Even though the cost may be heavy, I do not think it is too heavy for the resources of the country or for the results which have already been achieved, and which still remain to be achieved. The only difficulty that arose in connection with the matter, was as to the interpretation of this agreement, and as to in what manner the implementing should take place. That has been a question between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the government for some years past. I need not tell the House—many of the old members remember it—that when we made the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway company, the government engaged the services of some of the most able counsel who could be obtained. We had the Minister of Justice, who did not himself take any technical part in the framing of the contract, and who left this largely to Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, and to one of the most able counsel of the Dominion, Mr. George F. Shepley. These gentlemen prepared the contract for our guidance, and even though our best efforts were given to make it a document that could not be disputed, still, as doctors differ, so will lawyers and judges. When the difficulty arose, Mr. Shepley and Mr. Newcombe advised us that the proper method of implementing would be to issue bonds, so as to make up the difference, whereas, the Grand Trunk Railway Company took the position that the implementing should be only by the payment of cash to the amount of the difference between the face value of the bonds and the price they realized. Then, the matter was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada. Before I proceed, might I refer to a remark made by my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance a moment ago, when he said that the blame, if blame was to fall upon anybody, must fall upon the previous administration.

I agree altogether with my hon. friend that if blame must fall upon anybody, it must fall upon us. But in such a matter it may well be considered whether or not we are very much to blame after all. The question was one of law, and let me before I go further, state to the House what was the opinion, as to the construction of the contract which we made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, of a gentleman well versed in law, whose eminent ability as a lawyer is well known; I mean the Deputy Minister of Justice. When the difference arose with the Grand Trunk Railway Company as to the interpretation of this contract, the matter was referred by the Minister of Finance to Mr. Newcombe, and this is the opinion which was given by Mr. Newcombe:

> In reply I beg to state that in my opinion that method of implementing is still open to the government. In the first place I think that the whole transaction shows that there was no intention that the government should pay cash otherwise than as expressly provided, and it is my opinion that under the legislation and agreements the government has not the power to pay the deficit in cash as proposed by the company.
>
> Then, section 5 provides that the company is to implement its guarantee 'so as to make the proceeds of the said bonds so to be guaranteed a sum equal to seventy five per centum of the cost of the construction of the western division, ascertained as provided in the said contract but not exceeding in respect of the Prairie section $13,000 per mile.' It will be seen that the method of implementing proposed by the company would not fulfil the object for which the implementing was to be undertaken, that is to say, it would not make the proceeds of the bonds a sum equal to 75 per cent. of the cost of construction, &c., while the other method would comply with this requirement to the letter.
>
> Again, the recital of the implementing clause in the mortgage schedule can hardly be taken to have had any other object than to account pro tanto for the amount of the issue to be made under the mortgage, and we know as a matter of fact that there was included in that amount the sum of $4,255,125 in respect of bonds to implement on a basis of 92½ per cent.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the right hon. gentleman give the date of that letter?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The 11th of June, 1908. In support of the statement of

Mr. Newcombe, which I have just read, that in the preparation of the bonds the sum of $4,255,125 had been provided in respect of bonds to implement on a basis of 92½ per cent in the papers which were brought down by my hon. friend there is an opinion of Mr. Shepley in which this point is more clearly put. In preparing the mortgage, Mr. Shepley said:

> The company's officials have furnished a memorandum, and this memorandum has been checked by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, and the limit finally agreed upon (£14,000,000 sterling) has been fixed with reference to the principles stated above.
>
> The memorandum furnished by the company's officials required correction in some details, and after correction the figures based upon that memorandum appear to be as follows:—

Cost (including terminals) of both sections..	$51,560,000
15 per cent. for contingencies in respect of the mountain division	5,175,000
3 years' interest capitalized..	3,854,250
Bonds to implement upon a basis of 92½ per cen.	4,255,125
Total..	$64,844,375
or..	£13,340,000

That is to say, as stated by Mr. Shepley, there was an estimate furnished by the company of £14,000,000 sterling of bonds to be issued under the agreement, and there it is shown that there is a provision made of $4,255,125 of bonds to implement the difference between the cost of the bonds, 92½ per cent, and their face value. Mr. Newcombe, in his letter, goes on:

> As Mr. Shepley states, page 3 of the memorandum respecting implementing provision, enclosed with your letter (top of page 3), the implementing contemplated is an implementing of the guarantee and not an implementing of the proceeds, and the implementing is to be such as will make the proceeds of the bonds in the whole guaranteed a sum equal to 75 per cent. of the cost of construction, &c.

Mr. Newcombe then concludes with these very suggestive words to which I call the attention of the House, especially of those who are disposed to blame us:

> I may add that the construction thus put upon the contract as to the competence of an implementing such as that proposed by the Minister of Finance does not seem to me to admit of any serious doubt.

The House now understands the whole kernel of the situation, which was this: There was a difference of opinion between the Minister of Finance representing the government, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, as to the nature of the implementing. The government contended that the obligation of the government was discharged by an implementing of the guarantee, whereas the company contended that the obligation of the government could be discharged only by implementing the proceeds of the bonds. The question was referred to the Supreme Court. I need not go into the technicalities of the questions which were submitted to that court. If I remember rightly, there were five questions, all of which bore upon this question: Was the obligation of the government discharged simply by implementing the guarantee, that is to say, by issuing more bonds to cover the difference betwen the face value of the bonds and their cash price, or was it to implement the proceeds? The matter was argued before the Supreme Court, and all the judges of that court unanimously decided that the implementing was one of the proceeds, but simply of the guarantee, as contended by the Minister of Finance, supported by the law officers of the Crown. The matter was taken before the Privy Council, and that body reversed the judgment of the Supreme Court, holding that the implementing should be of the proceeds and not of the guarantee. Therefore the legislation of my hon. friend becomes necessary.

Now, of course I need not say that we must all bow to the judgment of the Privy Council. They are the supreme authorities, and their judgment is final, whether that judgment be right or wrong. I am not reflecting in any way on the competence of that court, but looking at the facts as they are, there is one thing to be said in favour of the construction by the Supreme Court of Canada. To the courtesy of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) I am indebted for the factum of each party in this case. On reading the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific, I was impressed by the statement therein made which I thought worthy of consideration. Upon the contention that the implementing could be done by an issue of bonds, this consideration is expressed:

> To issue additional bonds ranking equally with the said mortgage bonds would involve a breach of faith with the holders of the said second mortgage bonds inasmuch as it would weaken their security.

That view seems to have been very largely the one which induced the Privy Council to give the judgment it did. By the contract, when the government was authorized to guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the extent of 75 per cent, the Grand Trunk Pacific also undertook that the bonds necessary to complete the other 25 per cent should be guaranteed by the Grand Trunk railway, and this undertaking was carried out. Therefore the second bonds were issued after our own, and there was a good deal of force in the point I have just cited. But it seems to me that this objection cannot hold for this obvious reason. It cannot hold, because

the purchasers of the second bonds must have known the condition agreed upon, namely, that if there was a difference between the par value and the cash price of the bonds guaranteed by the government, that was to be implemented by other bonds. Therefore they took these second bonds subject to the possibility that there might be required an additional issue to make up that discrepancy. But the view taken by the Privy Council was that it would be a breach of faith to implement by a new issue of bonds the deficiency arising from the discrepancy between the market value and the par value. Here are the words of the judgment of the Privy Council:

With the utmost deference their lordships are unable to accept the interpretation placed by the Supreme Court on paragraph 5. It seems to their lordships that there is nothing in paragraph 5 importing that any further liability was to be imposed on the company in respect of the first mortgage bonds and that it falls upon the government to implement their guarantee so as to make the proceeds of those bonds issued and to be issued equal to their par or nominal value. It would be a breach of faith with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to let in any further charge in priority to their security, and as it appears to their lordships the company has no power to issue bonds other than those authorized by the original contract.

This is the final decision, but I have this to say that our contention was a hazardous or an improvident one. It was one which had the authority of the law officers of the Crown in its favour, also that of Mr. Shepley, one of the most eminent counsel in Canada, and I have here the words of Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, who, under his own signature, said that the construction we had put upon the claim was one which, in his opinion, could not admit of serious doubt.

However, the Privy Council has spoken and we have only to submit. My hon. friend says this will involve a further outlay out of the treasury of some $10,000,000, but is there not after all some reason why we should console ourselves if such should be the case? A moment ago I said that the condition now existing west of Lake Superior is one which must cause a great deal of anxiety, not only to hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches, but to every hon. member of this House, and to everybody who has any concern for the welfare of his country.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? Does he admit that if it had been pointed out to the government that an amendment could have been made which would have prevented the rendering of the judgment now given by obviating any doubt of the position taken by the late government, that amendment should have been accepted?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is very easy to be wise after the event.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the right hon. gentleman say that the possibility of a different construction was not pointed out to him at the time?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That point was taken up and discussed by our counsel.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I mean in this House when section 5 was being discussed. Was it not then pointed out to my hon. friend, and to his Minister of Finance and Minister of Justice that the clause might have the very result which the Privy Council has given it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I know that my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), did make a statement to that effect; but the Privy Council understood the clause in one sense, our own Supreme Court, and our own counsel understood it differently. It was a case of disagreement between lawyers, and the final judgment is in favour of the contention of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker).

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But when it was pointed out to the right hon. gentleman and his ministers that there was a possibility of such a construction being put upon this clause, and when they had it in their power to amend the clause so as to remove any doubt, why did he not have the clause amended and save the country $10,000,000?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have said already that we had the opinion of the hon. member for Hamilton on the one side and that of Mr. Shepley and Mr. Newcombe on the other. Let me again read the opinion of Mr. Newcombe that in his view the question did not admit of doubt.

Mr. BORDEN. But that opinion of Mr. Newcombe was of very much later date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly, but he was construing the contract and he said that it did not admit of any doubt. As I have said there is a condition to-day in the Northwest which must cause anxiety, not only to the gentlemen on the treasury benches, but to the whole Canadian people. You have in that country any amount of wheat awaiting transportation for lack of railway accommodation. It is to be hoped that the railway companies will be able to give more storage facilities and provide more cars than they have been able to give hitherto, and in that way mitigate to some extent the condition now prevailing.

Mr. S. BARKER (East Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the Bill, I

shall perhaps take a little liberty with the House, by going back upon some of the facts, and I may not altogether agree with what the right hon. gentleman has just said as to the facts. I think, however, that there can be no question in this House that the Bill introduced by the Minister of Finance, should be supported. I shall do so simply because there is not now any question whether we wisely undertook certain things in 1904, but the simple fact that we did enter into a certain undertaking by which the highest court of the empire has decided we have obligated ourselves to pay the money that is asked for. Therefore, Sir, if it was three times the amount involved, there should be no hesitation now, and I trust that as Canadians we shall not allow any question to be raised upon that point. What we have agreed to, what we have undertaken, we will abide by, and I therefore sincerely hope that every member in the House, for the credit of the country, will vote for the Bill.

But, Sir, while doing that, I think we are justified in asking the House to go back upon the history of the transaction which has involved us in this very serious loss of public money. It is due to members on this side of the House, who were then in opposition and to the country which after all, must bear the brunt, that we should look back now and see how this was all brought about, and whether the case is as simple as the right hon. gentleman affects to think it is. If I understand the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) aright he is under the impression to-day that when this question was first opened in the country, there were a great many people who thought that the construction of the railway was not needed then, that it was premature. I do not know just what my hon. friend is referring to. If he says that many people thought at that time there was no need for additional railway facilities for the transportation of the grain produce of the great northwest to the ocean, then he is altogether outside the facts. I was in the House at that time and I can vouch for the opinion of every member of the Conservative party; I venture to say, there was not one man on the Conservative side who doubted for a moment the absolute need of another through railway at the earliest possible moment. There were in the Conservative party at that time members who were interested in other railways, some in the Canadian Pacific railway, and others in other roads, but every one of them, whether interested in the Canadian Pacific railway or not, agreed that another railway should be built, that the party should unanimously support any generous liberal subsidy the government would propose to give, and that we should facilitate the construction of the road in every way. That is putting it according to what I know to have been the feeling then on the Conservative side; and so far as my knowledge and observation went, it was the opinion of every man on both sides of the House.

Hon. gentlemen will recollect that in November, 1902, a notice appeared in the 'Canada Gazette' of an application to parliament for a charter for a company to be called the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. That was the root of this whole matter. I shall read, before concluding, the application of that company to the right hon. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as Prime Minister of Canada for a subsidy and the conditions they proposed. The application will show that they proposed a line from the Pacific ocean at or about Port Simpson to and through Edmonton, and to and through Winnipeg, and then to North Bay. At North Bay their proposed line would have connected with the existing railway system of Ontario, which would have carried the line through from the Pacific to Montreal, where it would meet the Intercolonial owned by the government. Thus by the project proposed to the right hon. gentleman there was offered to us at the earliest possible moment a through line from the Pacific ocean to Halifax, another real transcontinental railway about whose early construction there was very little doubt.

I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that there was a great deal of difficulty in inducing any company to undertake the construction of such a line. The hon. gentleman had in his own hands that proposition as early as November, 1902, and he did not allow the people of this country or of this House or his followers to know that he had that until two years afterwards. He treated that paper as a confidential letter and he kept it in his own possession. Yet knowing that he had that he tells the House that it would have been impossible at that time to get any company to undertake the construction of such a road. This is not new to us. We have been charged with opposing the Transcontinental railway. We never opposed that system at all. We did not know exactly what the proposal of the Grand Trunk Company was to be for the best reason in the world, that the right hon. gentleman would not let us see it. It was impossible for us to know, we did not know what terms they proposed or what subsidy they expected, but we thought they would ask a good deal more than they expected to get and that the government would have dealt reasonably and liberally with them and no more. So, from every possible point of view, opportunities were presented to the gov-

ernment for the construction of that railway at the earliest possible day.

It was not possible for the proposed company to do what they desired to do, and what events have shown would have been the very best thing for Canada. In 1903, there were in the city and province of Quebec certain personal and political friends of the right hon. gentleman who had various railway, bridge and other projects and schemes more or less visionary and more or less financially hopeless. After the private Bill of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had been introduced in the House, it was referred to the Railway Committee. Immediately there were rumours of all kinds. We heard of personal negotiations between the right hon. gentleman and the Grand Trunk railway officials. The right hon. gentleman undertook to negotiate 'off his own bat' with some of the ablest railway men in the country—did it all himself. When, some weeks afterward, the Bill came up in the Railway Committee—I was present—the right hon. gentleman informed us that he had made another arrangement than that proposed by the Bill. He proposed that the railway should be constructed easterly from Winnipeg towards Lake Abitibi and thence to the city of Quebec. And there was to be a branch from the neighbourhood of Abitibi, to North Bay and a branch to Montreal. This was announced to us as a perfectly new idea. The Grand Trunk railway officials were there, and if I am any judge of men's countenances, they assented very unwillingly and under pressure. I do not think that any man who saw them could possibly doubt that. The next stage was that another set of men came in. The right hon. gentleman had political and personal friends away down east in New Brunswick. After a week or two, and after further private and personal negotiations—it was said at that time that the right hon. gentleman was meeting the railway officials in private cars, away from the Cabinet and from his ministers; doing the whole thing himself—we had another meeting of the Railway Committee; and we found that the proposed line was to be extended down into New Brunswick, Moncton being ultimately named. And that line as proposed then by the right hon. gentleman paralleled the government's own railway for hundreds of miles. That is not all. The right hon. gentleman had some more friends: he had some friends in Quebec and vicinity, and so it came about that the taking up of the two sections from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to Moncton involved taking up that most lamentable affair, the Quebec bridge. And thereupon, as we find, the bridge company was taken over. They had received bonuses from the Dominion of Canada towards that bridge, from the province of Quebec and from the City of Quebec. They had spent all they had received and were in debt something over $900,000. They were utterly bankrupt—stranded; their charter was not worth a dollar. But a very prominent Quebec gentleman was at the head of the company, and the next thing we knew the government was buying up this concern. The government took over its liabilities, compensated the shareholders and directors of this bankrupt concern, and it became part, to all intents and purposes, of the great Transcontinental line. It is almost amusing to think that the hon. Mr. Fielding, in 1904, when addressing this House, put the amount at which the bridge should be chargeable to the Transcontinental railway at $2,000,000;—he thought that was excessive, but he generously charged that amount against the bridge. Every one who knows the history of that bridge is quite sure that the cost of that part of the project will be seven times two million. But in the airy way they had of handling millions in those days, they put it down as $2,000,000. It was perhaps, the most unfortunate part of the whole project—though we have not yet, it may be, heard all the misfortunes of the eastern division. That bridge, as we all know, dropped into the St. Lawrence, carrying with it scores of poor workmen. We had been paying millions on the bridge and the government had not even insured the payments it made. And the government contract for construction was with a corporation in the United States, the capital of which was $100,000. This was another instance of the business abilities brought to bear upon the construction of this gigantic work. The one visible asset we got from the bridge company was a lawyer, a political and personal friend of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who was taken over as supervisor and superintendent of construction of the eastern division of the great Transcontinental line at a handsome salary. We got him, and that is about all we had, I think, for the money the country expended in buying out the old bridge company.

Now, it may be just as well here to consider the difference in the two propositions. The first is that which the skilful railway men had planned out, a simple undertaking, that would have been profitable to them and most useful and most profitable to the country. The Grand Trunk's proposition was to carry a line from the Pacific to North Bay. That was to be the whole construction. And they would undertake it for certain subsidies to which I shall refer presently,—we did not know what they were then, for the reason I have already stated, but they were a subject for consideration, and no one would have objected to a generous treatment, but not

necessarily giving the company all they asked. The Grand Trunk Railway Company were willing to carry that traffic to Montreal, and there hand it over to the government railway. They put that proposition in writing. So, in every possible way, in which you could regard it from the point of view of the people of Canada, the Grand Trunk Railway proposition, apart from any subsidy they may have asked, was the most feasible, the most useful, and the most profitable, that could possibly have been advanced. And what did we get in exchange? The Grand Trunk being coerced—I think there is no doubt about that—into the views of the right hon. gentleman, stipulated that the government should undertake the construction from Winnipeg; and the government did undertake it. They let the Grand Trunk off all the distance between Winnipeg and North Bay and undertook to build it themselves. The government also undertook the construction from Lake Abitibi to Moncton and they undertook the bridge at Quebec. Then they made a further bargain with the Grand Trunk Pacific that the company were to build only from Port Simpson to Winnipeg.

The country undertook the enormous expenditure involved by the construction of a line through all the wild country to the north. It assumed that, and it was to rent the road to the Grand Trunk for seven years free and afterwards at the rental specified. The charter having been laid before parliament to meet the new terms interjected into it by the Prime Minister, we had a discussion in the House in 1903 and we endeavoured, by every means in our power, to introduce into the contract an obligation on the part of the Grand Trunk to deliver the traffic at Montreal to the Intercolonial railway, the government road. We were opposed in that by the right hon. gentleman and his followers. Every possible reason was given why they could not do it. One day it was impossible to carry it out, another day the Grand Trunk would not agree to it, and so we spent months in weary debate in this House endeavouring to get it made perfectly clear that the traffic which was to be brought over the Transcontinental should go through Canada and not to the United States ports. After all the objections and all the efforts we were making it was a surprise to us long after to find that the Grand Trunk had actually offered in writing to the right hon. gentleman to do that themselves. They had actually offered to hand over the whole of the traffic to the Intercolonial at Montreal and yet the right hon. gentleman kept that concealed in his pocket, defied us and prevented us from getting that most important concession from the Grand Trunk railway.

I think that, perhaps, I might here refer to what occurred on the 10th July, 1903. The country was astounded one fair day to hear that the right hon. gentleman's railway minister had resigned. He had left the government and why? He says that he resigned merely on account of his objection to this railway project. He is reported at page 6738 of 'Hansard', 1903, in these words:

> Now, Sir, I want to say emphatically here that until the question of the Grand Trunk Pacific came up for consideration before council, the thought of resignation never entered into my mind.

He then gave several cogent reasons why he objected to the plan, and at page 6742 will be found his letter to the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and I will read one or two extracts from it. He says:

> Again, as respects my being open to the charge of want of fairness to yourself, it rather appears to me that an allegation of that character more properly lies at your door. The Grand Trunk proposition had been made to you, and you had consulted with other ministers, and those ministers had met Mr. Hays on several occasions, as I am advised with your knowledge and approval, long before you made me aware that negotiations or discussions on this subject had been entered upon and were being prosecuted. I do not say that I was unaware of them, because information indirectly reached me to that effect.

I would not be surprised at that because it reached all of us.

> But I do say they had made progress and had been well advanced before my chief had considered it proper or necessary to acquaint me with the facts. I think I might justly complain that so important a matter of policy, arising within the sphere of my own department, should have been conducted and continued in this way behind my back, and without my knowledge.

It was rather a serious charge for the member of a responsible government to make against his chief that, in a matter concerning the department that Mr. Blair presided over and in a matter of such enormous importance, the right hon. gentleman was negotiating with railway men behind his back. At page 6746 of that volume will be found Sir Wilfrid Laurier's reply to Mr. Blair:

> Privy Council, Ottawa,
> 14th July, 1903.
>
> My dear Blair,—I received yesterday afternoon, your letter dated the 10th, placing in my hands your resignation as member of the Cabinet and Minister of Railways.
>
> I have received at the same time another letter in which you set forth the reasons

which have led you to the course which you have adopted.

This last communication opens with a review of the deliberations which have taken place in council on the railway question. In this review, matters are stated which, in my estimation, come within the rule that 'the deliberations of the council, upon all matters which engage their attention, are strictly private and confidential.' I, therefore, refrain from discussing them.

With regard to the charge that negotiations with Mr. Hays made progress and were well advanced, before I considered it proper or necessary to acquaint you with the facts, I have only to remind you that I thought it advisable at first, to retain in my hands the negotiations of this important subject, keeping the council constantly informed, until I referred the matter to a sub-committee, of which you were one.

Now, in the course of business, one can understand that, with the right hon. gentleman holding negotiations privately with skilful railway men, he would get so far committed and get the terms so far settled and in shape that his colleagues would be committed themselves, and it would be too late for them to take any real part in conducting negotiations properly and with due regard for the public service.

He says:

The plan which we have adopted for the construction of the line from Moncton to the Pacific coast, has been purposely selected so as to keep in the hands of the government the key to the transportation problem from the prairies to the ocean, and to leave to the initiative of a private company the section of country where energy and enterprise will be constantly required to meet the exigencies of an ever-changing situation.

The right hon. gentleman wants to keep in his own hands the direction of the traffic, and it would not have required much effort on his part to do that had he simply shown his colleagues the application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company where they offered to hand the traffic over to the Intercolonial. That did not require very much skill, but it did require a great deal of skill to get in these Quebec lines and the bridge and other things. That did require skill, but it had not much to do with securing the traffic for Canada. Then, Mr. Blair goes on to say, and I call the attention of the House to these words because they are the words of the Railway Minister:

But, Sir, if I am capable of exercising any judgment on a matter of this kind, I am bound to say that if I had come to this parliament, and, with what little knowledge and experience I have had of railway questions, deliberately advised this parliament and this country that this was a scheme which merited their acceptance, I do not believe I should have been doing my duty to myself, and in not doing my duty to myself, I should not have been doing my duty to the party with which I am allied.

I do not know that a responsible minister, whether he be the leader or otherwise, could have more severe condemnation passed on his conduct than these words convey. The right hon. gentleman had a Cabinet minister there particularly charged with this railway business; he was the man selected by the government to administer the railways of the country, and he says he could not accept the terms which the right hon. gentleman himself had negotiated. I do not know that I need say much more on that point.

Now, with regard to the agreement made in 1903, I wish to inform the hon. gentlemen in this House who were not here in that year, that from early in the session until I think October the discussion of the Bill went on and every clause of it was minutely examined. I do not believe anything within the last twenty years has occupied so much of the time of parliament as that Bill of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in 1903. The result of it all was that the right hon. gentleman carried his Bill just as he wanted to. He had a large majority in this House and every member of his party voted straight all the time. I do not want to say they were subservient, but they certainly did obey the right hon. gentleman and went straight for the Bill, and it was impossible for us to get anything at all into that Bill that would have served the purpose that we had at heart, namely, to secure the traffic for Canadian lines and Canadian ports. That was the strong point we were fighting for, and the right hon. gentleman would not yield one inch to us. The result of the agreement made at that time was that while the government undertook what was perhaps the most difficult part of the whole line, that part from Winnipeg to Moncton, the Grand Trunk Pacific took only a portion of the part they were originally to construct, namely, that portion from the Pacific to Winnipeg. That portion of the road was divided into two sections, the Prairie section and the Mountain section. The government agreed to guarantee the bonds on the Prairie section to the extent of $13,000 per mile and on the Mountain section to the extent of $30,000 per mile. That was in clause 28 of the agreement, and it was a very simple clause indeed. The company issued the bonds and the Dominion guaranteed them. There was no implementing or undertaking that they would produce par or anything else. The proposition set out in section 28 was the proposition that was accepted by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. But, that agreement was subject to the approval of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk railway, and when in the spring of 1904 it was laid before them there

was a good deal of discussion as to the cost of the mountain section. It had been at first assumed that it would cost about $45,000 per mile, and on that they were to get a guarantee of seventy-five per cent or $30,000 per mile. At the meeting of the Grand Trunk Railway shareholders in London, the President Sir Rivers Wilson, addressing the meeting, told them that upon the latest information the cost of construction would be not $45,000 per mile but $56,000 per mile. Other negotiations ensued and again Mr. Hays appeared here and informed the right hon. gentleman that he could not accept the conditions of the 1903 agreement, and he asked for several alterations. It will be observed throughout all this, at every stage of the discussion, that the Grand Trunk Pacific people never hesitated to ask for what they wanted, and the difficulty always seemed to be that the government would never ask for anything, and were only too willing to yield.

Then the agreement of 1904 was made, and we have a very good example of the right hon. gentleman's method when he introduced that agreement to the House. At page 715 'Hansard,' 1904, Sir Wilfrid Laurier is reported as saying: That the Grand Trunk Company had considered the conditions imposed on them by the agreement of 1903 too onerous, that they had made several requests, and that the government had agreed to certain modifications, to which he now asked parliament to consent. Now, remember gentlemen, he was introducing to the House a new agreement which contained all the altered provisions involving this loss of $10,000,000 and here is what he said about it:

> The modifications are not numerous, and I venture to say that our hon. friends opposite, when they saw the narrow extent of the concessions which we had agreed to, were surprised at the moderation of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the comparatively unimportant modifications which we were called upon to make. Not only were they surprised at the moderation of the concessions which we made, but I believe they were vexed, because it deprived them of a good deal of the thunder which they were prepared to fulminate here.

He treated it as the merest trifle. He went on:

> At all events, the proposition is before parliament and the time has now come to discuss it. I would suspect from the smiles which I see on the faces of my hon. friends opposite that to-day they are not quite satisfied. I suspect that they will have some fault finding even yet, but I have been so accustomed to that from these gentlemen, that anything which they may say will not surprise me now. I am not after all surprised, nor do I find much fault, if on this, as on every other occasion, it has not been found possible to satisfy the gentlemen on the opposition benches.

The right hon. gentleman then dealt with several of the clauses of the 1904 agreement not directly connected with the resolution now before the House, and, therefore, I pass them by at present.

Coming to the change made in section 28, which change was, of course, one of those which would surprise us as to the moderation of the Grand Trunk Company, and which would cause us to be vexed because it deprived us, the opposition, of a good deal of the thunder which we were prepared to fulminate, he proceeds to inform the House that the restriction of the guarantee to $30,000 per mile of the cost of construction of the Mountain section was removed, and that now the government undertook to guarantee 75 per cent of that cost whatever it might be. Then, too, he said the government undertook to implement the proceeds of the sales of the bonds, so as to make the amount actually going into the construction, 75 per cent of the total cost of construction.

So there was one modest little demand which was to vex us, the vile opposition of that day, from its very moderation. Let us see what it meant to Canada.

The president of the Grand Trunk, addressing his shareholders at a meeting a few weeks previously, had said, on the latest information, that the mountain section would cost for construction $56,000 a mile. Therefore the government knew that in removing the restriction of $30,000 per mile they were subjecting the country to a guarantee of $42,000 per mile, or an addition to our obligations on that section of $12,000 per mile, or for, say 500 miles, an increase of $6,000,000 with interest.

Having thus crushed us with such a trifling concession, the right hon. gentleman proceeded to lay before us another of his little arrangements, but this one, he admitted, in certain possibilities might cost the country a little more. He apparently had not at all realized how much was involved in omitting the restriction to $30,000 a mile.

Well, not content with removing the restriction of one guarantee to $30,000 a mile, he further undertook that the government should implement the guarantee so that the company should receive par for the bonds guaranteed as to both the Mountain and Prairie sections. That might, he admitted, cost us a little more. So far, as you see, it is costing us in round numbers about $10,000,000—and we must not forget that that money is gone forever —not recoverable—and there will be more to follow.

Now, let us see just where we stand as to this $10,000,000. The Finance Minister will of course borrow the $10,000,000 at interest, and hand it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific as a gift. But as we have

guaranteed the bonds to the holders, then if the Grand Trunk Pacific fails to pay, we must pay that money again to the bondholders with interest. And under section 32 of the agreement, we must, for the first seven years from the date of the bonds guaranteed on the Mountain section, pay all the interest to the holders and have no recourse against the Grand Trunk Pacific. And, further, for the next three years, if we pay interest on those guaranteed bonds, we must accept re-payment from the Grand Trunk Pacific not in cash, but in 40 year bonds bearing interest. So that, about 47 years after the date of the bonds, we will get only the three years' interest back.

Now, there was something said by the right hon. gentleman as to their misunderstanding. There was no misunderstanding. The right hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that there was a question about the meaning of that clause. Does he suppose that if there had been a doubt raised on the side of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company as to its meaning, they would have failed to get it put beyond a question? All that he had to do was to say to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company: There seems to be a doubt as to the meaning of this implementing.

I had pointed out that if the bonds should not realize par, the government must bear the loss, without recourse; and so it would be wiser to require the company to issue additional guaranteed bonds for which the government would only be a surety. But the then Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) said in reply to me:

> I have no doubt the hon. gentleman's method would be the best, but I do not think he has any justification for assuming there is going to be a loss on the sale of the bonds. We all hope that the market will improve.

So they preferred to take the risk, and we had the right hon. gentleman and his ministers gambling on the stock market. The right hon. gentleman was inclined to admit that there might be a little more loss in dealing in their methods than there otherwise would have been. He used the expression: 'it might cost a little more.' That was just like the $14,000,000 Quebec bridge which we were told was likely to cost $2,000,000. The cost of everything undertaken by the late government was belittled. He knew perfectly well the risk they were taking, yet he would not ask the Grand Trunk railway to insert a few words in its agreement which would have made the meaning clear. The addition of ten words to that clause would have made its meaning clear beyond question, and every word inserted would have been worth a million dollars to the country.

As I have just made reference to the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I think I ought to read to this House the very words he used in a celebrated statement. We have all heard discussed in the press and on the hustings the $13,000,000 prophecy of Mr. Fielding. He told us that all that railway from Moncton to the Pacific was going to cost Canada would be $13,833,356, and we could pay that out of one year's surplus. Let me read his words. They will be found in the fourth volume of 'Hansard' of 1902, page 3631, 26th May:—

> A summary, briefly, of the figures show the following:—
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Total present sum required to cover 7 years' interest (all other interest being paid by the company) on cost of eastern division.. .. .. .. | $10,655,562 |
> | Total present sum required to provide government portion of 7 years' interest (all other interest being paid by the company) on cost of mountain section, western division.. .. .. | 3,177,794 |
> | | $13,833,356 |
>
> 'That is to say, if out of our large surplus this year, we should set aside $13,833,356, it would provide for the full payment on the seven years' interest which is all the obligation that the government are to bear as respects the whole line from Moncton to the Pacific.'

You will observe that he absolutely ignored the obligation to make good the loss on the sale of bonds, which we then pointed out to him. He was satisfied the market was going to improve and we were not going to lose on the sale of these bonds, and we now have to pay $10,000,000 of a loss; he did not take that possibility into his calculation at all. He just figured out the interest, and told us that $13,833,356 would be the cost to the government of the whole line from Moncton. How many other items did he ignore?

I started out by saying that I would read the original proposal of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the late government. That will be found in volume 2 of 'Hansard', 1904. It is a very important document. It is a document which the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) received before this question came before parliament at all. It is a document that was never produced although time and again the opposition made formal motions in the House for the production of every paper relating to this undertaking. My right hon. friend the then leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and several other hon. gentlemen moved again and again for the papers. They called the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact that we wanted every paper relating to the subject, and he assured us that the government had brought down every one. He was most emphatic. He made that statement so unequivocally that the Minister of Public

Works (Mr. Monk), then in opposition withdrew his motion. The right hon. gentleman knew that my hon. friend withdrew his motion on the faith of that assurance. Well, that paper I now propose to read. I should add that when the right hon. gentleman was charged with unfairness, he said that it was a confidential paper, and he did not undertake to produce confidential papers. He called it at other times a confidential letter to himself. Well, here is the document:—

Confidential.

Montreal, Que., Nov. 3, 1902.

To the Right Honourable
Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., P.C.,
Premier of the Dominion of Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Your petitioners desire to memorialize your government in regard to the construction of a first-class line of railway from the northern terminus of the Grand Trunk railway, at, or near, North Bay, Ont., through to the Pacific coast, for the reasons and upon the conditions set forth:

1. That it is considered very desirable and in the public interest that there should be, without any unnecessary delay, a second transcontinental railway reaching from the Atlantic ocean to the Pacific ocean, in order that additional facilities may be provided for the large growing business of the Northwest, which might otherwise find its outlet through American channels.

2. That your petitioners propose, as soon as authorized by your government, to undertake the construction of such a line from North Bay, Ont. (or some other point north thereof, to be defined) to the Pacific coast, the terminus to be at or near Port Simpson, with all necessary branches along the route, to be designated.

3. That your petitioners, therefore, ask that their application for authority to construct such a line of railway, to be called the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, shall be granted.

That was, of course. a personal application to the right hon. gentleman, for a charter to construct this line.

4. That your petitioners will be prepared, immediately an agreement is entered into by the government, and the concessions hereinafter mentioned are sanctioned by an order in council, to place a corps of engineers in the field, both at the eastern and western ends and at other points on the projected line.

5. That the routes to be selected shall be submitted to and approved by the government, after proper surveys have been made.

6. That as soon as plans and routes are approved, work shall be commenced and the road shall be completed and in operation within a period of five years from the time the Act is in force.

If the government had passed this Act in 1903 these men were willing to undertake that by 1908 the line would be running throughout.

7. That all the work shall be subject to the inspection and approval of the chief engineer of the government.

8. That in order to provide for the connections with the Atlantic seaboard all the year round and through an all-British territory route, your petitioners will be prepared to enter into an arrangement with the government for an interchange of traffic, or other satisfactory agreement, with the Intercolonial railway at Montreal, or to consider such other proposal as the government may submit.

Will the right hon. gentleman say that that was not a material thing to be laid before parliament when we were discussing this measure? We were contending that under his arrangement it would be possible for the Grand Trunk Pacific railway to divert the traffic to Portland instead of going on to Halifax or St. John.

9. That your petitioners would have the advantage of all the eastern connections, in Ontario and Quebec, of the Grand Trunk railway, and by this means on the completion of the Transcontinental line there would be established and opened up a complete system from ocean to ocean.

10. That the conditions referred to in clause 4, upon which your petitioners would undertake the carrying out of the proposed work, may be set forth as follows:—

(a) That the Dominion government will grant a cash subsidy to your petitioners of $6,400 per mile of railway, and in addition 5,000 acres of land per mile.

(b) That the payment for the carriage of the mails shall be calculated on the same basis as provided for under the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

(c) That rails and materials of every kind used in the construction of the railway—if dutiable—shall be admitted free, if such material cannot be obtained in Canada upon equally favourable terms.

(d) That the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenaces required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion or by any province hereafter to be established or by any municipal corporation therein; and the lands of the company in the Northwest Territories (until they are either sold or occupied) shall also be free from such taxation, for 20 years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

Your petitioners ask that your government will give the prayer of this petition their early and most earnest consideration.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

On behalf of the petitioners,

GEO. A. COX.
WM. WAINWRIGHT.
CHAS. M. HAYS,

At page 3705 'Hansard' 1904, the right hon. gentleman, in referring to this paper which I have just read, a most formal petition to him as Prime Minister to be laid before the government, said:

This confidential letter was in my own possession.

I have thus gone over the history of this transaction. I do not wish to discuss the question of the law; that has been settled by the highest court of the empire. If there was a doubt such as the hon. gentleman mentioned, when he was taking the advice of counsel as to what that meant, the simple way was to put it clearly in the agreement and settle the thing altogether. Why did he need to take advice afterwards and then injure, as he must have injured, the credit of this country by trying to get out of the legal obligation he had entered into? It was not creditable to the government of that day or to any government. The matter was clear, they were to make good the proceeds up to 75 per cent. Would it require a lawyer to say what that meant? It is more a question of business. The whole thing was brought to the attention of the minister in 1904, and all he had to do, as I said, was to have ten words added to the agreement and there would have been no trouble. It would not have made any difference because the right hon. gentleman intended to go on with it anyway. Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance, was also determined to do it. The right hon. gentleman thought it was going to cost a little more. Mr. Fielding thought that my plan was the better one, but he had hopes that the price of bonds would improve in the market.

The right hon. gentleman made a point of this opening up new country to the north, and he said that some people thought it was too early, that it was premature. That is where the point arose of some people thinking the project was premature; they thought it was premature to go through the wilds of the north, but not that the construction of such a railway as the Grand Trunk proposed was premature, everybody agreed on that. What ought to have been done in or since 1904 was for the province of Quebec to do what Ontario is doing, build a railway up in to the territory to the north. They are doing that, and they will in that way open up and develop that northerly country. Quebec should have done the same thing in the country up to the north of the old settled portion of that province. The Dominion might have helped them if necessary, and after they had opened up and developed the country there so that we would have known positively what there was in that country, it would have been time to build the line east and west. Those people who said the project was premature in this respect were right, and I think the more we have seen of it the more we are convinced of that fact. But the right hon. gentleman preferred being poetic. He spoke of the roses that bloomed away up in the north, and he had other quotations. He prayed Heaven it was not too late, he must go ahead blindly without surveys or anything else, and, great as the loss has been as we now see on that western division, I very much fear that it is a trifle and will be a trifle compared with the exposures we may expect on the eastern division.

All that we are talking of to-day has nothing to do with the eastern division—the government is building that; and we have yet to learn what disclosures are in the right hon. gentleman's possession as to it.

I hope there are no more 'confidential letters,' no more private negotiations. I do not know whether there were any private negotiations about these bonds or in any other respect. But the right hon. gentleman certainly did an extraordinary thing. The Grand Trunk Railway company were allowed to sell these bonds in England. It mattered not to them whether the discount was 10 per cent or 20 per cent, because the government had to make good the loss, and he apparently put it in their power to sell as they pleased on the market. Of course, I do not mean to charge him or the company with dishonesty or any desire for dishonesty; but it was not businesslike of the right hon. gentleman to put that in their hands. It is true, there was a provision that the government should be consulted about the selling of these bonds. Have we ever heard anything as to these consultations and negotiations? If there were such, why have we not heard of them? The right hon. gentleman, so far as we know put the whole thing in the hands of a company that did not stand to lose one dollar whether the discount was 10 per cent or 20 per cent. I say it was a monstrous thing for any business government or any body of business men to put the country in that position.

Mr. OLIVER (Edmonton). I am sure the House is indebted to my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) for the information he has given in regard to the history of the Grand Trunk Pacific project. I do not know, however, that we can altogether appreciate what he is pleased to consider as the important features of that history. He has given us his recollections as to what took place, and his imaginings as to what may have taken place. May I trespass on the time of the House to say something about the same project from my point of view? First, let me say, there is no project so great that fault cannot be found with it in detail, and no project so good but some person can find something bad to say about it. So my hon. friend has given us the benefit of his knowledge as to transactions within the Cabinet, private and confiden-

tial communications, and a large number of other matters which may be of importance to him and to those who are of his type of mind; but to my understanding these matters are not of importance as compared with the great question of the establishment of a Transcontinental railway in this Dominion and the results that necessarily follow, and have followed, and are following, the construction of that railway. My hon. friend has told us that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company made a proposition to the government for the construction of the railway from Port Simpson to North Bay. And he has told the House that, in his estimation, the country would have been better served if that project had been accepted. For my part, I would take issue with him and say that the country, in my opinion, would not have been as well served as by the present project; and will give my hon. friend some reasons for my belief. If the building of this road has any purpose at all, that purpose is the development of the prairie provinces, it is to enable the further development of these provinces as wheat-growing areas and to provide means whereby the wheat grown in these provinces can reach the markets of the world by the most favourable route. I contend that the road from the prairies—say, from Winnipeg taking that as a starting point—to Montreal, by way of North Bay, is not, and cannot in the nature of things, be as favourable a proposition for the development of the western country as a road of less length direct to the city of Quebec. A road which cuts out two hundred miles of haul between the wheat fields and the market is the better of the two propositions. I think that will not be denied.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Not necessarily the best.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) denies it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. And will prove it.

Mr. OLIVER. That will be his privilege. In order that we may have no misunderstanding, let me re-state the proposition. By the Transcontinental railway between Winnipeg and Quebec, the prairie producer reaches the Liverpool market by 200 miles less haul than by the route by way of North Bay and Montreal. That is, it is a somewhat shorter distance by rail from Winnipeg to Quebec than by the present rail route from Winnipeg to Montreal by way of North Bay. And Quebec is approximately 200 miles nearer Liverpool than is Montreal. My point is, then, that the prairie producer reaches the Liverpool market by this route with nearly 200 miles less haul than by the route via North Bay and Montreal. And I say that is unquestionably the better proposition for the development of the prairie country. Now, as to the prairie country itself and the effect upon it of the construction of this railway. I will say nothing, or little, of the actual mileage of railway constructed. There is now railway communication from the head of the lakes to the summit of the Rocky mountains. There are branches from the main line throughout different parts of the prairie country. There is, everybody must admit, a necessity for greater railway communication in the prairies. Settlement could not have increased without that communication, and the results of settlement, that is production, the creation of wealth which has added so tremendously to the upbuilding of Canada, could not have taken place had not it been for the construction of that railway mileage. But the most important feature of the railway project is not in the mileage that has been constructed under the arrangement.

This Grand Trunk Pacific proposition was the effort of the government of Canada of that day to break the condition of railway monopoly which had up to that time prevailed throughout the whole of the prairie area from the Red River to the Rocky Mountains. It was that condition of railway monopoly which was the great deterrent to the progress and prosperity of the prairie country and there was no other way of securing the advancement of that country except by breaking that railway monopoly. The mere addition of the number of miles of railway that the Grand Trunk Pacific has constructed would have been a benefit, but it would not have been all the benefit that the construction of that mileage by an independent railway system would be, so that it would be essentially a competing system and I say the result could not have been achieved in any other way. The railway system that would compete with the railway system already occupying that territory would certainly have to be a substantial system. It would have to have strength behind it and the fact that the Grand Trunk and the government of Canada were behind it would be, in the minds of everybody, evidence that the Grand Trunk Pacific was able to compete with the Canadian Pacific and the result has been the progress and prosperity of that western country. In order to get right down to the finest point, let me explain to my hon. friends here just how this question of railway competition affected the development of that country. As long as there was only one railway system operating it was thoroughly understood that the man who desired to invest in that country was absolutely at the mercy of that railway system and, whether he invested in land, or in any

industrial or commercial enterprise, he knew that, being absolutely at the mercy of that system, he was practically working for the railway rather than for himself, or, as it was usually phrased in that country, he was working on shares with the railway. Under such a condition capital could not be expected to invest in that country and capital did not invest. But, when the Grand Trunk Pacific project was launched, when it was known that the Grand Trunk was in the enterprise and that the government was behind the enterprise, when it was seen that the work was going on and was certain to continue, then, and not till then, Mr. Speaker, did the investing public have confidence in the west and from that date begins the era of prosperity that has spread over the west because of that project and that legislation.

As a result of the principle of competition introduced into that country there is not only the feeling of which I have spoken, a feeling of confidence resulting from the fact that every man knows to-day that he is not at the mercy of a single railway company, but the railway company that previously occupied that territory, that acted as though it owned it and believed that it did own it and everything in it, gives to-day a service throughout its whole system in the prairie country such as it never thought of giving until the principle of competition was introduced. To-day, as you travel over the prairie country, now that we have three competing systems, I will guarantee that you will get railway accommodation equal, or superior, to what you will get right here in this province of Ontario, because of the competition that was introduced into that country by the policy of the government in regard to this project of the Grand Trunk Pacific and in regard to the aid given to the Canadian Northern as well. It is true that this project has cost money, it is true that it has cost more money than it was expected to cost, and I am one to say that in my humble judgment it is immeasurably better for the country that the railway costs what it does than if it had cost only half as much. Let me explain why. The Grand Trunk Pacific line could have been laid from Winnipeg to the summit of the Rocky mountains for half the money that has been spent upon it. There is no doubt about that, but I say that it is to the interest of the producers of the country, it is in the interest of the principle of competition and it is to the credit of the government whose policy and project it was, that we have across those prairies a perfect line of railway that can haul freight, and give a service such as could not be given on a cheaply constructed line of railway, a line of railway that is not excelled in capacity by any line in the world. By reason of the character of that construction, by reason of the money that has been spent, by reason of the fact that to-day we are compelled to vote $10,000,000 in addition to aid already given towards the construction of the road, we have a standard of railway construction, and a standard of service in that country such as I have already said we have not got in this older, eastern part of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the road is better because the country is paying the $10,000,000, and not the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. OLIVER. I mean to say that the road cost that money or it could not have been as good a road. I mean to say that the money that this parliament is asked to vote has gone into the construction of the road, and that without that money the road could not have been as good as it is. Do I make my point clear? It is for the good of the country, it is for the benefit of the western country particularly that that amount of money has gone into the road and the parliament of Canada is not doing any injury to the country in paying that amount of money.

Mr. NORTHRUP. We did not think that they received the money. That is the reason for the Bill which we have now before us.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will have his opportunity. I suppose I may say that the money has gone into the road, and this money has to be voted by parliament to recoup the company which put the money into the road. But, the road is there, it cost the money, and there is no question about that. Again, in regard to this eastern section of the road; I have heard it said time and time again that the government had broken faith with the country, because they had said that the total cost to the treasury of this whole proposition would be only $13,000,000.

It is pointed out that whereas it was expected that the eastern section could be built for $25,000 per mile, it has cost $50,000 or $60,000. Again I say it is immeasurably better for the west and for the east too, that the road does cost $60,000 per mile than if it cost $25,000 per mile. It would have been possible to build a road for $25,000 per mile from Winnipeg to Quebec, but such a road would not have been of serious value to Canada as a means of delivering the grain of the west to the ocean ports. The kind of railway that was the standard of construction in Canada, at

the date this project was brought forward, would not have fulfilled the requirements of the country as will the road that is being constructed. To-day, with grain piled on the prairies, with millions of bushels of grain that will in all human probability, be destroyed because it cannot be carried forward, is it not of the last importance that the link of communication between the prairies and the seaboard shall be of such character that it shall carry the last pound and the last bushel it can possibly carry. Is not that economy, and is it not in the best interests of the country? I have had the privilege of travelling over some parts of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and while I am not an engineer, it was borne upon my mind very strongly how the cost of construction was multiplied by keeping the grades and curves down to a minimum. It is absolutely true that the road has cost from one-third to one-half more because it has been kept down to the minimum grade, but, just in proportion it is twice or three times as valuable to this country because that has been done.

I heard my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) say that no person in this House at the time the railway project was under consideration opposed it. Perhaps the gentlemen then opposite did not; I must say that I thought they did. My impression was that in the session of 1903, they said they would keep parliament here until the snow flew, and they did, rather than let the agreement pass. And, because of that delay in the passing of the agreement, and the depreciation in the money market that took place during that time, it became necessary to pass a supplemental agreement out of which arises the question of this ten million dollars. It is a matter of record that had my hon. friend and his friends agreed to that bargain when it was brought down, it would have been signed then and there by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and there would never have been the question raised that has been raised on the supplemental agreement that had to be brought forward during the second session. If there is blame in regard to this matter, my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) and his friends will have to carry the blame, on the historic facts of the case. In regard to this sum of money that must be paid, I have no doubt that the idea will be sent abroad that the people of Canada have been stuck to the tune of ten million dollars, because of some fault, or flaw, or mistake, on the part of the late government. That is not a fact. Parliament agreed absolutely in the session of 1904, to the amended arrangement whereby the Grand Trunk Pacific Company was to get seventy-five per cent. in proceeds of the cost of construction, up to $13,000 per mile, and the only question was, whether it should be in an additional issue of bonds or in cash. It seems to me, with all due respect to the opinion of my hon. friend (Mr. Barker), given at that time, that it was his business to differ from the government. The government took one position and he was bound to take the other. It did not make any difference what the government did, he was bound to oppose it, and to-day he comes along and claims credit for having done so. If the case had not been carried from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council, he would have been deprived of that credit, because the Supreme Court said he was wrong.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The higher court said he was right.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, on the off chance of having made a successful guess, my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) is entitled to consideration.

Mr. NORTHRUP. And the government made a wrong guess.

Mr. OLIVER. We will admit the government guessed wrong, but the point that I want to make is, that the money has gone into the construction of the railway, that the railway is worth the money, and that the country is not paying one cent more money than the parliament of Canada agreed to pay. We may be paying it in a different way, but we are paying this money for something we are getting. We are getting a good bargain, and the country, and particularly the western country, is getting ten times the value of the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific Prairie section. And, at this particular time, let me again just mention that if ever a government was justified in declaring on the introduction of that railway project, that there was no time to lose; if ever the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was warranted in saying: 'pray God it may not be too late,' it was in the case of the proposed construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, because to-day we have the knowledge that unfortunately it is too late, and dreadfully too late. I say that if the road from Winnipeg to Quebec were completed, as it might have been completed, were it not for the obstruction of my hon. friends in the session of 1903, the country would have been better off, judging by the conditions to-day, in the result of one year's transportation of crops than the whole sum mentioned in the present Bill amounts to. If to-day that road were completed from Winnipeg to Quebec, with the grades and curves and under the conditions under which it is built, that loss of wheat which is doing the country such stupendous damage would have been alleviated to a very large degree if it would not have been wiped out altogether, and our friends opposite would not be in the dilemma in which they are to-day of either going back on their prin-

ciples or letting the grain spoil in the fields.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister has raised the curtain on another act of that comedy, or to speak with perfect truth, that tragedy of errors, whose successive acts ever since the opening in 1902 have followed with wearisome regularity and painful monotony. It certainly is not a moral play, its best friends, if it has any outside the actors, and scene shifters, and box-office, would not say that the only interest in the play, outside the dazzling extravagance of the stageing, is in the fate of the actors, and the mystery that hangs round the future of the star actor, and the unhappy victims that have to finance the enterprise. Luckily, I believe, we must be coming to about the last act, for one cannot but notice that the actors other than the star have already vanished from the stage on which they have lagged superfluous far too long. The star actor is apparently pacing from one side to the other, calling the judgment of Heaven, or in other words, of the Privy Council, on the devoted heads of the Canadian people, whilst his faithful henchmen are urging him to seek a harbour of refuge in an alien port, which they are at the present time deliberately preparing for him.

Now, as I said, the curtain has been raised on what is apparently nearly the last act. Let us consider the position in which we are to-day. In my humble judgment there seems to be a complete misapprehension as to the judgment lately given by the Privy Council. I agree with every word that was said by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) this afternoon as to the duty of this House, the necessity with regard to the honour of the Canadian people, that we should bow to the judgment of the Privy Council. But one is so apt to be misunderstood, or even misrepresented, that I take the opportunity of saying that nobody, not even the magnates at the head of the Grand Trunk Pacific, bow more readily or humbly to that judgment than I do. But I do contend that there is an entire misapprehension as to the real meaning of that judgment, and so, like the hon. member for Hamilton, I shall certainly vote for this Bill because we think the government of this country should be placed in funds so that if it ever comes that, as honest and honourable men, representing an honourable country, we can fairly and properly be called on to pay $10,000,000, we should be in a position to do so. But I sincerely trust—and I regret the right hon. gentleman who leads the House is not in his place to hear my appeal—I sincerely trust it will be many a long day before the people of Canada will be victimized by paying the $10,000,000, which some people most wrongly have spoken of as a judgment against this country.

Now let us understand exactly the legal position in which we stand, bowing as I say, humbly and respectfully to the judgment of the Privy Council. It must be admitted that, by the judgment of the Privy Council, accepting their construction of that clause, the meaning is that Canada is to implement—if I must repeat that unhappy word which has cost us so much already—we must implement the guarantee of the bonds by paying in cash the amount which these bonds fall short. But supposing it were a covenant between the government and individuals. Supposing, instead of the government on the one hand and the Grand Trunk Pacific on the other, it was a case of a contract like that, and in order to make it perfectly plain, supposing it were a mortgage, or a covenant, between A and B, and B made default, I am willing to assume that Canada as represented by B made default, and that the mortgagee has a perfect right to call upon his mortgagor for payment, does it necessarily follow that the mortgagor must allow the judgment to go by default? Not at all. There may be a hundred defences he may have to his covenant, admitting that the covenant is there, and that, as a matter of strict legal interpretation, he is liable to the amount called for by the company. Let me illustrate. Supposing A has covenanted with B for $10,000 on a mortgage; B could say it is perfectly true, it is my covenant, and under that covenant I owe you $10,000, but you and I had a deal together in north west lands, and the result was that you have in your hands to-day $15,000 of my money, the result of our speculations in northwest lands. If B could prove that in his defence, does anybody pretend that a court would give judgment against him for $10,000? Far from it. The court would take the account between the two parties, and assuming that A owed the $10,000, if B owed him $15,000, then, by subtracting the 10 from the 15, the amount of the judgment for B against A would be $5,000. That is the view I take of the position at the present time. I think we are amply entitled to say to the Grand Trunk Pacific: We have had dealings with you, and we claim that whatever the ultimate result of examining the accounts may be, before we pay you this $10,000,000 or $5,000,000, we will have an accounting between us, and if we owe you money we will pay it. But if on examining the accounts it is found that we don't owe you the money, and you owe us more money than we owe you, pardon us if we decline to pay you

the $10,000,000. Now let me illustrate this by a further case. Let it be understood that I am not venturing to say that, when the accounts are taken, they will turn out one way or the other; but I do say that from one end of this country to the other there is hardly a man but honestly believes that all the dealings on the part of the government with the Grand Trunk Pacific have been such that it would not be idle or useless for the government to set up a counter claim against them. Supposing the government were to say to the Grand Trunk Pacific: It is true, under this covenant, you were entitled to $10,000,000, because we agreed to guarantee the bonds up to 75 per cent of the cost, and then to implement the balance. The bonds sold on the average at 85, some for 90 and some for 80, but on the average 85; supposing that the Grand Trunk Pacific deliberately sold those bonds at a lower figure than they could obtain in the market, the government is entitled to have the accounts investigated to see whether those bonds realized the total amount they should have realized. In order to illustrate the point again, suppose it turned out that a higher figure could have been obtained, but through the negligence or something worse of the Grand Trunk Pacific, through the dishonesty of some body, those bonds were sold for a lower figure than they should have brought in the market, that surely is a fair matter to be taken into consideration in estimating the counter claims the people have against the Grand Trunk Pacific. Again, when we guarantee the bonds for 75 per cent of the cost of the road, what is the meaning of the cost of the road? I do not know what the cost of that road is, and I do not think any man in this House or for that matter in the country, knows what the legitimate cost of that road is. But to illustrate the point again, assuming that we guaranteed bonds for $100,000,000, and they were sold at an average of 85, $85,000,000 would be the amount realized on the bonds, on the nominal sum of $100,000,000. In that case, on the face of it, this country would be liable for the shortage of $15,000,000, because that is the amount that is required to complete this road. But supposing that the Grand Trunk Pacific had formed subsidiary companies, supposing that the very men at the head of the Grand Trunk Pacific had formed a subsidiary company, and had given the contract to themselves; supposing these contracts were so outrageously exorbitant that they sublet those contracts to others and, without turning over their hands, raked in millions of money on those contracts, so that instead of the road costing $100,000,000, as was our supposition, it cost only $75,000,000 or $80,000,000, it is perfectly clear that instead of this country being liable to the Grand Trunk Pacific for the difference between what the bonds realized and the alleged cost of the road, the Grand Trunk Pacific would be liable to this country and would have to make good the guarantee on the bonds over what the road actually and honestly cost.

Then there is a question about interest. I shall not speak very positively about that because so many statutes have been passed that it is very possible, and I think not unlikely, from my perusal of these statutes, that the Grand Trunk Pacific may have hoodwinked the government and succeeded in covering up the weakness that otherwise would have existed in the original contract as far as they were concerned. Under the original contract the interest was to be capitalized at the end of the year, and would be a fair amount to be added to the cost of construction under the statute. But the road was not constructed within the five years specified, it has gone on year after year and, instead of being completed in 1908, it will not likely be completed until 1914 or 1915. Heaven knows when it will be completed. But all this time that interest has been accumulated and has been bonded, and the government is asked to endorse bonds for the amount of that interest as a part of the cost of construction. Unless that point is covered by some of these statutes, and I hope that the government will look into these statutes and see if it is, I would say that the government are entitled to set up as a set-off or counter claim against the $10,000,000 the claim that the Grand Trunk Pacific agreed to finish construction in 1908, that the government agreed to pay as part of the cost of construction the interest on the advances capitalized each year, and that if the Grand Trunk Pacific have taken an extra five or six years to complete the construction and therefore the bonds are so much more than they would have been had the agreement been lived up to, then the government have a counter claim against the Grand Trunk Pacific for the amount of bonds on interest account that have been necessitated by the negligence or failure of the Grand Trunk Pacific to carry out its contract. There are other offsets or counter claims that might be raised. I am not prepared to go into all of them to-night. I am giving this as a sample case, which I hope the government will consider and find out if under the circumstances it is not only possible but altogether probable that when the accounts are honestly and fairly taken between the Grand Trunk Pacific and this government, it will be found that instead of the government owing the company $10,000,000, as appears on the face of the matter, the company owe the government a good many millions.

As an illustration of the way these matters have been carried on—and I do not think this would be a defence to this contract, but I think it would be a splendid justification for declining a further loan—I will take the loan of $10,000,000 made a short time ago to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. We know that that went to pay for the rolling stock, for the purchase of which it was said the Grand Trunk Railway Company had advanced money to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, millions of dollars advanced by the Grand Trunk to the Grand Trunk Pacific to purchase rolling stock, when the Grand Trunk Pacific had not a foot of rail to run it on, or a locomotive to draw it, and every man in Ontario knows that in travelling through that province at every siding on the Grand Trunk railway one sees dozens of cars with Grand Trunk Pacific on them, used for the purposes of the Grand Trunk railway. If this government loaned money to the Grand Trunk Pacific for the legitimate purposes of that road and if the Grand Trunk Pacific, managed by the same men who manage the Grand Trunk railway, chose to take that money and buy rolling stock which was absolutely useless to them, and let the Grand Trunk Railway Company run that rolling stock (which certainly is not like wine and would not improve with age), then if an application were made for a further loan, and I believe that this Bill is to be followed by such an application, we would be amply justified in looking into that whole matter and saying we want an accounting as to this before we again consider a loan.

Then take the case of townsites in the west. Is it not a matter of notoriety that the Grand Trunk Pacific, after obtaining their townsites practically for nothing, formed companies which have disposed of these townsites at enormous profits? I am not saying that there was anything illegal or criminal about that but I do say that if the Grand Trunk Pacific comes back to this House and asks for a loan in order to enable it to carry out a great national undertaking, we are surely justified in saying: What did you do with the townsites? Have you given all these to your friends? If you have not, you will not require this loan, and if you have given them to your friends you had better get the loan from your friends and not from us. I was surprised when I came to look into this matter, to gather together the various statutes that have been passed by this House in connection with this unhappy enterprise of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The right hon. the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) this afternoon spoke of this as a project which everybody in Canada approved of. I want to now and here express my dissent from that statement, and to say that in 1903 and in 1904 and from that day to this, I have entirely disapproved of that proposition and speaking with all sincerity I do not believe that a similar proposition has been presented to any civilized land since the days of Ali Baba and the forty thieves. I have here the various statutes which this House has passed in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Hon. gentlemen opposite suggest that members on this side of the House perhaps neglected their duties by not being always present and carefully perusing every word of these statutes. It may be some excuse when I say that I have here fifteen statutes in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Townsites Company, passed since 1903. I would like any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, and I throw out the challenge now, to point to one single statute of these fifteen that was passed in the interests of the people of Canada. Application after application has come in with wearisome regularity—and I think that expression is justified when I say that I have here fifteen statutes passed in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific and its Townsites Company—and not one of these statutes has been passed in the interests of the people of Canada.

This afternoon we heard something about the inception and history of this railway, I do not intend to endeavour to cover the ground which has been covered by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) much more ably than I could cover it. But I wish to lay before you a few salient points. In the first place an application was made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to the government of this country, addressed to the Premier, for permission to build a road from North Bay to the Pacific coast and giving the terms on which they would build it. I think myself, to be perfectly frank, the terms were rather impudent, but I do not for a moment believe that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company ever thought the government would give them 100 per cent of what they asked and, therefore, they asked for a great deal more than they expected to receive so that on a fair, reasonable compromise they might perhaps get all that they dared to hope for. This House considered this matter in 1903. Perhaps the most vital point in the whole problem was what was to be done with the freight when it reached Montreal. This House, with the exception of the Prime Minister and possibly his colleagues, if he showed them this petition, were in absolute ignorance as to the contents of the petition of November, 1902, signed by Messrs. Cox, Hays and Wainwright, so that throughout the whole discussion, until the 26th of October,

only the Prime Minister and his colleagues were able to consider intelligently the position of the case. Those of us who were in the House at the time know that when we came to Ottawa we had the application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to build a road to North Bay and we know that certain negotiations took place and the result of these negotiations was that a railway was contracted to be built from Moncton to the Pacific coast which, I venture to say, not one single man in Canada wanted built. My hon. friends opposite say that I am speaking recklessly, but I am speaking with knowledge of what occurred in 1903, and I say that there was not a man in Canada from the Premier down who wanted the wretched system that was unfortunately for some reason adopted by the government of the day. The Grand Trunk railway did not want it, I do not suppose that anybody will say that Mr. Hays and his colleagues are men of such stupidity that they do not know what they want. And they put very clearly and particularly what they did want. Now the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific wanted a road from North Bay to the Pacific coast. But they could not get it; they were held up by the government. As the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), told us—and I have 'Hansard' here to prove it if necessary—the government imposed upon the Grand Trunk the building of this subsequent line. How did they do it? Those hon. members who were here in 1903, will recollect that when we met in the committee to consider the application of the Grand Trunk railway, we were held up in a mysterious way. Suddenly the route was changed, so that it was to run to Quebec and not to North Bay. The Grand Trunk railway did not want to run to Quebec; if they had wanted it, they would have put in their application to that effect. But as the hon. minister of that day put it, the Grand Trunk railway had imposed upon them the building of a road from Quebec to the Pacific coast. And the Prime Minister of that day must have wanted the road from the Pacific to Quebec, or he would not have insisted on that change in the order. But, in compliance with that insistence the change was made. Well, why was not the road built to Quebec? Is there a man here who does not know why it was not built to Quebec? When the right hon. gentleman came down with all the influence of the government to propose the building of the road from Quebec to the Pacific, his supporters from Eastern Quebec and the maritime provinces declined to support the Bill. They said if it was going as far as Quebec, it must go to the sea. And, after a wearisome discussion, the government was obliged to concede what was demanded, and agreed to run the road—from where? From Halifax? From St. John? No, the government had not the courage for that. The declaration was that the road was to run from sea to sea, and that was the stipulation. But the difficulty was that, running the line down to the sea, they had to choose a terminus on the sea. If the government road were run to Halifax, the government would lose the support of the New Brunswick members, and if it ran to St. John it would lose the support of the Nova Scotia members, who were very numerous on that side at that time. And, because they dared not go to Halifax and dared not go to St. John, they stultified themselves; they made their followers, after voting for a road from sea to sea, then humbly vote that a road running from Moncton to Port Simpson was a road from sea to sea. There is hardly a schoolboy who has not a better conception of the geography of the country than had the right hon. gentleman in forcing that through—a road from sea to sea, with one terminus at Moncton.

That was the first stage of this Bill. We were told this afternoon that if the Bill had not been held up by the opposition everything would have been lovely and the road would have been completed years ago. There was no proof of that. The fact is the Grand Trunk Pacific people had agreed to accept this, but they realized the influence they had over the government, that the government was committed to them, that the government had become partners with them in the line. I do not wish to take the time to prove the statements I make, but if anybody contradicts me, I have 'Hansard' here to prove that Mr. Hays, Lord Welby, one of the directors, and Sir Charles Rivers Wilson, the president, in their messages and addresses to the board of directors and in their letters to the Prime Minister of that time, said specifically and unequivocally that they were partners with the government of Canada in building this road. I think we cannot afford to forget the statements made by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific authorities in letters which were brought down by the government of the day, without repudiation or contradiction, that on that side of the water and when appealing to their shareholders, they declared: We are partners with the government of Canada, in this road we are building.

Now, if they were partners with the government in this work that fact may afford us some light on some of the proceedings in this House. When we come to the clause already before us altering the original arrangement, we can understand

the difficulties in which the government stood, being partners of the Grand Trunk Pacific. We heard something else this afternoon from the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and from the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) as to the position of the government and the legal advice they took with regard to this clause. But the legal advice they took was in 1908 and this clause was passed in 1904. Would it not have been the part of reason and wisdom in the government to take advice when they were passing the clause? I have 'Hansard' here which will show that my hon. friend from East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) told this House exactly what the effect of the clause would be. The Minister of Finance agreed with him, and in 'Hansard', 1904, and at pages 3634 and 2430—I will not take time to read them unless any hon. member doubts that I am quoting correctly—we have the Minister of Finance agreeing with my hon. friend from East Hamilton. When the implementing of the guarantee was spoken of, it was stated that it could be done in one of three ways, and the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister agreed. You could issue bonds for a high rate of interest so that they would produce par. Or, if you wished to issue them at a lower rate, you could issue more bonds guaranteed by the government to make up the difference, or you could pay cash. And they all agreed that the payment of cash was the most objectionable way. The Minister of Finance said in his remarks that it had been agreed in this discussion that the issue of additional bonds guaranteed by the government was the wisest course. We had the member for Annapolis of that time discussing the matter, and he, in the presence of the minister, stated clearly and squarely that of course the only way was to guarantee additional bonds. Thus, though there were three possible ways of doing it at that time, will anybody tell me why such peculiar phraseology was used as is used here, when half-a-dozen English words would have made it clear that what they intended to do was to issue additional bonds? While I do not intend to say a word against the judgment of the Privy Council, and while I know very well that it is contrary to the law of evidence that they could be guided by the statements made in this House, yet, when we come down to the question of equity as between the parties to the contract, we find that these Grand Trunk Pacific magnates sat still when the representatives of the people were told by their partners that this meant that we were to guarantee additional bonds. But a little later, when it was too late for the government by any legal device to escape the dilemma in which they were placed, then their partners come forward and say: 'It is true there were three ways in which the word "implement" could be applied, and that one was the issue of additional bonds at a high rate of interest;' but you cannot do that, because second mortgage bonds have been issued, and it would not be fair—and no doubt they were right in that—after issuing second mortgage bonds —to issue new bonds to go ahead of them. And you cannot issue more bonds for the same reason. So, when it came before the Privy Council, they did not pretend to say that in 1904 the meaning of these words was necessarily what it is, but two ways of applying the word 'implement' have been eliminated by the action of the government, and so they say there is direct liability and you must pay the cash. I suggested a short time ago that there might be a counter claim. If the government, on looking into the matter—and I don't pretend to say but that it is their duty to look into it—and if they find that the bonds were not sold for the highest price that could have been got, surely we should be entitled to claim a set-off against the Grand Trunk Pacific to the extent to which the bonds were sold at a rate below that which was obtainable. I desire to call attention to a significant fact which does not affect this case except as the principle of good faith comes in.

Here we find the government of this country with its credit guaranteeing bonds for the Grand Trunk Pacific and they are selling at 80. We find the Grand Trunk which never pays any dividend upon its ordinary stock also guaranteeing bonds for the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the bonds guaranteed by the government of Canada sell at 80, while the bonds guaranteed by the Grand Trunk sell at about par. Is that a subject of congratulation to the members of this House? Does it not rather cause one to wonder what business acumen there was behind this proposition when we see government guaranteed bonds going at 80 and Grand Trunk guaranteed bonds going at par? The former being at 3 and the latter at 4 per cent.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the hon. gentleman give us the dates at which these bonds were sold?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have the papers in my hand, and I will give it before I sit down. I see it is London, January 31.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am referring to the fact that the market quotations differed on different dates.

Mr. NORTHRUP. This is the market in London, on the 31st January, 1912.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Has my hon. friend the dates at which the bonds of the Grand Trunk and of the government were sold and also the rate of interest?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I thank the hon. gentleman for his inquiry. I think it shows how some hon. gentlemen view questions of this kind. I was careful to state expressly before the hon. gentleman rose, that one bond paid 3 per cent. and the other paid 4. The point is, and I stated it expressly, that the Grand Trunk Company had a great deal more shrewdness than the ministers of the Crown because the ministers of the Crown had not the shrewdness to insist that their bonds should be issued at 4 per cent. and if that had been done they would have not only gone at par, but they would have gone above par. If the Grand Trunk Pacific is going to pay interest on its bonds, why should the interest on the bonds not have been put at a figure that would bring par? These bonds were issued practically simultaneously. Formerly the government bonds represented the first mortgage and the Grand Trunk the second, but now the Grand Trunk is in many respects the first, and in no respect the second, owing to the very material changes made in the Act in 1904. When we find these Grand Trunk bonds going at par, the Grand Trunk are not to be called upon to put up any more for the guarantee of these bonds and if the road is a success, there is no pecuniary responsibility on the part of the Grand Trunk, but, the unfortunate country, if the road is the biggest success in the world, under this bargain made by the ministers of the Crown, has to pay $10,000,000 which the representatives of the people were told it was not the intention to pay. Here then is the result and I think we are justified in saying that there was every warrant for the statement by gentlemen named before, that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government were partners in this enterprise. But, there is another reason why one has to consider these matters. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) made a statement this afternoon to the effect that the more the road cost the better. I admire his acument. I do not differ in the slightest from his conclusion, looking at it from his standpoint. There is not the slightest doubt in the world that if the Grand Trunk Pacific could have been made to cost a thousand million dollars, it would have been all the better from a certain standpoint. It is quite evident that the hon. gentleman has been whiling away his time in the recess, by reading the records of the Ontario courts because those records embody the history of one O'Gorman. That man was the purchasing agent for the company known as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and he was convicted because, as purchasing agent of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, he went around to parties from whom he had purchased goods and after the contract had been made said: There is to be a rake-off of 15, 20 or 25 per cent to the government. That is the reason that the cost is as high as it is. But, he ran across an honest firm in Toronto who declined to pay the money, the facts came out and the gentleman was convicted. I have never yet heard, although I have inquired in different quarters, that this trifling conviction in any way impaired his usefulness as purchasing agent of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I suppose that is because the government of the day and the Grand Trunk Pacific were partners in this great enterprise.

In his speech the hon. member for Edmonton also told us with great unction that the proposed road would be 200 miles shorter than some other road, and my hon. friend laid the law and the gospel down distinctly and unhesitatingly that if the road was 200 miles shorter than any other road it would be more desirable to the country. Is it any wonder that we have such a wretched, accursed contract weighing down the people as that which we have with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and which the ministers of the Crown never intended in 1903 and 1904, but which the judgment of the Privy Council has shown to exist, when we have an ex-minister of the Crown who would dare to stand up in this House—I should not say 'dare' because the hon. gentleman spoke with absolute honesty—and make the statement that as long as the road is 200 miles shorter it must be a better road? It never seemed to enter his mind that curves, gradients and the cost of the traffic might make one road more expensive to operate than another, that one road might run through a thickly peopled country and the other through a wilderness, or that it would necessarily follow that people being at one end of the road and desiring to ship their grain to the other end could not ship it more cheaply by sending it through the wilderness than through the thickly peopled country. Did it ever enter his mind that if the curves and gradients on one road were almost such as to make the road utterly impassable, it would mean that that road was not in as good a position as the other, notwithstanding the fact that it might be 200 miles shorter? That never entered the mind of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues. I would be too just to the hon. member for Edmonton and to the right hon. leader of the opposition, I would be too just to their supporters who voted for these measures, to believe that they understood the law or the facts of the case when

it is laid down by an ex-minister of the Crown, that 200 miles difference in length was the only question, irrespective of cost. I would have believed that the great problem which confronted them was to get light curves, a low gradient and good materials as cheaply as possible. But it never entered the mind of the hon. member for Edmonton that cheapness was any factor. If you can shorten the line, he tells us, the more it costs the better. Does he mean that the more it costs the less they can carry freight at, and the less people there are in the country through which it passes, the fewer there will be to interfere with the traffic? Let us take the case presented by the hon. member for Edmonton, who says that wheat is rotting on the ground because we have not this outlet for it. Why have we not this outlet? Because the hon. gentlemen opposite refused to agree to the proposition of the Grand Trunk when they appeared before them in 1903 and asked for authority to construct a road to be completed in 1908 through to North Bay, where there was a line which would take the grain to Montreal, and where they guaranteed to hand it over to the Intercolonial railway, the government road. We would have had that road some years ago had these hon. gentlemen yielded to the suggestion and to the motions made by the opposition in the House in 1903 when this important question was before the House.

Now, Sir, it is a matter of the utmost importance that we should understand exactly with whom we are dealing. The Grand Trunk Pacific is, of course, a road under the control of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I presume there will be no particular doubt on that matter. Then, the Grand Trunk magnates controlling the Grand Trunk Pacific, I presume, will deal with the Grand Trunk in the way they have been accustomed to deal with the people of this country. I am not here to make any attack on any individuals, but I am here as a Canadian, sincerely and honestly believing—I may be wrong in my belief, we are all liable to error, but no member of this House ever spoke with more sincerity than I speak now—that one of the greatest dangers to the unity of the empire is the conduct of the directors of the Grand Trunk and of the Grand Trunk Pacific. One can go up and down this country from one end to the other and the denunciations one hears from the man in the street of the conduct of the magnates of these two roads, conduct which extends to the directors in the mother country, are such as to make you shudder at the dissatisfaction which it has excited.

Why; because, after all, you are never going to have true unity between Canada and the motherland, except on the ground of mutual respect. Now, if the magnates of the Grand Trunk—the greatest road we have in Canada under old country management—allow that sort of thing to be said and done by their managers in this country; if they allow the people of this country to be hoodwinked, as was the case in 1894, by their managers, sitting quietly by and allowing the representatives of the people to be told what the meaning of this clause was, and saying not a word to correct these false statements, so that there is now only one contingency left for this country, and that is to pay ten million dollars, you cannot be surprised if the ordinary Canadian begins to suspect that that is not the kind of fair business dealing they ought to expect from the people in the motherland. The result of that kind of thing is, not what those who like myself desire to see the unity of the empire preserved, can approve. It is only a year or two ago that the name of the general manager of the Grand Trunk and the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific was brought before this House in connection with a telegram sent to him by the then acting Premier of this country. We had a strike on the Grand Trunk and Sir Richard Cartwright, the acting Premier, sent the telegrams to practically every collector of customs in Ontario asking for a report on the state of the strike. He also sent a telegram to Mr. Hays, of the Grand Trunk, asking what could be done about the strike, and the answer came back from Mr. Hays, there was no strike, it was over, all the company wanted was protection for their property. And, at the same time, practically every collector of customs in the province of Ontario sent telegrams to Ottawa describing the fact that trade was paralyzed, that trains were at a standstill, that factories were closing for want of raw material, that merchants were losing their money through being unable to obtain goods to carry on their business. I am not going to say where the truth was, but it would not be a bad idea for the present government to investigate whether or not there was collusion between all the collectors of customs in this country to tell one story, or whether there was something wrong with Mr. Hays when he told his story. Then, at the termination of that strike an agreement was made by the Grand Trunk with two ministers of the Crown, that all the men, except certain ones who were specified, would be returned to their places within ninety days. These men were not returned to their places, and the only answer that the railway magnates designed to give was that the Grand Trunk had a right to employ such men as it saw fit to discharge the

duties of its service. That of course is perfectly true as an abstract proposition, but it is somewhat irrelevant, and, may I say it is contemptuously impudent as an answer to the promise that the Grand Trunk would return the men to their places within ninety days. I would not pretend to give in my own words the records of some of the acts of the Grand Trunk, and the Grand Trunk Pacific, but surely I cannot be astray if I read the judgment given by one of our courts in Ontario; the judgment of a judge whom every one will admit is perhaps the most popular judge with the people of Canada, a man whose unswerving integrity, whose great ability, and boundless courage, has made him a bulwark, as the people of this country think to defend them from the aggression of some railway corporations. I refer to a judgment given by hon. Mr. Mabee, in a case brought before him, in which the Grand Trunk Pacific—I will use his own words:

The Grand Trunk Pacific, in fixing its location plan which was approved by the Board, located on lot 882 station grounds. That was approved showing stations grounds.

Later on, it entered into negotiations with the then owner of lot 882 and some considerable correspondence has taken place between them, to all of which it is not necessary to refer.

The judgment then goes on to give the facts, it is not necessary to read them, but I quote the following from the judgment itself:

It is now suggested that all they were dealing about was sufficient land to put a siding in. It is idle to say, in the light of this correspondence, that there was no other object in view except the getting of enough ground for station purposes; whoever would think of locating a townsite at a siding without any station facilities?

Apparently the railway company was unable to get from the owner of the property a conveyance, as they were requesting, of a half interest in the land for a townsite.

There is this patriotic road holding up this man. Then the judgment goes on to say:

It seems to me that this man with whom this contract was made and whose lands the railway company obtained for the location of a station on lot 882 is in no way proceeding with haste when he discovers that the company in effect repudiate their agreement and are advertising the lands for sale in a townsite in competition with what I presume he is trying to exploit on lot 882, and on which they promise the public that a station will be built in the spring of 1912, within three or four months.

Now, it is perfectly apparent that there is only one thing to be done in this case. This company has got to carry out its agreement. It is a public scandal that a railway corporation should go about the country and obtain conveyances of this kind under false pretences.

If a private individual had done what this company through its officials have done, he would probably be landed in the penitentiary. At any rate he ought to be in the penitentiary. The land was obtained through the grossest deceit on the part of the representatives of this company and it is a breach of faith of the worst character that they should attempt to repudiate their contract. It is true that the time is not yet ripe for the construction of a station. The road is not built. It is not yet ready to open for traffic, but an order may go requiring the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to construct and have ready for use by the public a station, the plans to be filed and approved by the Board's engineer, on lot 882, where it was intended originally to construct it. That station must be ready for operation at least as soon as the road is open for traffic.

An order may also go refusing the application that was filed with the Board on the 11th of December for the location of station grounds and a station on lot 851, and restraining the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company from the location of a station at that point. It is out of line with what they originally intended to do, done with bad motives, and it is done in violation of their solemn contract with the predecessor of Kelly in title.

Now, Sir, in quoting that language, I am not giving my own opinion, but the judgment of a judge, one of the principal judges in Canada, the Chief of the Railway Commission. My whole appeal now is that the country should not pay over this ten millions without investigation. Let us investigate first and pay, if necessary, afterwards, and not pay first and investigate afterwards. I think the wisest course for us is to investigate first. I have called attention to the action of the Grand Trunk Pacific magnates. It may seem to be going out of the way to attack an individual, but this whole country is concerned in what this individual is doing. Reputation will tell, and if a man is found under certain circumstances suspiciously situated, his reputation will help him out, or it may ruin him entirely. Having said this much as to the way the country has been treated in the past, let me remind the House for a moment of two clauses in the contract. I presume I would not be wasting the time of the House if I were for a moment or two to refer to the fact that this was to be a Canadian road. It is so stated in the preamble of the first Bill, Chapter 91, 1903, and in the agreement made on the 29th of July, 1903, between His Majesty the King and Sir Rivers Wilson and other representatives of the Grand Trunk I find the following clause:

Whereas, having regard to the growth of population and the rapid development of the production and trade of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, and to the great area

of fertile and productive land in all the provinces and territories as yet without railway facilities, and to the rapidly expanding trade and commerce of the Dominion, it is in the interest of Canada that a line of railway, designed to secure the most direct and economical interchange of traffic between eastern Canada and the provinces and territories west of the Great Lakes, to open up and develop, the northern zone of the Dominion, to promote the internal and foreign trade of Canada and to develop commerce through Canadian ports, should be constructed and operated as a common railway highway across the Dominion from ocean to ocean and wholly within Canadian territory.

Clauses 42 and 43 of the contract also referred to the fact that it was to be a thoroughly Canadian road from ocean to ocean, with Canadian ports, and this is the ground upon which the government assisted the railway.

I think I need not occupy any more time to establish my chief proposition, that every dollar that this country has given to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway—and Heaven knows it has given mighty sums, and apparently will have to give mighty sums more—is based on an agreement that it was to be a thoroughly Canadian road, running from ocean to ocean wholly on Canadian soil, for the benefit of our inland commerce and our ocean ports.

I noticed in the month of August last that in the state of Massachusetts a railway charter was granted to some gentlemen, and I will read the names of the lucky men. I have here a copy of the charter, which is certified under the seal of the Commonwealth, so that for all practical purposes it is as good as the original. It reads thus:

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Be it known that whereas Charles M. Hays, Earl H. Fitzhugh, Ezra H. Baker——

And a number of other names unknown to me, which I will not read—

and the Grand Trunk Railway Company —have associated themselves with the intention of forming a corporation under the name of Southern New England Railroad Corporation for the purpose of locating, constructing, maintaining and operating a railroad.

And they get their charter to build a railway through certain places in the state of Massachusetts. Now, there is at the present time a Bill before the House of Representatives of the state of Massachusetts, a copy of which I hold in my hand, entitled an Act to enlarge and extend the corporate powers of the Southern New England Railway Corporation, and, without going into details, I may say that this Bill gives them the right to build a number of branch lines, among them one into Boston. It also authorizes the company to increase its capital stock to $10,000,000 and to issue bonds to twice the amount of the capital stock actually paid in. So that these gentlemen, who are so hard up that they are coming to us for a loan of $10,000,000 to enable them to complete this road, are applying for power to increase the capital stock of this Southern New England Railway Corporation, for which they have obtained a charter, and to bond it to twice the amount of the capital stock paid in. Now, what is this road for? I confess that it is a mystery to me why our Canadian papers have not apparently been aware of what has been so frequently and conspicuously published in the Boston papers. I have here a file of the Boston papers, representing every paper published in Boston, and those papers for weeks and months past, day after day, have been full of this new enterprise to make Boston the Atlantic terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I will not ask the House to take my word for this; I will read from some of these papers. But before doing so, let me say that the Senate of the state of Massachusetts has referred to a committee, which is to report not later than March 30, a number of questions which will enable the Senate to decide how far the Grand Trunk Pacific Company intends to make Boston its main port, and what advantage it might be to the Commonwealth to acquire the property of any or all of the railways entering the city of Boston, and issuing bonds, &c., for that purpose. Let us see what the Boston papers themselves are saying about these matters. The Boston 'Globe' of the 17th of January, 1912, says:

Plans of the Grand Trunk—Advantages offered to New England—Direct Rail Connection with Canadian Grain Country—Four Days from Boston to the Pacific.

Plans for bringing to the attention of the Massachusetts legislature the advantages to the state through the proposed extension of the lines of the Grand Trunk-Central Vermont system to Boston and Worcester are well under way.

E. H. Fitzhugh, president of the Central Vermont railroad and the recently chartered Southern New England railroad, and one of the chief assistants to Charles M. Hays, the American president of the Canadian Transcontinental railroad, came to Boston yesterday to meet the attorneys who will conduct the legislative hearings on the petition of the Southern New England railroad.

President Fitzhugh was in consultation yesterday afternoon and evening with lawyers, engineers and officers of the Central Vermont, who have been collecting the details concerning the proposed new line, which are to be submitted to the Committee on Railroads of the Legislature.

From the attitude of President Fitzhugh it is evident that President Hays is serious in his intention to build the line from Worcester, Vt., across New Hampshire and Massachusetts to Boston, to construct the branch from Boston to Blackstone and the cross-country road from Douglas to Worcester as quickly as possible.

President Hays and President Fitzhugh are anxious that the railroads to Boston, Providence and Worcester be completed and ready for occupation by the time the last spike is driven on the Grand Trunk Pacific, now under construction from Moncton, N.B., to Prince Rupert, B.C. Hundreds of miles east and west of Winnipeg are ready for operation, but it may be a couple of years before the long road across the continent is finished.

During this period of construction the Grand Trunk wishes to build the 130 miles or so that separate the Central Vermont at Windsor from a Boston terminal, in order that Boston may be one of the terminals of the railroad from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The purpose of the Southern New England railway, as will be argued before the committee of the legislature, is to give Boston and New England a direct rail connection with the great grain country of the Canadian west and northwest, to place the manufacturers of New England in touch with the market of the growing agricultural and purchasing sections of the Dominion.

The Grand Trunk railway through the Southern New England railway, is coming to Boston to bring business here and to create a traffic between factories here and the prosperous communities that will be developed along the new transcontinental road.

The idea of President Hays is to stimulate commerce by adding Boston and the New England manufacturing centres to a line that will stretch across the continent and will be the longest railroad in the world under one management.

The Southern New England from Boston will be as much a part of the transcontinental trunk line as is the section of track which is now being laid across the Rocky Mountains in British Columbia.

It is for the purpose of shortening the distance from the New England factory to the farmer of western Canada and putting the manufacturer in touch with the purchaser on the same line of railroad that the Grand Trunk has applied for the authority to build a railroad to Boston and Worcester.

At the same time the Grand Trunk is seeking the traffic from the large manufacturing cities of New England to the British Columbian towns that are springing up as fast as the rails of the Grand Trunk Pacific are laid. President Hays wishes to reach all the manufacturing centres of New England.

After speaking of the possibility of tapping the mill centres, the article goes on:

The building of the proposed Southern New England from Boston, upon the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, will mean the possibility of trains being operated from Boston to Prince Rupert, the Pacific terminus, in a running time of within four days.

The Grand Trunk Pacific is being built with an average grade as low as four-tenths of 1 per cent. The grade through the Canadian Rockies is as low as that across the plains, which will give to the Grand Trunk Pacific a train capacity of far greater tonnage than that of any other transcontinental road.

When the proposed railroads are completed a train running on the time now made by the Intercolonial Limited between Montreal and Toronto will cover the distance between Boston and Prince Rupert within four days. All of the construction is of the heaviest rails that are now rolled and there is not a wooden bridge on the road.

The Grand Trunk in extending its line to the Pacific has looked with particular favour upon the port of Boston and the mill cities of New England. President Hays thinks that a great deal of business for the new railroad across the continent may be developed in the territory to be tapped by the Southern New England railway. The Grand Trunk has to make traffic for its transcontinental road and New England is considered to be an inviting field.

There is an editorial in the same issue of the Boston 'Globe' headed 'Welcome, Grand Trunk.' I do not wish to occupy the time of the House by reading, as I might do, editorial after editorial on this matter. But I wish to refer to a long article in the Boston 'Sunday Herald' of January 28, 1912, in which there is a map showing the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway running directly from Boston to Montreal, then to Scotia Junction, then to Cochrane, and then to Prince Rupert. Here is the great Transcontinental line, which we have been subsidizing to such a tremendous extent, going to Boston, and the Boston papers publishing maps showing its route from Boston to Prince Rupert over which the trip will be made in only four days. The heading of this article is: 'Linking Boston with the Far Pacific.' In the article there are two or three striking passages. It points out that when the railway is completed it will be possible for passengers and freight to make an uninterrupted journey from Boston to Prince Rupert, and then says:

This means such men of affairs as Chairman Hugh Bancroft of the directors of the port of Boston, President Hays of the Grand Trunk, Augustus S. Cobb, the physiographic expert, and others point out, that Boston is going to share heavily in the enormous development of the Canadian Northwest, to be one of the vital links in the commerce between Europe and that district, even a link in the trade of the three continents. When this huge transoceanic, transcontinental line of travel gets really under way, the traveller from Liverpool bound, say to Yokohama, need buy only two tickets, one at Liverpool and another at Boston.

And to such simplicity it is played for freight to make a journey of this length, 12,000 miles, that the shipper at Liverpool need put only a through tag on his goods and away they go over the sea, then over land and over seas again to their destination—the nearest approach to an airline route that the wizards of transportation have yet conceived with certainty of realization. In these days of talk about the development of business in Boston generally and that of the port in particular, there is much material for thought in the approaching completion of this transcontinental railway from Boston to Prince Rupert.

Now, the Transportation Committee of the Boston Chamber of Commerce and the Worcester Board of Trade have both passed reports favouring the Grand Trunk extension to Boston on the ground that Canadian ports cannot furnish an outlet for the exports of the great northwest.

It seems that the Boston 'American,' one of the Hearst papers in Boston, was the first to start the scheme by sending out petitions signed by 100,000 people, which it transmitted to President Hays, asking him to do what is being done now. I have here a copy of the Boston 'American,' January 14, containing a large picture of President C. M. Hays. On June 26, President Hays, of the Grand Trunk Company wrote this letter to the editor of the Boston 'American':

Dear Sir,—Mr. Warman has called my attention to your letter of June 1, and the box of signatures to the petition inviting the Grand Trunk to come to Boston.

All of us here appreciate very much the good offices of the Boston 'American' in securing this long list of petitioners, and I write to assure you of my personal appreciation of your efforts.

Then there is an interview with Mr. Hays, and this is what he said:

The London representative of the 'American' acquainted President Hays on the last day of April with all that was being done in the 'American' campaign. The 'American' sent President Hays a cablegram reporting progress. In the morning the 'American' received this cablegram in reply:

To the Boston 'American,' Boston, Mass.

When the Boston 'American' petitions and the official resolutions referred to in your cablegram have been received by me to be placed before the Grand Trunk board of directors, I am certain the subject will be duly considered by that body.

To be placed before the Grand Trunk Board of Directors. The applicant for the charter is Charles M. Hays, with half-a-dozen other names, but the petition is to be laid before the Grand Trunk directors.

President Hays returned to Canada late in May, and just before the last Sunday in the month received a reporter for the 'American.' The 'American' wanted a message for its readers, the great boxes of petitions were almost ready for shipment to Canada. Not yet ready to take the public into his confidence, President Hays sent a brief message, which was interpreted to be an admonition to New England to keep on working and to 'hold the fort.'

This is what President Hays said in the 'American' last May, in Montreal, just before the arrival of the petition of the 'American' readers to 'come to Boston':

The officers of the Grand Trunk railway are certainly very grateful to the people of Boston and the neighbouring section of New England for the display of confidence in our company. We could not well be otherwise.

The part your newspaper has taken, in the matter of inviting us to Boston, is little short of amazing. I believe the very first person who met me in London, on my arrival from Plymouth, was a representative of the Hearst News service. He called upon me several times subsequently.

He told me—your representative in London—about the unanimous vote of the Massachusetts Senate, the Massachusetts House, and the Boston City Council; and assured him that I would place the resolution before our board of directors just as soon as the official records had come to me.

I have been away a month. To-day for the first time I saw the transcript of these votes. To-day also, I received the letter of his honour the Mayor, and saw the statement of His Excellency the Governor. You tell me I am soon to have the petition of 100,000 New Englanders.

Such a testimonial as this would make any railroad man happy. It makes me very happy. What shall I say to make New England happy?

I will say this. I will say that not only the original resolutions passed by your House of representatives, your Senate and your City Council, together with the letter of Mayor Fitzgerald and the statement of Governor Foss, but also the 100,000 petition of the 'American,' will go to London and be formally placed before our board of directors.

Moreover, I believe I can safely say, to Boston and New England, that these votes, these expressions, this request, will receive all the consideration—all the courteous consideration—to which they are entitled.

For myself, personally, I wish you would say to the people of New England that I fully and deeply appreciate the good-will back of this movement.

Without taking up the time of the House longer, I may say that for some time back, and at the present time, there is a wide spread movement in Boston, supported by the legislature, the senate, the Boston City Council, the mayor, the Chambers of Commerce, and Boards of Trade in neighbouring cities, all urging the Grand Trunk to come to Boston; their papers are full of articles all along the same line, that Boston is to be the terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific line, when it will be only four days to Liverpool. Now, in view of that fact, in view of the express contract which was made between the Grand Trunk Pacific and this government, in view of the fact that the millions and millions that we have given to that company, were given with the understanding, and for the purpose of getting a road wholly over Canadian soil to Canadian seaports, I think I am justified in calling on the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, and calling on the Finance Minister, to pay heed to these facts, and I say to them it is their duty, before they pay over one dollar of this money, to investigate and see whether there is a wilful and deliberate attempt to break the contract made by the Grand Trunk Pacific with this country.

If it be the case that all the people in Boston whose views are expressed here are in the right; if it be the case that the Grand Trunk Pacific is coquetting with Boston; if it be the case, as stated in one paper, that it would cost $10,000,000 for the Grand Trunk to construct its terminals in Boston; at this very time when this country is being asked for $10,000,000, it would be well for this government to see whether or not Canadian money is being poured into the coffers of the Grand Trunk Pacific to be poured out into Boston, or whether this country is to have an entirely Canadian road from sea to sea over Canadian soil. In conclusion I wish to say, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, that I do not for a moment repudiate the judgment of the Privy Council; but I wish to impress on the House and the government the construction I give to this judgment, and I hope they will investigate, before paying a dollar to this company, to find out whether there is anything in any of these points I have raised. But if we find that this country has defences which, as between private individuals, would be ample defences and ample counter claims, so that no court would think of ordering one to pay the other a dollar, then I say the present ministry will fail in their duty, and will deserve to be ranged in the same class as the late ministry, if they fail to protect the people of Canada, as the late ministers so ignominiously failed to protect them.

Mr. GERMAN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance how much money at the present time the Dominion of Canada is liable for under the sale of these bonds by reason of the judgment of the Privy Council.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The implementing obligation upon sales of bonds already made amounts to about $5,000,000. Any funds that are due by way of implementing must be paid into the bank to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada, in like manner as the proceeds of the bonds are paid into that bank to be disbursed upon certificates of the government engineer from time to time as construction proceeds.

Mr. GERMAN. That is practically the answer I desire. I knew something about the agreement, and about the legal situation when that agreement went through, and I had an idea of my own that the common legal gentlemen whom the government at that time were getting advice from, were wrong. I thought at that time, and I think at the present time, the Domin on of Canada should protect those bonds, and if necessary borrow money at 3 per cent to buy them.

The agreement, as I understand it, provided that the bonds should not be sold without the concurrence of the Dominion government. Then, the Dominion government, whether it was a Liberal or a Conservative government, should have seen that those bonds were not sold below the price for which the Dominion government securities are sold. I think that at this moment the present government should protect the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and if necessary borrow the money to purchase the bonds with the 3 per cent guarantee, and then the government of Canada and the people of Canada would lose nothing because the bonds would be worth 100 cents on the dollar.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The questions my hon. friend has raised have been very fully considered by the government. It has been suggested, and it is a thought that at once occurs to a financial man, that in order to save the amount of implementing on bonds sold in the future (because the others are sold, they are gone), if the government should purchase at par those bonds from time to time as required for the purposes of construction by the Grand Trunk Pacific they would then have the 3 per cent bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific and would save the difference between their selling price, say 80 net, and par.

Mr. GERMAN. Sure.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Not too sure, it requires some further consideration. There are $25,000,000 worth more of bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific to be sold. I would point out to my hon. friend that these are 50 year bonds from the present day, that they mature in 1962. Where my hon. friend is wrong is just here: These are 3 per cent bonds. My hon. friend says why not have the Dominion borrow at par, because it can issue its securities approximately at par, and buy in the 3 per cents, you would then have the 3 per cents and you would save the difference. What he has overlooked is this. The standard security of the Dominion of Canada is not a 3 per cent security, but a 3½ per cent security. If we borrowed money on a 3½ per cent basis, practically speaking, issuing our bonds at par or a little under, then if we bought the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific let us consider our position. On the one hand we would be paying out 3½ per cent on the amount we had borrowed to take them up and on the other hand we would be getting 3 per cent only from the Grand Trunk Pacific bonds. In other words we would be losing half a point of interest. Putting it on a financial basis, Grand Trunk Pacific 3 per cent bonds on a 3½ per cent basis, at 82 are equivalent to 3½

per cent at about 94. In other words, the equivalent of the Grand Trunk bonds guaranteed by this government at, we will say, 82, is on a 3½ per cent basis, about 94, between 93 and 94. The transaction would be this: The Dominion would issue its securities at or near par and would take up the remaining bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and in doing it they would save, on the estimate I have made, about 5 points, not 20 points, not the difference between 80 and par but the difference between the rate of 93 or 94, because that is the corresponding rate on a 3½ per cent basis, and the price at which Dominion securities would sell. So on $25,000,000 of bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, if we took them up and paid for them at par, that is to say implementing as we went along, the government would save about $1,250,000, or possibly a little more. But let me point out two considerations to my hon. friend. In the first place, in order to do that the government would have to increase the National debt by an amount of $25,000,000. In the second place we should have to consider the desirability of holding as an investment, bonds of the railway company, it is true, guaranteed by the government. The situation is not essentially different from this, that this government at any time can make 5 points if it desires to do so by buying the bonds of any Canadian railway Company guaranteed by the Dominion government standing at 93 or 94.

Mr. GERMAN. Oh no.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes. The Dominion to-day can issue its securities at about par and can turn around and buy on the London market Canadian Northern or any other securities on a 3½ per cent. basis, now selling at about 93, and in that way, we could make the difference. The difficulties are these two: Is it wise to increase the National debt by $25,000,000 to help out that transaction for the amount that would be saved and second, is it advisable to hold securities of the railway company, guaranteed as they are by the Dominion government.

Mr. GERMAN. Will you allow the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, guaranteed by the government, to be sold at 20 per cent. less than par, rather than have the Dominion government itself take them up?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I have said that that is a matter for very careful consideration on the part of the government, and it is under consideration by the government. There are no discoveries being made with regard to this matter. It is the most obvious thing in the world for a financial man to say we can save the implementing by taking them up, but these considerations I have mentioned are important considerations and not the least important is the question of the desirability of the government holding those bonds with the interest maturing from year to year, that is bonds which they have purchased with the proceeds of their own securities. It is not true that you save 20 points, because you must put the security on the same basis as that on which the Dominion sells its securities.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House to accept the motion?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If there are no other speakers, I shall say a few words in reply as the mover of this motion. My hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has brought up some very interesting points in connection with this matter, all or nearly all of which have had my careful consideration. The Bill which I am introducing, enables the government to carry out the obligation, whatever it may be, on the Dominion arising under this agreement of 1903, as interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that bonds were sold at less than par and he raises the very interesting question as to whether, if those bonds were improvidently sold, there would not be a set-off.

Now I may say to him that that is a matter about which I have made, and am now making, very careful inquiries. The results of my inquiries to date have been these: It is provided somewhere in the statute or in the agreement that the bonds which have been sold from time to time were sold with the consent of the government; in other words that the government consented to the time of issue and the price of the securities. That, of course, is not conclusive. But it is a fact, I am advised, that my predecessor in office and the government of that day approved of the sale of these bonds from time to time as required. Now, while these bonds appear to be selling at a very low price—at 80, a discount of 20, a very heavy discount—yet it must be born in mind, as I have pointed out originally that at the time the bonds were to be issued, it was thought that they would sell at par or nearly at par, but since that time there has been a fall in all high-grade low-interest bearing securites. Among these, as mentioned by the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) this afternoon, are British Consols, which have fallen to 76 or 77, a very great fall indeed. The standard security to-day that is the Dominion's direct liability security, is about par,—there have been sales at 100¼ recently. It is a fact, and a curious fact, that a guaranteed bond never sells as high as a bond that

gives a direct obligation. You would think that in the case of the Dominion, its guaranteed securities would sell at precisely the same price as a security giving its direct obligation to repay. But it is not so, and this is probably the reason; Under the law, one of the most easily defeasable contracts is the contract of guarantee; and, though the wording of the instrument of guarantee generally states that, notwithstanding anything that may be done, the covenant of the guarantor is absolute, nevertheless guaranteed bonds will not sell within some points of as high a price as the bonds or debentures or securities which represent the direct obligations of the Dominion. Let me repeat to my hon. friend from East Hastings, that all the sales will be carefully checked, that is the sales which have taken place in the past will be carefully checked. And let me say to him further that I understand that the auditor of the Railways Department has checked the disbursements—(I am only giving what I am told, for I have not had time to verify it myself.) At all events, the hon. member may assume this, that before anything is paid out in respect of bonds which have been sold in the past, a careful accounting will be made with regard to the matters which he mentioned— as to commissions and as to whether the sales were in any way improvident. My own opinion is—I must be frank with the House—that these sales are not improvident. And for this reason: If you put a 3 per cent bond of the Grand Trunk Pacific on a 3½ per cent basis and check it up with a 3½ per cent debenture or bond on the London market, you will find that there is just about a parity. Consequently, the real question that arises in my judgment is an accounting to find out what the net proceeds actually were, so that in paying the difference between the proceeds and par you are careful that the Dominion does not pay too much.

Now, we come to another point raised by my hon. friend, the cost of production and interest. In the trust mortgage securing the interest on these bonds the expression 'Construction work' is thus defined:

The said expression 'construction work' in regard to the section in respect of which the same is used, shall also include any sum or sums of money paid or to be paid by the Pacific Company as interest——

That is, interest is part of construction:

——accruing, or about to accrue, during the period of construction, as hereinafter defined, upon the bonds issued by the Pacific Company and guaranteed by the government under this mortgage——

The expression 'period of construction,' that is, the period during which this interest shall run, is defined in this section V, which is the one I have read:

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

Section 7. The expression 'period of construction' in section 5 of this article shall mean the period of time which shall elapse until the western division shall be completed under the provisions of the Transcontinental Railway Acts, or of any Act of parliament extending the time for completion, and the government shall fix the date of such completion by order in council accordingly.

My hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) may remember that the matter came up in the House prior to the recess, and an Act was passed giving the Governor in Council the authority to extend for a certain time. If it is extended 'construction work,' as defined in the clause which I have read, would cover interest during the period of construction to which the time had been extended.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am afraid that is the case.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am glad to have the hon. member's opinion, because I know he has gone into the matter thoroughly. With regard to this money which is due, using the expression generally, to the Grand Trunk Pacific, of course this money was to be received and held in trust by the Receiver General of Canada, who is the Finance Minister, under the terms of the trust mortgage securing this issue.

Mr. GERMAN. How much is the exact amount at present?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). According to the statement which I made to the House the other day, it amounts to $4,900,000. Now let us see how that is to be paid up. That money is not to be at once handed over by cheque to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and it has never been suggested that it is so to be dealt with. Under section V, of this trust mortgage, provision is made for the disposition of the proceeds of the sale of the bonds:

Section 3. All of the said bonds shall be so issued that the purchase price of any of such bonds (hereinafter referred to as 'the proceeds' of the said bonds), shall be paid by the purchasers thereof from time to time into the Bank of Montreal, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, the Merchants Bank of Canada, or such other bank or banks as the government may approve of (which are hereinafter collectively and distributively referred to as the 'Bank'). The bank shall receive and hold the said proceeds and any interest accruing thereon at the credit of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General of Canada, in a special account in one of the offices of the said bank, in accordance with and subject to the provisions of section 4 of this article.

That is, the proceeds of the bonds sold by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. And I have pointed out to my hon. friend from East Hastings, that these bonds which were sold from time to time were

sold with the consent of the Minister of Finance of Canada. I have explained also —the hon. gentleman was not present at the time—that there has been an accounting, I understand as to the disbursements, and I believe there was a check by the auditor of the Railway Department. However, that is a matter, as I have said, which will engage my most careful attention before the money is paid over. In other words, the interests of the Dominion in regard to that will be absolutely safeguarded so far as it is possible to do so. Now, in regard to this implementing money, that is, additional money, it is also covered in the trust mortgage, section V.:

Section 5. Whatever the method of the implementing by the government, in accordance with the provisions of the scheduled agreements in such manner as may be agreed upon as therein provided, of its guarantee of the bonds to be issued by the Pacific Company and guaranteed by the government under the provisions of the scheduled agreements, the results of such implementing shall be paid into the said bank and shall be dealt with by the said bank in the manner provided in sections 3 and 4 of this article.

In other words, the implementing money goes into the bank to the credit of the receiver general in the same manner as would the proceeds of the bonds which had been sold by the company. My hon. friend from Hastings has raised a very interesting question indeed, and one which, as I say, has received to some extent our attention. It is like this: Would the government have the right to set off as against this any claim of the nature that he has mentioned? Let me submit this to my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup), who is, I know, a very good lawyer. I do not understand that he says we should refuse to carry out this transaction. Let me point out to my hon. friend, as a financial man, a little jealous of the standing of the securities which are issued directly by the government or guaranteed by them, that the Receiver General of Canada, under the trust mortgage, is a trustee for all the bondholders. The bondholders are interested in the construction of this line; therefore the Receiver General would be trustee for all the bondholders entitled to the security of the mortgage. Let us see what that means. There is a third interest set up. I wonder would it be fair—I have no doubt myself that it would not be—I wonder would it be legal, would it be against the rights of the bondholders if the Receiver General, as the trustee under this mortgage, declined to pay out the proceeds on the ground of set-off by reason of the failure of the Grand Trunk Pacific to carry out part of its contract.

Mr. McKENZIE. Was not the condition under which the bonds issued under the guarantee well known to the purchaser of the bonds, and would he not know that he took these bonds subject to compliance with the contract by the company?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). This trust mortgage secures all the bonds which have been sold on the English market. The bondholder has notice of everything that is in this mortgage, but the point I am making is that, these bonds being sold, their proceeds have been placed at the credit of the Receiver General and the implementing money will be paid into the credit of the Receiver General for the purpose of providing for the construction of the line. Let us assume that the government deliberately took exception: We will not pay any more money at all on account of some counter claims that have been set up. Of course, the Dominion guarantee is absolute, but the intention was that this money would be used for the purpose of constructing the road on which the bondholders have a first charge as a part of their security. I have in my pocket the opinion of the Department of Justice with regard to some of these matters which have been mentioned, but, let me say this generally: The matters which have been discussed here to-night will be most carefully considered by myself and by the government. I think the House can assume that no moneys will be paid out without the matter being most carefully considered, and without the best advice of counsel in regard to them. I think that covers the main points which have been brought to our attention by my hon. friend from Hastings who has gone into the matter with such very great care.

My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who, I am sorry is not in his seat to-night, I think went out of his way to score a point against this government with regard to the wheat, which he says is lying on the plains of Saskatchewan. I do not think there is any man in Canada who has more sympathy with that situation than I have, I do not believe there is any man or any government that can be more solicitous about that situation than I am or than we are. But, let me ask my hon. friend and the former government of which he was a member, why it is that the National Transcontinental railway is not completed to-day from Winnipeg to Cochrane? Whose fault is it if there are not sufficient railway facilities to bring part of the grain from the west? Why has there been such a delay in connection with the construction of the western part of the National Transcontinental railway? The Grand Trunk has its connection up to Cochrane and if the section were completed from Cochrane to Winnipeg the Grand Trunk would bring trains down and re-

lieve the situation in the west. The western line of the Grand Trunk Pacific is hung up in the air because that line is not completed and I am advised that it will not be completed in less than a year and a half or possibly two years. If the late government had been energetic in regard to completing that end of the railway which was the natural part to be completed almost at the first then I say we should probably have heard less about lack of cars to bring the grain from the west. I want to be fair in these matters, but I say it is an illogical argument in connection with a debate of this kind on this particular matter to endeavour to place the blame upon this government because grain lies on the plains of Saskatchewan. In so far as I am concerned in my humble capacity as a member of this government, I am satisfied that they will do everything possible to improve conditions in the west not only now but in the future. They will endeavour to give them all necessary railway facilities to take out their grain. Large questions arise, the question of extending this line through to the Pacific coast and, when the line is completed through to the Pacific coast, which we hope will be in a couple of years, the question of terminals. These questions will engage the attention of the government. The government has pledged itself to the building of the Hudson Bay railway. We are doing everything we can to facilitate the movement of grain, but everybody knows that the situation in the west is a most exceptional one and in a debate of this kind it ill becomes hon. gentlemen opposite to raise any question so far as blaming this government is concerned in regard to the movement of grain to the south. If it is meant by that that the grain cannot go to the south by reason of the rejection of the reciprocity agreement I would ask: Who rejected the reciprocity agreement? Not this government, but the people of Canada rejected the reciprocity agreement. Is it fair to place blame upon this government in regard to a situation brought about by railway congestion in the west and by climatic conditions when the government took office only a few months ago? If there is any blame because of the lack of cars and railway facilities to bring the grain out a large part of that blame must be borne by the government formerly in office in not having hastened that part of the National Transcontinental railway between Cochrane and Winnipeg.

My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition only the other day called attention to the long faces that he had seen on this side of the House. I am sorry that I have not the pleasure to-night of presenting to my right hon. friend a photograph of the faces of the opposition this afternoon when he arose to make his masterly address in connection with this matter. If not by their words, then by their looks, they expressed contrition and they will not do it again. I can assure my hon. friend from East Hastings that the question he has raised will be very carefully considered by the government because, as we all know, large sums of money are involved.

No money will be paid out unless in accordance with the terms of the mortgage, after taking the advice of the Department of Justice, and considering the other matters that have been brought to our attention.

Mr. GERMAN. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to say that at the present moment the liability of the government, under the judgment of the Privy Council, is a trifle over four million dollars?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I have a statement prepared, which shows that the amount required for implementing upon the sales of bonds which have heretofore taken place is about $4,900,000. I desire to say to my hon. friend, and it will apply to both sides of the House, that if ever we attempt to use the word 'implement' again I think we ought to use it only in its agricultural sense.

Mr. GERMAN. Will the Minister of Finance allow me to ask him another question?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Certainly.

Mr. GERMAN. Will he implement that by buying the bonds himself for the Dominion?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I was just wondering whether my hon. friend was really interested in the Dominion saving a few points, or whether he was really more desirous that we should supply a ready market for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Now, I am not going to add anything to what I have said to my hon. friend; I have told him that that matter is engaging at the present time my attention, and the attention of the government. I have told him that it is obvious that if you bought in bonds at 80, if they happened to be bonds issued at the same rate per cent as you can borrow money at, that you would save twenty points. But I point out that you would have to put the threes on a three and a half per cent basis and consequently there is no such sum saved, but there would possibly be saved five points. I repeat this because my hon. friend was not in at the time. The real question that arises is this: is it advisable to increase the National debt to the extent of twenty-five million dollars, for the purpose of saving the amount of money I have

indicated, and in the second place is there any consideration to be attached to the fact that if it were done the Dominion would become holders of three per cent railway bonds to the amount of twenty-five million dollars, guaranteed of course by the Dominion government?

Mr. GERMAN. Does not the same thing apply to the last sale of bonds, as to whether or not the Dominion government should supplement?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Do you mean those that have been sold already?

Mr. GERMAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Well, I have already pointed out to my hon. friend and it answers his question now, that the Dominion government can at any time it so desires, go into the matter of buying guaranteed bonds, and make five points on the transaction, but up to date, the Dominion government has not done that. For instance, you have Canadian Northern Ontario Railway bonds and Canadian Northern bonds, guaranteed by the Dominion, and selling several points less than the direct obligation of the Dominion. Does my hon. friend seriously suggest—and if he does, why did not the late government do it—that this government should go out and sell its securities to the amount of $150,000,000 or $200,000,000 more on a three and a half per cent. basis, and buy in the bonds of all these railway companies for the purpose of making five points? But, if that were done, what would happen? In the first place, if we attempted to do it, our own securities would drop several points, and the chances are that before you got through you would defeat your own purpose entirely. There is no difference, so far as the bonds sold, are concerned, between Grand Trunk Pacific bonds bearing the guarantee of the Dominion, and the bonds of any other railway company bearing the guarantee of the Dominion. In other words, they sell on a parity, and on the same argument my hon. friend advances, the Dominion might well consider going out to the open market and buying in these bonds, which are in the hands of purchasers at eighty or eighty-two,—because they are at an exact parity at ninety-three and ninety-four on the three and a half per cent. basis—the same argument will apply to buying in all your guaranteed securities.

Mr. GERMAN. Certainly it would.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). All I have to say to my hon. friend (Mr. German) is this: If he seriously advocates that, and if that is the proper thing to do, then he should have been the Finance Minister in place of my predecessor, who, I am sure, would do nothing of the kind.

Mr. NESBITT. What do you estimate the price of these bonds on?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I estimated the balance on the basis of the last sale.

Mr. NESBITT. What was that?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Net, about eighty.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 76) to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act.—Mr. Cochrane.

On section 2.

Mr. COCHRANE. When this Bill was last in committee the leader of the opposition asked me to give him some figures in reference to the cost of the Transcontinental line from Moncton to Winnipeg. I submit the following statement:

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—EASTERN DIVISION.

STATEMENT showing work done to December 31, 1911, and Estimate of Cost of Completion.

SUMMARY.

Items.	Value of Work done to Dec. 31, 1911.	Value of Work required to complete.	Total Estimate of Cost of Work.
	$	$	$
Grading, contract items, including clearing, excavation, culverts, substructures of bridges, tracklaying, ballasting, ties, signals, interlocking appliances, telegraph lines, fencing, water supply, track scales, temporary trestles, and extra work, also pump houses and pumps and substructure of Cap Rouge viaduct	79,368,700	30,510,300	109,879,000
Right-of-way and expenses	1,964,500	2,231,500	4,196,000
Rails and fastenings, including frogs, switches and diamond crossings	10,214,500	2,985,500	13,200,000
Buildings, including stations, section and tool houses and divisional point buildings	985,300	3,971,700	4,957,000
Steel superstructure of bridges, including flooring	4,611,400	1,441,600	6,054,000
Surveys and expenses	4,148,000	22,000	4,170,000
Engineering and expenses	7,681,700	3,850,300	11,532,000
Springfield shops—			
Locomotive shop plant and equipment, including water supply, sewerage system and lighting	2,334,300	602,700	2,937,000
Car shop plant and equipment	171,200	1,129,800	1,301,000
Proposed car ferry at Quebec	Nil.	650,000	650,000
Terminals at Quebec, and line from Quebec Bridge to Quebec city	508,500	9,091,500	9,600,000
Rentals of joint terminals at Winnipeg	131,300	118,700	250,000
Headquarters—Salaries and expenses	1,732,900	1,267,100	3,000,000
Total	113,853,300	57,872,700	171,726,000

GORDON GRANT.
Chief Engineer.

OTTAWA, February 10, 1912.

I might also say that there has been no interest from the commencement charged up, so that the figures in the above table do not represent the total cost of construction of the Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg. I submit the following:

Statement showing the cost of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway, based on the estimated cost submitted by the chief engineer at $171,726,000, and on the supposition that it will be completed and handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway on the 1st January, 1914, and that the money could be borrowed at 3 per cent.

Interest during construction at 3 per cent to 31st Dec., 1911	$ 7,690,128 68
Interest on estimated expenditure at 3 per cent for 1 year at Dec. 31, 1912	3,730,000 00
Interest on estimated expenditure at 3 per cent for 1 year to Dec. 31, 1913	4,635,000 00
Estimated cost of completed road exclusive of interest at Dec. 31, 1913	171,726,000 00
Capital cost estimated to January 1, 1914	$187,781,128 68
Interest on $187,781,128.68 at 3 per cent for 7 years (January 1, 1914, to December 31, 1920)	39,434,031 00
Add betterments, &c., during 9 years (January 1, 1912, to December 31, 1920) unforeseen and unestimated	7,884,840 32
Interest on $7,884,840.32 at 3 per cent based on expenditure of 1/9th per year, about	900,000 00
Capital cost estimated to January 1, 1921	$236,000,000 00

or a capital cost of $130,800 per mile.

If the road does not earn 3 per cent in excess of 'working expenditure' for the 3 years ending December 31, 1923, then interest is added to the capital for three years longer, adding $22,050,000 to capital cost, making the capital cost of the railway $143,015 per mile, plus expenditure for betterments for 43 years.

Capital cost estimated to January 1, 1924	$258,050,000 00

If the road is not taken over by the Grand Trunk Pacific railway on January 1, 1914, each years' delay will add in interest about $4,500,000 to the capital cost.

It will be noted that in the above calculations interest is not compounded except at the period the road is supposed to be handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific, January 1, 1914, and for arriving at the interest for the 3 years, January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1923.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does that statement include the Quebec bridge?

Mr. COCHRANE

Mr. COCHRANE. No, but it includes the terminals.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does it include the $10,000,000 which the company is getting now?

Mr. COCHRANE. No. In order to give the right hon. leader of the opposition some further particulars—because he is entitled to all the information that we have—I will go over some of the returns made to us; and I might say that the following statement is made up and certified by the engineer, Mr. Grant:

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Statement showing districts, mileages, &c., and amount of sundry items and work done to December 31, 1911.

District 'A.'

Length, 256·61 miles, from Moncton to New Brunswick and Quebec boundary.
Grading completed, 256·4 miles or 99·5 per cent.
Track laid, 256·4 miles.
Telegraph lines, 253·1 miles.
Bridges, 99·9 per cent completed.

District 'B.'

Length, 578·19 miles, from New Brunswick and Quebec boundary to east abutment of bridge, Megiskan river.
Grading completed, 462·6 miles or 80 per cent.
Track laid, 445·5 miles.
Telegraph lines, 286·6 miles.
Bridges, 97·5 per cent completed.

District 'C.'

Length, 121·94 miles from east abutment of bridge on Megiskan river to Quebec and Ontario boundary.
Grading completed, 77·7 miles or 63·3 per cent.
Track laid, 77·7 miles.
Telegraph lines, 24·7 miles.
Bridges, 27·2 per cent completed.

District 'D.'

Length, 276·11 miles from Quebec and Ontario boundary to 204 miles west of Cochrane.
Grading completed, 264·6 miles or 95·8 per cent.
Track laid, 239·4 miles.
Telegraph lines, 144·2 miles.
Bridges, 95·5 per cent completed.

District 'E.'

Length, 195·19 miles from 204 miles west of Cochrane, Ont., to 399 miles west of Cochrane, or 125 miles east of present Lake Superior Junction.
Grading completed, 154·8 miles or 79·3 per cent.
Track laid, nil.
Telegraph lines, nil.
Bridges, nil.

District 'F.'

Length, 375·90 miles from 399 miles west of Cochrane or 125 miles east of present Lake Superior Junction to Winnipeg.
Grading completed, 371·6 miles or 98·9 per cent.
Track laid, 359·7 miles.
Telegraph lines, 274·2 miles.
Bridges, 91 per cent.

Recapitulation.

Length, 1,804·7 miles from Moncton, N.B., to Winnipeg, Man.
Grading completed, 1,587·7 miles or 76·82 per cent in twenty-one contracts.
Track laid, 1,378·7 miles, main line, and in addition 278·7 miles in sidings.
Telegraph lines, 982·8 miles.
Bridges, 82·75 per cent.

The hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) wanted a copy of the order in council. I have a copy of it here. I may say that I find that there was a mistake in that, in the statement that it was recommended by the commission instead of by the chairman of the commission. But I took the matter up with the chairman, and he informed me that his law clerk had advised him that he had a right to do what he had done, and that the matter was brought before the commission, and Mr. McIsaac, one of the commissioners, thought that he was acting within his jurisdiction in appointing Mr. Macpherson. I also wish to say that I was misinformed, and misinformed the House, when I said that Mr. Macpherson's salary had not been increased. I am informed that it has been increased.

Mr. KYTE. What is Mr. Macpherson's salary at the present time?

Mr. COCHRANE. $7,500.

Mr. KYTE What was it before?

Mr. COCHRANE. $5,000, I think.

Mr. AMES. What is the total value covered by the $236,000,000?

Mr. COCHRANE The total mileage from Moncton to Winnipeg is 1,804·7 miles.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am obliged to my hon. friend for the information he has brought down. The figures which he has placed before the House cannot of course be taken in at once, but they will be there for future reference.

The one thing in which I was particularly interested to know was the condition of the road to-day, and how far it had proceeded from Cochrane towards the Lake Superior Junction.

Mr. COCHRANE. District E is 195·19 miles in length, from 204 miles west of Cochrane, Ontario, to 399 miles west of Cochrane, or 125 miles east of present Lake Superior Junction. Grading completed, 154·8 miles or 79·3 per cent. Track laid, nil. Telegraph lines, nil. Bridges, nil.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend may have been under the impression that he sent me a copy of the order in council to which he referred, but I never received it. The first information I have received is from the lips of my hon. friend just now. When the Bill was first moved in

the committee, certain information was asked for and no progress whatever was made with respect to the Bill. I thought I heard the chairman speak of the second section. There must be some mistake. Surely the committee is not going to understand that the first section has already passed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe) Clause 1 is initialled as having been passed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it will be within the memory of all members present on the former occasion that there was no progress made, and my hon. friend withdrew the Bill from the consideration of the committee, awaiting a further opportunity to procure the information.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. I state distinctly that that was the case. I raised this question with respect to the first clause relative to the appointment of one commissioner, as I felt it was necessary that we should be furnished with information, not only with respect to the work that remained to be done, but also with respect to the status of the commission. We were under some misapprehension, I know I was, as to who really constituted the commission at that time. We were told that certain members of the commission had sent in their resignation. Whether any of the resignations had been accepted we were not able to ascertain. I felt it important that we should know that. Before we take into consideration the question as to whether we should reduce the numbers of this commission from four to one, we should know the work yet to be done. When this matter was first under consideration by parliament, parliament determined the number of commissioners to whom should be entrusted the responsibility and the duty of the construction of the Transcontinental railway between Winnipeg and Moncton, and parliament, in its wisdom, entrusted that work to a commission composed of four men. Had the proposition been to entrust it to a commission of one man, I am sure parliament would have hesitated before taking action. When it is proposed to reduce that number to one man, it is necessary for us to have information as to what part of the work remains uncompleted. We have had that here to-night, and although I listened as closely as I could, I am not yet in possession of the information which I require. We must remember that when the Intercolonial was constructed it was placed in the hands of a commission, I think there were three commissioners, and they remained until the road was completed. Had there been a proposition to change the number when the work was half or two-thirds completed, I do not think parliament would have consented to it. Now when two years' work remain to be completed, I think it is an amazing proposition to place upon the shoulders of one man the responsibility of completing the work, and determining the final settlements of contracts. The work yet to be done involves most serious responsibility. I care not how able a man may be, it is not wise, it is not in the interest of the public to entrust this great work to one man alone. Subsequent to the request I made to my hon. friend for the information he has just brought down, I moved that there should be furnished to the House certain other information. I moved for information with respect to the proceedings of the commission from the day this government came into power to the present time, from the time of the resignation of the present chairman down to the time I made my motion. That information has not yet been furnished. I do not think that this committee is in a position properly to consider the proposition involved in the first section. The committee may determine when it has all the information that one man is competent to carry on the work, and that it would be wise to entrust it to the responsibility of one man.

I do not think the committee is in a position to say whether or not that would be a wise course. If, in 1903, the then Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had proposed to place the construction of that line from Winnipeg to Moncton in charge of one commissioner, parliament would have hesitated and perhaps have declined to give its sanction to such a proposal, and it is quite a serious matter at this moment. While there is not so much work yet to be done and while it does not involve so many years' labour, yet the responsibility in the final winding up and completion of the work is, in my judgment, a very large percentage of the responsibility that was involved in the whole work at its inception and it would be a dangerous precedent to establish. We must go upon precedent in these matters. At the time of the construction of the Intercolonial railway the precedent established was a commission of three members. That perhaps was not so great a work as this although for that period it was a very great work and meant much for the future of Canada. The precedent established by parliament on that occasion is certainly worthy of being followed on this. I do not know if my hon. friend had not confidence in the commissioners, he placed no imputation on the members of the Transcontinental Railway Board. If lack of confidence in the commissioners was the reason for his desire to

change the board, then it might have been well to consider the substitution of other gentlemen on the board, but it is quite a different proposition to wipe out the commission and place in the hands of one man the whole responsibility and the complete control of this great work including the final accounting with respect to contracts. It is a serious responsibility for any man to assume and it is a serious consideration for this parliament whether they are willing to entrust that responsibility to one man and to rely upon his judgment, I care not how great, how able or how well qualified he may be, from an administrative or engineering or other standpoint. There are involved decisions of great importance not merely to the railway but to the people of Canada who are looking forward to the completion of the railway as a work that will mean much for the future. We may differ with respect to its cost, indeed there were differences with respect to its advisability in the first instance. As to the character of the road that was proposed to be built there were those who favoured its construction as a government work and those who felt that the whole project should be entrusted to a private railway corporation; but parliament in its wisdom determined that it should be built but not operated as a government road, that it should be built not by the Department of Railways as canals have been built for years, directly under the control of the minister, but by a commission, and parliament wisely determined that that commission should consist of four men. Before we change this, before we entirely overturn the decision of that parliament, and appoint a different commission, we should have every possible information with respect to the status of the road, the character of the work yet to be completed and I hold that we have no such information, that it was not brought before the House as promised, and that certainly it has not been given to us at as early a moment as we should have had it. I think we should have had an opportunity of perusing the returns that have been brought down. The minister should bring down the other return; the Board of Railway Commissioners should furnish him with copies of the documents, and we should have an opportunity of at least closely reading those returns. I have no desire to in any way impede the progress of this Bill, but I think my hon. friend should give an opportunity to hon. members to read over these documents to ascertain the nature of the work yet to be completed. When my hon. friend first brought the Bill before the committee he gave certain information with respect to it, and it shows how easy it is to be mistaken. The very first statement of my hon. friend with respect to the status of the commission was wrong.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. With all deference to my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane), let us consider the matter of the change in the character of the employment of Mr. Macpherson. Mr. Macpherson has been assistant chief engineer, and in receipt of a salary of $5,000 a year. He was subordinate to the chief engineer. By an order in council, which I hold the government was not empowered to pass, the character of the commission was changed. Mr. Macpherson was appointed assistant chairman, an appointment which was not authorized by the Act; no such official was contemplated within the four corners of the Act. The Governor in Council had the power to appoint commissioners, a chief engineer, and a secretary. And they made these appointments. But under the terms of the Act the commissioners have the power and the right to select all other officials, engineers, experts, and agents and employees of every character. But it appears that the government, on the 14th of December last, on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, assumed to appoint Mr. Macpherson as assistant to the chairman, to take effect from the 1st December, 1911. So, this was retroactive in its terms. Of course, it will be understood, that I am not raising objection to Mr. Macpherson. I believe he is a man of eminent ability, and has the qualifications to fill such a position, were such a position authorized under the Act. I am dealing with the order in council from an entirely impersonal standpoint. The character of his engagement was changed. He had been the assistant engineer, and he is given power and authority over the chief engineer, with a salary higher than that of the commissioners. I understand that the chairman received $8,000, and the commissioners received $7,000 each, while the chief engineer received $6,000. And Mr. Macpherson was appointed assistant to the chairman with a salary of $7,500. There must have been some reason for all this, but we have not heard what it is. It may be an entirely good reason; I might quite coincide with the reasons which influenced my hon. friend in making that recommendation to council, and this committee might approve of his action. But he has not taken the committee into his confidence by telling us the reasons which actuated him in making that recommendation. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that it is a fair request I make of my hon. friend, that the further progress of this Bill should be deferred until an opportunity is given to look over the terms, and until an opportunity is given the hon.

gentleman himself to bring down the returns which this House has ordered that he shall bring down.

Mr. COCHRANE. I was not asked for any returns.

Mr. EMMERSON. The House ordered it.

Mr. COCHRANE. No; the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asked me to give him a statement of the progress of the building of the road, which I have brought down, I think to his satisfaction, and if not I shall be glad to meet his wishes if I can; and the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), asked for a copy of the order in council appointing Mr. Macpherson, and that I have furnished.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) may not be informed of it, but the very day after I made the request for this copy of the order in council which he has so courteously brought and laid on the table at this moment, I made a motion in the House that certain other papers should be furnished.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not see that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman's attention has not been called to it. It was the duty of his officials to have informed him of this matter. The motion is on record in the proceedings of this House as having been passed. There was no discussion; it passed as a matter of course. I think we are entitled to that information, because of the want of definiteness in the information with respect to the situation of the commission. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) when he first took the House into his confidence at all, said that one man could look after this matter alone, and one man is going to do it; and it was by reason of that fact that the commissioners had resigned—and we were led to suppose that they had resigned and gone out.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I made a frank statement to the House and stated that one member had resigned without condition, that one had resigned asking for three months, and that one had resigned asking for six months. The commission is all sitting yet.

Mr. EMMERSON. I accept that statement as I accepted the previous one. But my hon. friend subsequently corrected his first statement and said that the commission would continue to act in conjunction with the chairman, and I have assumed that that is the case. But I think that the House is entitled to all the information with respect to the proceedings taken by this commission from the date when its members sent in their resignation down to the present. And I think we should have a copy of that procedure on the part of the commission. My hon. friend will find out—I have not time now to refer to and quote the records of the proceedings of the House—that a motion was passed calling upon him and his department and the Transcontinental Commission to furnish this information. And I ask my hon. friend in all seriousness and in all sincerity, to have the further progress of this Bill deferred until I, at least as one member of the committee having the right to make the request, shall have an opportunity of perusing, not merely the information brought down by him, but also the further information for which I have asked in the motion to which I have referred and which information has been ordered by the House to be furnished by his department.

Mr. COCHRANE. Can the hon. gentleman give me the date when that motion was carried?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not carried this in my memory, but I think it was on the 27th of January.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). It was on the 26th January, page 297 of the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. EMMERSON. The motion was as follows:

For a copy of all minutes of proceedings, records, orders, instructions or other writings made and had, or given or authorized to be made, had or given by the Board of National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, from the date of the appointment of Mr. R. W. Leonard, as a member of the said board and chairman thereof, to the present date; also of all letters, telegrams, instructions or other documents made or had or passed, since the said appointment, by and between the Minister of Railways and Canals, or other members of the government, or by any person by authority of the government, and the said chairman of Board of National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, or the secretary of said board; also of any orders in council relating to the appointment of an assistant chairman or an assistant to the chairman of said board, together with a copy of all letters, papers, instructions or documents relating thereto; as well as a statement of all payments of monies in the way of salaries or compensation made to the incumbent of the office of assistant chairman or assistant to the chairman of said board, and of all papers, letters or instructions made, written or received by the said minister or the said chairman, relating to or in any way connected with the payment or authorization of said salary or compensation.

It will be observed here that I have designated the gentleman as assistant chairman and then as assistant to the chairman, because when I first asked my hon. friend

the Minister of Railways and Canals with respect to the appointment as to whether Mr. Macpherson had been appointed assistant chairman, he said: No, but that he, or somebody, had been appointed as assistant to the chairman. I fail to see the fine point of distinction with respect to the difference in the names. But, I ask for this information, and in all fairness I think I am entitled to it as a member of the committee if no one else is desirous to see it. I observe by the order in council that Mr. Macpherson has been appointed as assistant to the chairman. I want no misapprehension as to the tenor of my remarks with respect to either the gentleman who occupies the position of chairman of the commission or the gentleman who occupies the position as assistant to the chairman. I believe that no better selection could have been made than has been made with respect to Mr. Leonard as chairman of the board, and from my knowledge of Mr. Macpherson I think he is entitled to a position of that great responsibility and even of greater responsibility, if my information with respect to him is correct, and if my observation is at all measurably near what it should be. But, it is only the information that I ask for, and I trust that my hon. friend will do me the justice to furnish it.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Chairman, there has been a tendency in this debate, and in preceding debates, for members on the other side of the House to be very voluble in their defence of this present commission. The astounding statement that the minister has made to-night with respect to the cost of the National Transcontinental railway, in so far as the eastern portion is concerned, is enough without any further evidence to enable this House to decide that the sooner this commission is got rid of the better it will be for the country, and when we consider that we have a good man who understands railway building and that we will be far more likely to reach an end of this unparalleled expenditure without making any further blunders, my impression is that instead of continuing these commissioners, the quicker they get out the better it will be for the country. One member of the commission has resigned and he was wisely informed to do so. The others know that they had better do so as quickly as they possibly can before the country becomes thoroughly seized of the figures which the minister has laid before the House to-night. I wonder if members of the House realize the astounding statement that the minister laid before us to-night? It comes in srange contrast with the quotations which have been given from the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Mr. Fielding who, some years ago, made the statement that this railway would cost the people of the country $13,000,000, an amount which would be met out of the surplus of a single year. Compared with the figures which we have here to-night the $13,000,000 which was originally mentioned, is a mere bagatelle. Let us look at these figures which the Minister of Railways has given us. This railway has cost up to date, $113,000,000 and it is now estimated that it will cost to complete $57,000,000 which will make an amount of $171,726,000. That will be the capital outlay as close as we can come to it now. That is only for the eastern section, without reference to the obligations we have undertaken on the line from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert, without respect to the guarantees we have given and without respect to the $10,000,000 that we are asked to make a present of to the Grand Trunk. This is only the cost of the portion of the line from Winnipeg to Moncton, and the total is $171,726,000. That is without any interest at all. We know that during the time that the road is being built and until the work is completed, the interest has to be met and we know that we have also to meet the interest for seven years thereafter. The interest to the date of completion will be $16,055,000 and, supposing it is completed by 1914 we still have seven years during which we will have to pay interest and that will give us $39,434,000 more. That brings the expenditure up to $227,215,000. If we add to that the betterments that will surely take place, it will amount to $7,885,000 more and if we take the interest on one-ninth of a year, which means that $900,000 must be added, we have the astounding sum of $236,000,000 as the cost of the railway from Moncton to Winnipeg. That does not include the $14,000,000 or $15,000,000 that the Quebec bridge will cost. Contrast that with the statements that were quoted this afternoon and it seems perfectly astounding that these hon. gentlemen could be so far astray in their calculations.

Let us see how our share is going to figure out. I could scarcely believe it after the quotations which were made from the speeches of the right hon. leader of the opposition and his Minister of Finance, who assured the House and the country repeatedly that $13,000,000 was all that the road was going to cost. To date the interest has been $16,055,000; seven years interest will amount to $39,434,000, and if, as in all probability will be the case, we have to provide for an extra year's interest at least, it will mean an addition of $4,500,000; so that $60,000,000 of interest is going to be paid out by this country in connection with the road instead of the $13,000,000 we were told it would cost by the right hon. gentleman and his Minister of Finance, calculations which are not

within one-fifth of what the road is going to cost us.

Let us look for a moment at the Grand Trunk side of it, and, although I have only had an opportunity to glance at the figures, I think I can make the House see the magnitude of the undertaking. What is the position of the Grand Trunk in this matter? The Grand Trunk will have to pay interest on $171,726,000, on betterments $7,884,000, and on three years interest, or, in all, about $201,710,000. That means that the Grand Trunk will have to carry a burden of interest of three per cent. on $201,000,000; that means they will have to carry a burden of $6,000,000 a year of interest or $3,300 interest per annum on every mile of that road from Winnipeg to Moncton. You talk about reducing the freight rates on the grain coming from the west on a railway that has got to carry an interest charge of $3,300 per annum for every mile of its line. How much do you think there would be left over to reduce the rates after working expenses are paid? I can tell you that the other railways in this country are laughing in their sleeves at the result of this enormous and colossal blunder on the part of the late government. They realize that this railway will never be a factor in reducing freight rates, because they know there is not a railway in all Canada that can begin to carry an interest charge on one thousand eight hundred miles of road, where every mile of that railway on an average has cost $130,000 a mile. I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House ever heard of a railway staggering along under such a burden as that. Is that going to be any relief to the farmers of the west? I fail to see it. Except it be in one way, and that is that the Dominion of Canada step in and take a bigger share of the burden than they are carrying to-day, and if the Dominion is willing to do that it may possibly make it possible for that railway to be operated in such a way that it will be a relief to the west. But, when we think we are through with $60,000,000 we are again on the horns of a dilemma. We have to offer to relieve the Grand Trunk Pacific from a large portion of the burden they carry, which will increase that $60,000,000 very materially, or else we have got to let them stagger along alone under that burden, in which case there will never be a reduction of freight rates. Instead of wasting the time of the House in sympathy for that commission which has got the country into this tremendous expense, it is far better that we should pass this Bill and let these gentlemen requiescat in pace; let them pass out of the public sight and be glad they are permitted to do so, and let us get down to one good, reliable railway building man and put him in charge and say to him: Make the best you can out of the bargain, get us out of it as reasonably as you can, and finish the road as best you can. In the meantime, we will be glad to have a full impartial investigation that will try to find out where some of this $235,000,000 has gone.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) tries to make out that there can be no possible reduction of freight rates from the west on account of the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but there is just one feature of it that he has taken good care not to mention, and that is, that when the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed it will be able to haul freight from Winnipeg to Montreal or from Winnipeg to the winter ports in the lower provinces, at less than one-half the cost that the same freight can be hauled for at the present time. That can be accomplished by the Grand Trunk Pacific owing to its low grades. Another point my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) has forgotten to mention is that when this road is completed the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will not have to spend millions and tens of millions of dollars, as the Canadian Pacific railway is doing now, in order to put the road in a position to compete on anything like even terms with other railways. It was stated the other day by some hon. gentlemen on the other side that the Canadian Pacific railway was only too willing to reduce freight rates, but they did not do so because while they could stand it the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern could not. There is absolutely no ground for a statement of that kind. I can show to the utmost satisfaction of this House that on many products that are being carried by the Canadian Pacific railway in the west to-day they are charging very much higher rates than they did a few years ago, so that instead of lowering the freight rates of late years, in many cases they have been putting them up. While the Grand Trunk Pacific has cost a good deal of money to build it must be remembered that when the road is completed it will be able to haul grain and other products at less cost than any transcontinental road either in Canada or in the United States. I have not the slightest doubt that when the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed it will be able to reduce the enormous freight rates that are in existence to-day and which are fifty per cent or a hundred per cent even, higher in the west than they are in the east. I believe the Grand Trunk Pacific will be able to do that, while rendering a good service to the country, and that it will earn money to pay the interest on its cost, although that cost has been heavy. I believe, Sir, that the Grand Trunk Pacific will be a great blessing to the western farmer and that it

will not have to ask the government for further aid.

Mr. LALOR. On the portion of the Grand Trunk Pacific completed from Edmonton to Winnipeg are the freights any lower now than they are on the Canadian Northern or the Canadian Pacific railways?

Mr. TURRIFF. The Grand Trunk Pacific will not lower their freight rates of their own volition any more than any other railway will, but they can be compelled to do so by the Railway Commission, and the freight rates will be cut down and they can still earn interest on the charges. On account of their low grades the Grand Trunk Pacific will be able to carry on one train four times or five times as much as can be carried on one train of the Canadian Pacific railway from the Pacific coast to Winnipeg. From Winnipeg to the Atlantic ports they have a four-tenths of one per cent grade, which means that an engine can haul on that road any load that she can start with on an absolutely level track.

Mr. LALOR. Did the government in making the bargain with the Grand Trunk Pacific reserve any control over the freight rates?

Mr. TURRIFF. Every road in Canada is under the control of the Railway Commission.

Mr. LALOR. Only under the control of the Railway Commission?

Mr. TURRIFF. The railways are under the control of the Railway Commission; the Railway Commission is under the control of the government; the government brought the Railway Commission into being and the government can dissolve the Railway Commission if they want to at any time. The Railway Commission is under the control of this government just the same as any other commission. Let no one run away with the idea that because the Grand Trunk Pacific cost more than it was expected it would, simply because they built a better road than they started out to build, that it is going in the end to have any ill effect on the freight rates, because the fact is that on account of it being a better road it will be able to haul freight at a less rate than any competing road.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. May I ask that the Bill be allowed to stand over until we have looked into the figures brought down by the Minister of Railways. It must be apparent that it is impossible, after simply hearing the figures. to come to any conclusion with regard to them. I hope my hon. friend will have no objection to allow the Bill to stand.

Mr. BORDEN. I am unable to see how the passing of this Bill depends so essentially upon any examination of these figures. So far as the figures are concerned, they only give the details of what has been stated here over and over again, that the road is at the present time about two-thirds completed. So far as the cost is concerned, there cannot be any doubt about that. However, if the consideration of the Bill, in the opinion of the right hon. gentleman, does involve an examination of these figures, and if we are to have an exhaustive discussion of all these statistics for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not, so far as the construction of this railway is concerned, it is to be placed under one instead of four, I am willing to accede to his suggestion although I cannot see the importance of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I quite agree with my hon. friend that the Bill itself does not depend upon these figures; but the figures have to be discussed—my hon. friend will not deny us that privilege—and they might as well be discussed upon this Bill as upon any other.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think the appointment of Mr. Macpherson has anything to do with the Bill. I am quite satisfied that the appointment of Mr. Macpherson was recommended by the chairman, and that the order in council was perfectly regular. I might say, for the information of the hon. gentleman who has taken exception to it, that there was no authority under the Act for the commission to buy a foot right of way. It was only last year that the late government passed an order in council giving them the authority, and the consequence is that the right of way is in a very bad mix-up. Mr. Macpherson is put in charge of right of way, and is held responsible for it. He is also at the head office when the chairman is away on the work, because I think it is most important not to tie the chairman down to the head office all the time. He should be out to see for himself whether the divisional and other engineers are performing their duties. But I have no objection to postponing the discussion, and I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. KYTE. Before we pass from the consideration of the Bill, I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention to page 1,909 of 'Hansard' where he is represented as having said:

> Young asks—on the ground of having had no holidays, but one out of the seven years he has been in office—for six months salary. Mr. McIsaac asks for three months, and Mr. Calvert resigns without any condition.

I understood the minister to say that Mr. McIsaac had resigned without any condition and that Mr. Calvert had asked

for three months' salary. I would like the minister to correct this statement

Mr. COCHRANE. I have not the letters here, but the facts were fresh in my memory when I spoke before.

Mr. KYTE. Will the minister give us the information again?

Mr COCHRANE I will give you all the information you want.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend 'The Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908,' by providing for the appointment of an additional Civil Service Commissioner, who shall have the salary of a Deputy Head of a department.—Mr. Borden.

Mr. BORDEN. It may be perhaps more convenient to have a general discussion on the Bill if the right hon. gentleman has no objection. At the moment, I would simply say that the reasons for introducing the proposed Bill are twofold. In the first place, I understand that some difficulty has been experienced in the operation of the Civil Service Commission from the very fact that it consists of only two members; for if these members are divided in opinion on some matter of more or less importance, no action can be taken, and some very awkward situations are likely to be created, and I think have been created, for that very reason. In the next place, it is hoped and expected that the operation of the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1908 will be extended as expeditiously as may be practicable to the outside service. I do not intend to suggest that that can be done at once. It will be done only after some investigation and some inquiry, but we hope to make progress in it from the very first, and in view of that extension of the operation of the Act, it is thought desirable for that reason also that there should be another member of the commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not intend to go into any general discussion of this measure at the present sitting, as I think that can very properly be deferred until the second reading of the Bill; but in the meantime may I ask my right hon. friend if it is the intention of the government to extend the operation of the Civil Service Act within the present session or during the present year? I understand that there are several officers in the outside service whom it will be difficult to bring within the scope of the Act; but there are, on the other hand, a good many who can be brought in. For instance, the officials in the post offices, customs offices and inland revenue offices in large cities, might very properly be brought within the operation of the Act at once. With regard to extending it further to the service, I would not be prepared to offer any suggestion now; I am quite aware that it is a matter of great difficulty. It may not be so very easy to apply the Act to the service of the different departments in the country districts. With regard to the other point mentioned by my right hon. friend, it is not perhaps outside of the possibilities of human nature that two commissioners might not always see eye to eye. I have not known, however, that a deadlock has occurred except in very minor circumstances. It appears sometimes that on legal questions the commissioners have to refer to the Department of Justice. I offer no suggestion, I merely make this remark.

Mr. BORDEN. In reply to the right hon. gentleman, he will realize that as we were obliged to meet parliament within four or five weeks after assuming office, there has not been much opportunity, at least so far as I am concerned, to make any effective study of the matter he has mentioned. He has asked whether the Civil Service Amendment Act would be extended to certain officials in the outside service during the present session. I would not like to say at the moment that we will find time to make even the investigation that would be necessary for that purpose. He has asked whether its operations may be extended during the present year to some portion of the outside service. I would hope, and indeed I believe, that it will be possible to do so during the present year; but it will be impossible to pronounce at the present any opinion as to how far that would be practicable. I would like, however, to have it understood that it is our desire and intention to proceed along that line so far as it is practicable.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no question that the Civil Service Amendment Act introduced by the ex-Minister of Agriculture was a great relief to public men. Until then ministers were pestered from morning to night by applicants, and they were very many. That amendment gave great relief to ministers, and allowed them to do some work in their offices. Now, to extend the principle to the outside service would be a further relief. I am quite sure that when my right hon. friend visits Montreal or Halifax on public business, he is besieged by a troop of applicants for public office. I do not see any reason why the same rule which applies to the inside service at Ottawa should not be applied to the other large cities of the Dominion.

Mr. GERMAN. I do not agree at all with the remarks of the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux). You cannot apply the Civil Service Act to the outside service as it is applied in Ottawa. I have one instance in my mind now in the county of Welland. A postmaster has been dismissed very lately, a young man, active, intelligent, acceptable to all the people of the locality, from the post office. His name is Mr. Buck. He kept the post office at Crystal Beach, in the township of Bertie, in the county of Welland; he was dismissed, and a Mr. Rebstock was appointed in his place, who is a United States citizen. I want to call the attention of this government to the fact that they dismissed a Canadian citizen, who is not a partisan at all, who never took any part in politics except to vote as an intelligent man should, and that is for me, and they have appointed a young man of good ability, but a citizen of the United States, to that position. Now that young man wanted the position several years ago, and I refused to recommend him, because he was a United States citizen. But these hon. gentlemen, who were so much afraid of being tied up to the United States in a reciprocity agreement, have appointed a United States citizen as postmaster. I would like the Postmaster General to be here. I hope his colleagues will call his attention to the wrong that he has done. They did dismiss one postmaster in the county; I was not so much dissatisfied with that, because I dismissed a Conservative, and had him appointed. Now, I am frank to say that it is a serious problem to apply the Civil Service Amendment Act to the outside service. I doubt very much if it can be worked out. You may, by your Civil Service Commission, regulate the appointment of officers in the inside service, as in Ottawa, and probably in Toronto. But when you take it over the country generally, to whom will the commissioners who have to make the appointments, apply for information? They will apply to the men who are the leading men in the locality, and the leading men in the locality will be the men who represent the constituencies, or the men who have endeavoured to represent the constituency. The commissioners will take their opinions from these men; if they do not do that, what will they do? You cannot appoint men strictly on examination. You may get good men who will pass excellent examination, and who may be absolutely unfit for public positions, from disposition, from character, or other inability. You cannot appoint young men simply by reason of the fact that they have passed a first-class examination. I venture to say, and I want to say now in the presence of the hon. gentlemen who are leading this government, that we have in the county of Welland the best contingent of customs officers and immigration officers that exist in the Dominion of Canada.

I stand in the judgment of the commissioner of Customs and of the Commissioner of Immigration. They are all young men, they are all intelligent men, and I will put them up against any similar class of young men in the inside service who have been appointed by your commissioners. They are intelligent, good young men, I do not want to see them dismissed and I do not expect they will be dismissed because they should not be dismissed. They may dismiss a few labourers on the Welland canal but I hope not many. The government cannot appoint a Civil Service Commission who can satisfactorily control the appointment of outside officials; if they undertake it they will make a mistake. It should be left to the men in the various counties in whom the government have confidence. If these men do not make proper representations to the government and the government have no confidence in them, then the government should select someone in whom they have confidence and be guided by his advice, even in the county of Welland, if they happen to be guided by mine.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not know anything of the cases to which my hon. friend has alluded, but I shall bring his remarks to the attention of the Postmaster General.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 104) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. To-morrow we propose to take government Bills, beginning with the Grain Act and after that Supply, taking up the estimates of the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.23 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 15, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

ACCUSATION AGAINST JUDGE TOURIGNY.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Does the government know that accusations of extreme gravity are said to have been brought, at the time of the last elections, against Judge Tourigny, one of the judges of the Superior Court?
2. Does the government also know that Judge Tourigny has not replied directly to those alleged accusations and has not taken any proceeding whatever against his accuser?
3. In face of such a situation and the apparent unconcern on the part of a man thus publicly accused, does the government intend to take measures to assure itself of the truth or falsity of the accusations brought against Judge Tourigny?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1 and 2. The government has no knowledge.

3. The government has before it no accusations in any form that would justify it in taking cognizance of, or action upon them.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. MURPHY asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to a speech delivered by hon. T. W. Crothers, Minister of Labour, at Kerwood, Ontario, on September 1, 1911, in which he is reported by the London 'Free Press' of September 2, 1911, to have said:—

I am in favour of indemnifying every man who lost a dollar by the operations of the management of the Farmers' Bank. Some people have said that the depositors only should have their losses made good, but I hold that others are in the same position as the depositors. . . .

We intend to see that every man who lost will be recouped.

2. Has the attention of the government been directed to a further speech delivered by said Minister of Labour at Fingal, Ontario, on September 4, 1911, in which he is reported by the St. Thomas 'Times' of September 5, 1911 to have said:—

I am in favour of indemnifying every man who lost a dollar by the operations of the management of the Farmers Bank. Some people have said that only the losses of the depositors should be made good, but I hold that others are in the same position as the depositors. . . .

We intend to see that every man who lost shall be reimbursed.

3. Did the Minister of Labour repudiate the said reports of his speeches as published in the London 'Free Press' and the St. Thomas 'Times'? If so, when and where?

4. If no such repudiation has been made, is it the intention of the government to carry out the promises of the Minister of Labour?

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister):

It was suggested to me yesterday that this question is not in proper form, as it sets out allegations of fact. I would like to have it amended or dropped

POSTMASTER AT COLDBROOK, N.S.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Who is the postmaster at Coldbrook, Kings county, N.S., and when was he appointed?
2. Does he live at Coldbrook? If not, where does he live?
3. Is the department aware that Kentville is distant from Coldbrook post office several miles?
4. What is the postmaster's business?
5. Is it the policy of the department to appoint postmasters who do not reside where the post office is, but who live and transact business in other localities several miles distant?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. There is no post office named Coldbrook in the county of Kings, N. S. There is a post office called Cold Brook Station, of which Mr. W. E. Porter is postmaster. He was appointed on the 17th November, 1911.
2. The department has no specific information as to his place of residence.
3. The map of Canada shows that. The department has not been called upon to look into it.
4. The department has no other information than that the man is postmaster.
5. As a rule, no. It depends upon circumstances.

UNITED SHOE MACHINERY COMPANY.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York):

1. Is the taking of testimony still in progress before the Board of Investigation under the Anti-Combines Act of 1910 in the United Shoe Machinery case?
2. What legal counsel, if any, are following the investigation in the public interest, and employed by the government of Canada or any department thereof?
3. Was any application made at any time to the Minister of Justice by the Minister of Labour for the employment of counsel in the United Shoe Machinery case under section 30 of the Anti-Combines Act or otherwise?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Testimony was taken before the Board of Investigation at sessions held in Quebec on February 6 and 7, 1912. It is understood to be the intention of the board to

sit in Toronto on or about February 20, 1912. The government is not aware whether it is the intention of the board to take further testimony.

2. No counsel has been instructed by the government of Canada or any department of the government to take any part in the proceedings before the board.

3. No application has been made to the Minister of Justice by the present Minister of Labour for the employment of counsel or otherwise, and, so far as the present minister is aware, no such application was made by the former minister.

EDUCATION IN KEEWATIN.

Mr. BARRETTE:

1. Did the government or one of its members receive towards the end of November or December last, or at any time, since, a petition signed by Messrs. Arthur Larose, Mastai Poirier and Joseph Smith, residents of Le Pas, district of Keewatin, Northwest Territories, asking for the creation of a council to assist the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories in the administration of the Territories, clause 6 of chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, the authority for the commissioners in council to enact ordinances in matters of education; the creation by competent authority and in the manner desired, of a school district at Le Pas, in the district of Keewatin, Northwest Territories?

2. Was this petition addressed to His Royal Highness, the Governor General in Council? If not, to whom?

3. Who received it, and when?

4. What reply has it produced?

5. To whom was the reply communicated, and when?

6. If no reply has yet been given, what does the government intend to do in the matter, and will it reply to the petitioners? If so, in what way?

7. Whatever reply the government may have given or intend to give to the petition of Messrs. Larose, Poirier and Smith, is it its intention to avail itself of the law regulating the Northwest Territories, to appoint immediately, by virtue of clause 6 of chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, a council to assist the Commissioners of the Northwest Territories in the administration of these Territories, and to permit in favour of those who ask it, the regular working of the administrative machinery which parliament has foreseen and for which it has provided statutory provision?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. It was referred to the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories towards the end of December for report.

4. None.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6 and 7. The report of the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories will be given full consideration by the government when received.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

What have been the travelling expenses paid to the Deputy Minister of Justice from 1905 to 1911, inclusive?

Mr. DOHERTY:

In 1905-6	$1,295 55
In 1906-7	48 70
In 1907-8	1,144 05
In 1908-9	1,181 53
In 1909-10	1,213 38
In 1910-11	1,821 53

WHARF AND DREDGING AT FRASERVILLE.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Referring to the sum of $70,000 mentioned in the estimates of 1912-1913, for wharf and dredging at Fraserville, Quebec, and lately voted, is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to ask for immediate tenders in order that the projected works may be constructed as soon as possible, in the interest of the general public and especially in that of the Intercolonial railway, which could discharge its coal at Fraserville, instead of Lévis, thus saving fifteen or twenty thousand dollars on its annual expenses?

2. If so, will the honourable Minister of Public Works make use of the plans and specifications now existing in the department, and on which the preceding government was ready to ask for tenders at the time of the dissolution of parliament?

3. If not, what does he propose to do for the port of Fraserville?

Mr. MONK. It seems to me this question contains allegations of fact; however, I will endeavour to answer it.

1. It is the intention of the government, as soon as the appropriation of $70,000 referred to has been passed by parliament, to take the necessary steps to execute the work referred to in that appropriation.

2. The plans and specifications prepared already will no doubt be used by the department when the appropriation is at its disposal.

3. Answered by 1 and 2.

JUDGE BLAISE LETELLIER.

Mr. LAVALLEE:

1. At what place is the fixed residence of the Honourable Judge Blaise Letellier, one of the judges of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec?

2. Is it within or without the judicial district of Chicoutimi, for which he was appointed?

3. Is it the intention of the government to favour the interests of the honourable judge in permitting him to continue to reside in Bruce, or will it, in the interests of the public, require the honourable judge to reside in the midst of those who could utilize his services?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. His residence was fixed by order in council, in accordance with the Quebec statute, at Chicoutimi.
2. Within.
3. The government is not aware that Mr. Justice Letellier resides elsewhere than at Chicoutimi, but the attention of the honourable judge will be drawn to this question.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT PASPEBIAC.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Was Mr. Notary Beauchesne, of Paspebiac, county of Bonaventure, dismissed as collector of customs, who has been collector at the same place since 1905? If so, what was the exact date?
2. For what reason and who requested his dismissal?
3. Is the collector of customs at Paspebiac, Mr. Marcil, a brother or a relative of the member for Bonaventure?
4. Who recommended the appointment of the present collector of customs at Paspebiac and on what grounds?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. P. C. Beauchesne, collector of customs at Paspebiac, Quebec, was superannuated from 15th November, 1910, on his application for retirement.
2. See answer to No. 1.
3. Thos. H. Marcil, the present collector of customs at Paspebiac, is a brother of the member of parliament for Bonaventure.
4. His appointment was recommended by the Hon. Wm. Paterson, Minister of Customs, on the grounds that the position was made vacant by the superannuation of Mr. Beauchesne.

LEASE OF LAND AT BRONTE.

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. Has the government, or the Department of Marine and Fisheries, entered into an agreement at any time with the Police Village of Bronte, in the county of Halton, for a lease of a parcel of land in said village, bounded by Lake Ontario on the south, the lands of one Joyce on the west, Chisholm street on the north and, the Twelve Mile creek on the east, for a public park or playgrounds?
2. Has a lease for such purpose been at any time drafted?
3. Has such lease been executed by the government and the trustees of said village?
4. If not, is it intended to have such lease completed? If not, why not?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. No.
4. This is receiving consideration.

Mr. LAVALLEE.

MR. J. F. THERRIEN.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has J. F. Therrien, Inland Revenue Officer of Nicolet, P.Q., been dismissed?
2. If so, on what grounds and at whose request?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Mr. J. F. Therrien, Assistant Inspector of Weights and Measures, residing at Nicolet, has been dismissed.
2. His dismissal was on the grounds of political partisanship, and was the result of charges brought against him by the member for the riding of Nicolet.

IMMIGRATION FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. TURRIFF. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), and to make the question plain it will be necessary for me to read a letter:

Winnipeg, February 12, 1912.
Re Wm. Pearson Co., Ltd.

As you are no doubt aware, the above mentioned company, of which I am vice-president, is conducting an extensive colonization business. During the years 1910 and 1911 we have paid out in actual cash something in excess of $600,000 in the business of bringing in settlers, and we have met with a large measure of success. During the past year we have sold some 60,000 acres in quarter and half sections to actual settlers, and we will have three train loads of settlers effects coming in this spring to settle on the lands disposed of last season.

Naturally the attitude of the Dominion government towards American immigration is of great importance to us, in view of the fact that we have still some 200,000 acres to settle.

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg to say to the hon. member that it is not permissible to bring in documents of a controversial character like that, and read them in the House for the purpose of founding a question upon them. I gave that ruling only yesterday.

Mr. ROGERS. It is all right.

Mr. TURRIFF. I submitted this to the Minister of the Interior, and it is necessary to make public the information in order to let the minister know——

Mr. SPEAKER. I have only to say that the ruling I gave is in accordance with the rules of he House.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is not a controversial matter; there is nothing of controversy in it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

NAPIERVILLE POST OFFICE SITE.

Mr. R. LANCTOT (Laprairie) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the hon. Min-

ister of Public Works if he has given instructions to the Justice Department to pay Mr. Pierre Bourgeois, of Napierville, for the land bought from him last summer, as a site for a public building.

Mr. MONK (Translation.) Does the hon. member ask me if the department has given orders to begin the construction of a public building at Napierville?

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation) No, order to pay the land bought by the government during last summer for this building.

Mr. MONK (Translation.) My department is just looking after the settlement of this part of the transaction conerning the land, and I think there is something left over; the transaction is not yet completed.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation.) Here is the answer which the hon. minister gave on 1st of February:

Mr. MONK (Translation.) The information which I have given to the hon. member, is the one which has been furnished by the officers of my department. I think that this business has been sent over to the Justice Department. I will make inquiries, and I will be afterwards in position to inform the hon. member.

This question has been, I think, delayed long enough. The cheque has been sent at Napierville since many months, and I think that in justice the Department of Public Works should pay that land immediately.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I have already ruled, the introduction of any controversial matter to be read in the House for the purpose of basing a question on it at this stage is against the rules of the House. An infraction of that rule cannot be tolerated on the plea of asking a question. I call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Lanctot) to that rule. I trust that the hon. member, speaking in a language with which he thinks I am not familiar, would not assume to himself rights, which under other circumstances, would not be granted.

SOUTH AFRICAN BOUNTY SCRIP.

Mr. KNOWLES. I wish to ask a question of the Minister of the Interior, and also to call his attention to what I think is a matter of grave importance. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman when we may expect to know the action of the government in respect to the South African Volunteer Bounty Act and to call his attention to the fact that his delay is causing a great deal of inconvenience and suspense to the people who are waiting the decision of the government with respect to the extension of the South African Bounty Scrip.

Mr. ROGERS. I am fully conscious of the delay that has taken place and I hope to be able to bring the Bill down early next week.

IMMIGRATION FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. TURRIFF. I wish to put a question to the Minister of the Interior. It is generally reported through the American press that the present government is opposed to American immigrants coming into Canada, and that report has been circulated in a manner to do a great deal of harm to Canadian interests.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member is quite out of order in trying to discuss a question like that at this stage, or to place before the House any subject that may be of controversial character, and which may lead to discussion.

Mr. TURRIFF. I shall not transgress any further, but I think I am entitled to ask a question, and I want to ask whether the government is opposed to immigrants coming in from the United States. I could have put the matter a great deal plainer, if I had been allowed to explain it a little.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. ROGERS. This is a very important question and in case it might be misunderstood, I hope I will be allowed to answer the question put by my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) I may say in the first place that I regret to learn from him that the American newspapers have given expression to the statement that this government is opposed to American immigrants coming into Canada. We want to get as many settlers from the United States as we can, believing as we do, Mr. Speaker, that we will get a class of immigrants from the United States who will make highly desirable settlers in this country, because, as we know, they have a knowledge of the conditions prevailing here. I want to say to my hon. friend that we will continue in that course in the hope that we may bring about a very large immigration from the United States, feeling as we do that these immigrants will better their conditions in this country as have those who have already come to us.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Post Office Act by providing—

(a) for the temporary employment of railway mail clerks for a period of not more than

one year, at a salary of $500 and mileage allowance;

(b) for the appointment of temporary railway mail clerks as permanent clerks, with salaries not exceeding that which they received as such temporary clerks, but who shall not be eligible for an increase of salary until they have passed the necessary examination. —Mr. Pelletier.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. PELLETIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 105) to amend the Post Office Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act by—

(a) changing the classification of the clerks in the city post offices, offices of the post office inspectors, office of superintendent of railway mail service, and in the money order exchange offices by abolishing the stampers and sorters class and fourth-class clerkships, and substituting therefor third-class clerkships, ranging from $500 to $1,000, and divided into two classes known as third-class 'A' and 'B.'

(b) abolishing the junior and senior second-class clerkships and substituting therefor classes 'A' and 'B' of the second-class, and increasing the maximum of the class formerly known as junior second, and now known as class 'B,' to $1,200, and increasing the maximum of class 'A,' corresponding with the former senior second-class, to $1,400.

(c) dividing the first-class clerkships into division 'A' and 'B' with maximum salaries of $1,800 and $1,600, respectively, and increasing the minimum of the first-class clerkships from $1,200 to $1,400, and creating a new class of clerks, to be known as chief clerks, in the city post offices, subject to certan restrictions;

(d) improving the position of office superintendent in city offices, and changing what was formerly a fixed salary of $1,800 to a minimum of $1,800 and a maximum of $2,500;

(e) providing for the employment of temporary clerks in the above named offices for a period of not more than one year, at a fixed salary of $500, and temporary helpers to meet the exigencies of the service at a salary not exceeding $2.50 a day;

(f) increasing the salaries of certain inspectors, assistant inspectors and superintendents of railway mail service in recognition of years of service;

(g) increasing the minimum of the salaries of inspectors and superintendents of the railway mail service from $1,600 to $1,800.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. PELLETIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I ask the Postmaster General if he would be kind enough to have prepared a tabulated statement showing the number of offices affected, the number of employees and the amount involved annually by the changes which are brought about by this legislation? At first sight I am quite favourable to the principle, but I would like to see a tabulated statement showing the number of offices and the amount involved by this legislation. I think the minister will find in the department forms covering that information because formerly, when similar legislation was introduced, tabulated statements were furnished.

Mr. PELLETIER. I have had a memorandum prepared for my own information and when the matter is taken up in the committee I will be pleased to supply the information.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I just want the figures with reference to the various classes affected.

Mr. PELLETIER. I am afraid that it might take some little time. I might let the hon. gentleman have my copy.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the minister will send me his copy I will be very glad.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE GRAIN ACT.

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

On section 46:—fees for examination.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is a clause upon which there was a little discussion and it was allowed to stand over. After looking into it I cannot see any way of making a change in it that would be more satisfactory. There are eight or ten examiners, there are not many who go up for examination, the maximum fee is $20 and with travelling expenses, secretarial fees and whatever is necessary there is not much left to be distributed and these examiners get nothing else except what they get from fees. There are no statistics in the department with reference to the matter at all. It is arranged by themselves and as far as I know there has never been any complaint in regard to it.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is responsible for the Bill and its amendment and I would not delay the committee at all to discuss this provision further than to state that I entirely disagree with the position he takes and I think that what has occurred in the past and the fact that there is no information about it in the

department is no evidence as to what course should be pursued in the future.

Section agreed to.

On section 48, subsection 3:—standards.

Mr. OLIVER. In section 48 there was a subclause added. We had a subsequent discussion on that subclause. Has the minister reached any further conclusion in regard to it or does he still stand by the subsection?

Mr. FOSTER I think there was an addition made to that clause.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, there was an addition, but I called the minister's attention to the fact that it was possible that the addition had been made under some misapprehension and I asked for his further consideration on it. The point considered under this section was that the grade established by the standards board would be subject to approval by the commissioners. These grades are fixed by a board of experts and then their decision is made subject by this provision to review by the Board of Commissioners who are not experts.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I gave further consideration to that and probably under the circumstances it is best to leave it with the standards boards itself.

Mr. OLIVER. I would think so.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will move to strike out subclause 2 of that section.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 80,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We made an adition to that clause, adding a third to the two already existing exceptions to the general rule. Further investigation shows that the number of cases of that kind so far have been very few, and there is a possibility that if the person who is receiving the grain, having bought it some time before, finds that the price has gone down in the meantime, there is an incentive to raise the question and to try to get out of his obligations. I therefore move that section 80 be reconsidered, and that the amendments placed there the other day be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 91,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Section 91 now reads:

All grain produced in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and in the Northwest Territories, passing through the Winnipeg district en route to points to the east thereof shall be inspected.

There seems to be no reason why the words 'en route to points to the east thereof' should be considered in that section. All grain has to be inspected which passes through the Winnipeg district. It may be routed to Fort William or any point in Eastern Canada, but it may also be routed south, or, when the Hudson Bay railway is opened up, it may be routed north. I move that these words be struck out.

Mr. OLIVER. Where is the grain inspected, that goes by the Great Northern line from southern Manitoba to Duluth.?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). At Duluth, by one of our inspectors.

Mr. OLIVER. Does not all this grain originate in the Winnipeg district, and it passes out of the Winnipeg district.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Where does the Winnipeg district extend to?

Mr. OLIVER. It is indefinite, but it certainly extends just as far as Portage la Prairie.

On section 96—regulations as to binning and cleaning,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I move that the following be added as subclause 2:

2. In any terminal elevator where facilities do not exist to permit of the inspecting officer securing proper samples of grain which is being shipped from such elevator, the board may order the warehouseman of such elevator to immediately supply such additional facilities as in its judgment will secure the desired results. Any terminal warehouse man neglecting to comply within thirty days with the order of the board as aforesaid shall be guilty of an offence and punishable upon summary conviction with a fine of not less than five hundred dollars for each such offence.

In some elevators the light is so defective that the inspector is unable to obtain a good view of the grain as it passes. He has to reach away down in a rather dark place to take his sample, and while he is doing that things may happen. This provision simply lays on the warehouseman the duty of providing fair facilities for the inspection, and imposes upon him a penalty if he does not comply with the request of the board.

Mr. OLIVER. The amendment is probably necessary, but it is fairly long and cumbersome. Would the minister have any objection to let it stand until we have the opportunity of seeing it in print tomorrow?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Not at all.

Motion allowed to stand.

On section 104—offices in Winnipeg,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). For some time past there has been a demand more or less strong, and gradually growing more strong, for the establishment of a grain survey in the Calgary district; and in view of its geographical position and of the outlet to the west at the head of which Calgary stands, it is proposed to make provision in the Act for the establishment of a Survey Board and for placing Calgary in that respect in the same position as Winnipeg in the eastern part of the western division. Therefore, I move that the following section be added immediately after clause 104:

104A. An additional Survey Board shall be established appointed for the District of Calgary in the western inspection division, with such powers and under such special regulations and restrictions as the board may from time to time determine.

2. The said Survey Board shall consist of six persons, to be nominated by the Board of Trade of the city of Calgary, the competency of the persons so nominated to be approved by the board.

3. The provisions of section 101, subsection 3 of section 102 and section 103 of this Act shall apply to any such Survey Board.

I propose to move this, and then allow it to stand for the consideration of the committee. It involves looking into some sections, and it involves an amendment to another section which I intend to introduce.

Mr. OLIVER. I would ask the minister to take into consideration the advisability of distributing to some degree the right of nomination to this board. I do not wish at this moment to suggest anything definite; but I think that in the case of the standard board certain other important and responsible bodies are given the right of nomination. I think it would be well to apply that principle to this Survey Board at Calgary.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have paid some attention to that, discussing the matter with my officers. The governments practically of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, had the right of nominating one half the Survey Board as it at present exists. The question that my hon. friend has raised is, as to whether similar procedure should not be carried out with reference to the Calgary board.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). As a matter of fact that portion of it which was thought to distribute the nomination of the different provinces in conjunction with the Winnipeg Board of Trade, has practically operated to no advantage, the result being that in the process of working out, those from a distance never attended, and it has practically been the work of the nominees from the Winnipeg Board of Trade. Whether or not the same machinery should be created for the purpose of lying there inoperative, was the question that I considered, and concluded that it would be as well to put the power where there would be an active, personal ready responsibility. However, we can discuss that question when we come to it later.

Mr. NEELY. Would that mean that all grain going east of Calgary as well as grain going west, would be inspected at Calgary?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is inspected in Calgary now.

Mr. OLIVER. Grain going west?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. By government inspectors? I wanted to ask the minister if he would take into consideration the question of amplifying this amendment so that it would if necessary operate in other places. It is not necessary to describe Calgary, or any other town, at present, in the Act, to recognize the principle that it is possibly in the development of trade to have one not only at Calgary, as it seems now, but at other points from where, in course of time, the grain may eventually be found to be moving in large quantities. I would ask the minister to take into consideration the drafting of a clause such as this: That the board and the Governor in Council, if sometimes they found the necessity to arise, may have power to establish at other places what we are in the Act proposing to do and establish at Calgary. In this way every precaution would be provided. The Governor in Council would have to approve of it, and the board, and there would then be permanency in our legislation, and we would not have to go back to parliament any time a change was suggested.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). At present my hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) will recollect that the Act gives power to the board to make subdivisions within the inspection division if they wish. At the present time it would seem as though Calgary were the important point, and the only very important point, requiring this. The time may not be very long distant when Edmonton may be a city which stands at the opening of an avenue of grain to the Pacific coast through the new railway when it is completed. But parliament always meets once a year, and it is probably just as well for parliament to pass upon important matters of that kind. In any case if the board should come to the conclusion that a subdistrict was necessary

within the inspection division for inspection purposes that could be done. Of course other points, and similar requirements, could not be arranged without special legislation We have discussed that matter pretty fully, and I think at the present time this legislation will be all that is necessary.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it proposed to make provision for constituting Calgary an order point?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will come to that a little later.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would ask the minister if within the subdivisions the grain is already inspected and gets the regular government certificate as to its grade the same as at Winnipeg?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If a subdivision was made and a district constituted, it would then carry with it the inspection of the grain, and the inspection of the grain would carry with it the grade. But my hon. friend will see that it is inadvisable to amplify this unless there is some real necessity for it for various reasons.

Section allowed to stand.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We now come to the matter of the standards which were left off the other day. In section 105 some changes were made in the definitions under oats, barley and peas. That necessitated the placing of a clause in section 105 to prevent confusion as between the time of the passing of this Act and the first of next season. The law clerk has looked over the amendment which was proposed and has come to the conclusion that it does not quite meet the case and is not quite in legal phraseology, and he has drawn a clause which I will move to substitute for subsection 2 of clause 105. It reads:

2. This section shall not come into force until the 1st day of September, one thousand nine hundred and twelve, and until the said date such provisions of the Acts mentioned in section 247 of this Act as relate to matters dealt with by this section shall continue in force.

That I suppose is plain enough. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) want this to stand as well or shall we substitute it?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it would be as well to let it stand.

Section allowed to stand.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). In the case of section 107 the same remark applies and the same procedure will be carried out —the clause prepared by the law clerk will be substituted. I move to substitute it for the present standing subsection 2. The clause reads as follows:

2. This section shall not come into force until the 1st day of September, one thousand nine hundred and twelve, and until the said date such provisions of the Acts mentioned in section 247 of this Act as relate to matters dealt with by this section shall continue in force.

Section allowed to stand.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We next come to the matter of changing the names of the grades, which was pretty fully discussed in committee on a previous occasion. Two things are apparent—that the committee is not all agreed upon either one or the other names. The proposition I made was to eliminate 'Manitoba' and substitute the words either 'Canada' or 'Canada Western'. I have not particularly changed my views with reference to it. But I never like trouble in the family, and some of the younger members of the family are very tenacious of the old name. I do not like to inflict any unnecessary pain upon good members of the family by withdrawing from them a name which has been dear to them from their youth up. They seem to have been cradled on Manitoba wheat, brought up on Manitoba Hard or No. 1 Northern, and it has gone to the very root and fibre of their being. I am not so hard hearted as to try to pull it up. However, there is another consideration that has been presented to me that although it would not make much confusion in the matter of wheat. I am told by exporters of flour that to change the name from 'Manitoba' might have a far-reaching effect in the matter of flour, it would not have so much effect in respect of wheat. The flour which is made from wheat is sold in countries to which it is exported under 'Manitoba' of different grades, and the fear has been expressed by large exporters of flour that some confusion and possibly loss might ensue if the names were changed. Under these considerations I think it would be just as well for us to leave the matter stand as at present.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to all the different grades?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, so far as wheat is concerned.

Mr. OLIVER. I hope the committee will pardon me for saying that I think this is a case where second thoughts are not the best. I think the committee came practically to a certain conclusion on the previous occasion. The committee accepted the minster's suggestion, but added somewhat to it; it was the suggestion, at any rate, upon which the majority of the committee would have agreed, I think. I would strongly urge that if there is any difficulty about changing these names

that difficulty will increase year after year, and not diminish. There is no doubt at all that the names at present are an anomaly I venture to express the opinion that the reason given by the exporters of flour has absolutely no foundation. They are at liberty to call their flour by whatever name they please; as a matter of fact any change we would make in this Grain Act would not prevent them from doing so still. I cannot think that there is any warrant for their position in this matter. They would be, by all the laws of right and reason and morality, perfectly entitled to name their flour 'Manitoba', although it was made from northwestern wheat, or wheat that carried the name 'Canada Western.' They would surely have just as much warrant in giving their flour the name 'Manitoba' as they have to-day in giving their flour that name, although the wheat from which it is made never saw Manitoba. I presume that is exactly what is done. We will suppose that flour ground at Moosejaw carries the name 'Manitoba' but it never saw Manitoba. There is in that no moral wrong, that I know of. There is a certain quality expressed by the name, and that quality would be expressed by the same name just as well, though the wheat was marketed under a different name. I would urge this upon the minister, who I am sure takes a deep interest in this Bill, and I have no doubt he is taking a pardonable pride from his connection with it. But there are many others of us also who feel an interest in having legislation passed in such a shape that it would reflect credit upon us, and not condemn our judgment, not to say our common sense, if we allowed legislation to go through that, on the face of it, was not reasonable, and did not convey the idea that it purported to convey. Particularly is that the case now when we are submitting a new Act such as this, and under existing conditions it would be scarcely creditable to us if we did not, at as early a stage as possible, correct the anomaly that I have mentioned. We have no fault to find with those who in the first place gave these names to those grades, but conditions have changed since that time.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to emphasize if possible the line of argument taken by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). Whatever difficulties exist now must become greater and greater each year as the proportion of wheat grown in Manitoba to the total wheat grown in the three prairie provinces, becomes less and less. I am sure the members for Manitoba will realize that we are not asking anything unreasonable. We are not asking for a name that will designate Saskatchewan as the producer of that wheat, or designate Alberta as the producer; we are only asking for a name that will be as satisfactory to Manitoba as to the other two provinces. Since this matter was up for discussion the other day I have had an opportunity of talking with a member of a large milling concern, and he says that if the change is made as proposed by the minister, that is, to bracket the former name, with that protection the millers cannot suffer any injustice. I am sure that if this name is not changed at the present time, it will be a continual source of more or less irritation, it cannot be otherwise As the hon. member for Edmonton says, we are revising this Bill from one end to the other and we ought now to make this change, especially as we are not suggesting anything that anybody in Manitoba would have any good ground to object to.

Mr. KNOWLES. I thought it was settled the other day that we were going to change the name, the understanding being that we should adopt the name of either 'Canada Western' or 'Canada.' I am more strongly of the opinion that the time has come to change the name than I ever was. The other day the minister was not able to see any reason why the Act should not be amended in this particular, and I will say without flattery, that he has, I think endeavoured to be reasonable in this Bill and to do what the committee thinks best.

I think he will agree with me that it is the only practical thing to do, that the name should be changed and that the time is opportune for changing it. I question very much if the minister has changed his opinion. The only reason that he has given us is that he has light on the question different from what he had before with regard to millers giving a name or designation to their flour that they supply to the world's markets. As a matter of fact they call their flour by different names but the word 'Manitoba' does not appear in connection with it. Amongst the most famous brands of flour that I know are the 'Purity Flour,' 'Five Roses Flour,' and 'Robin Hood Flour.' These three, and the greatest of these is Robin Hood, which, everybody knows, is made at Moosejaw, these brands are known all over the world. I never heard of any well-known flour that has the name 'Manitoba' associated with it at all. As my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has said, they can still, especially in the foreign markets, call their flour by any name they like; they can call it Manitoba, or Saskatchewan or any other name. But, the point remains that the name 'Manitoba' is not a proper name, it is not suitable, it is not just. Manitoba at present raises only a small proportion of the wheat that is grown on the prairies. I do not think an argument can be made out by hon. gentlemen

from that province for the continuation of the name 'Manitoba.' I appreciate the view which the minister took in the first instance, and I do not appreciate the view which he expressed this afternoon. He says that the change is due to the expression of views which he has had from members of his family. I can realize that the members of his family, especially those who come from the province of Manitoba, are quite capable of expressing their views, because I know that they are not notorious for hiding their light under a bushel. I am afraid that the change is due to the fact that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) has been able to influence the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am on the side of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I want to uphold his hands, I think he held the right view and that he holds the right view still, but that he was influenced by the Minister of the Interior. I can see his fine Italian hand in the matter and I have no doubt that he and the gentleman at his back from that province have been able to exert sufficient influence to cause the Minister of Trade and Commerce to change his mind and to adopt the suggestion that the name 'Manitoba' be retained. I can quite appreciate the views held by hon. gentlemen from Manitoba; I suppose that if I came from Manitoba I would hold the same views, but I think that, taking an impartial view of the merits of the case, the view expressed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and practically agreed to by hon. gentlemen from Manitoba the other day, is the view which should still prevail, and therefore I beg to move:

That section 107 be amended by striking out, in line 18, the word 'Manitoba' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Canada Western.'

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this question the other day, and I said then that the wheat that was grown in southern Manitoba was the best wheat in the world. Some hon. gentleman took exception to that. I looked up the proof in the meantime and I wish to give the evidence in connection with this matter. We had Dr. C. E. Saunders giving his evidence in the Agricultural Committee in 1910 and on that occasion he said:

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. What reason do you give for the quality of wheat in Manitoba being better than the quality in other districts?—A. A more favourable ripening season; warmer weather.

Q. Superior to Saskatchewan?—A. Yes, I think, from my baking tests.

These were actual tests in baking.

Q. If you were a miller would you pay more for Manitoba wheat than Saskatchewan wheat? A. I think probably I should be willing to pay a little more especially in an unfavourable season, provided the Manitoba wheat was of the same grade and equally good in appearance.

Here we have the statement of the best qualified man we have in Canada, a man who has gone into this question fully and made actual tests by baking the flour, and his evidence goes to show conclusively that the wheat coming from southern Manitoba is the best wheat grown in the world to-day. As for this change that is proposed by my good friends from the west from 'Manitoba' to 'Western' or 'Canada' wheat, as far as 'Canada' wheat is concerned, I do not think we should consider that for a moment, and as far as making it 'Western' wheat is concerned, I do not think we should consider that either, because, as I stated the other day, Manitoba was the first province to go into the growing of wheat in western Canada, and I think that Manitoba is entitled to have the name of the wheat remain as it is.

Mr. KNOWLES. Why has she any more right than the rest?

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Because the name is there and it is established all over the world. There is no reason for the change.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman surely will not say that because a person has had a favour he is entitled to a continuance of that favour?

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). It is not a favour at all; it is a name that is established all over the world, and why change it?

Mr. KNOWLES. We might let you keep it if you said it was a favour, but when you say that you have a right to it, that is different.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the grain grown in southern Manitoba is the best that is grown, how does my hon. friend account for the fact that last year, when there was a prize given of $1,000 in cash for the best wheat, the wheat that won that prize was produced not in southern Manitoba and not in southern Saskatchewan, but in the more northern portion of the province of Saskatchewan. I have no doubt but that you can take samples of wheat from southern Manitoba, which grows fine wheat—I cannot complain of the quality of wheat in southern Manitoba—compare that with wheat from some parts of Saskatchewan and the Manitoba wheat may be found to be better. But what I claim is that wheat on the average grown throughout southern Manitoba is not any better than wheat grown throughout southern Saskatchewan, because it is practically the same class of wheat, and I know as a matter of fact that the millers, who are better judges than

anybody else, keep their analysts there every day to test every car load of wheat having reference to where it comes from, and they say that the wheat of southern Saskatchewan is equal in every respect to wheat from any other part of the west. A great many portions of northern Saskatchewan also produce equally as good wheat for milling purposes; so that the claim that Manitoba wheat is better cannot be made good if you go to the men who buy wheat for grinding purposes and pay for it, because they pay just as much for wheat grown west of Manitoba as they do for wheat grown in Manitoba.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). The hon. gentleman asked me how I accounted for wheat in Saskatchewan winning the thousand dollar prize. That brings us to the question of the grading of wheat in western Canada, and, in my humble opinion, the grading of wheat in western Canada is on a wrong basis.

I consider that all wheat should be tested, and graded according to the test, and that the system should not be as it is at the present time. In the grading rooms in Winnipeg, you find a long table with hundreds of samples, and they will look at each sample and they will grade it according to its appearance as No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 and so on, while, as a matter of fact, if you would test each of these samples, as has been done in some cases, you would very often find that No. 3 would make just as good flour, as No. 1 or No. 2. I consider that the system should be changed, and the wheat graded according to actual tests.

Mr. BLAIN. When the matter was considered before by the committee, I expressed myself in favour of the change proposed by the minister to call it 'Canada Wheat.' I still hold the same opinion, but I have strong objections to the proposition of my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) because that name would make the distinction between one part of Canada and the other even more pronounced than the original name 'Manitoba.' I say this for fear I may be misunderstood. If the alternative is between calling it 'Canada West' or 'Manitoba' for my part I would prefer to make no change and all the more so because the name 'Manitoba' has earned a distinction in the markets of the world for which the Province of Manitoba is entitled to credit.

Mr. ROBB. When the question was before the committee at its last sitting, I took the position that the word 'Manitoba' should remain. I am glad to know that the minister has repented and decided that he is not going to unduly interfere with the trade of Canada in the markets of the world by changing the name from 'Manitoba.' It is quite reasonable that our friends in Alberta and Saskatchewan should each stand up for the name which concerns his particular province, but I trust these hon. gentlemen will take a wider view of the question. Remember, that Canada has built up a large trade throughout the world on the word 'Manitoba' not only in wheat but in flour.

We might in this respect, take a leaf out of the book of our American friends under whose system all the wheat grown in the hard wheat belt of the United States northwest is practically recognized on the markets of the world as 'Duluth.' The mills in Minneapolis and Duluth grind millions of bushels of Kansas wheat, but they ship that flour out branded 'Minnesota,' and they do that because that name has earned a world-wide reputation. In the same way the word 'Manitoba' on our wheat to-day is worth millions of dollars to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. These other provinces will gain nothing by changing that name. Manitoba has a reputation in the wheat markets of the world, and it is worth more to the province of Saskatchewan than it is to the province of Manitoba, because Saskatchewan now produces more wheat than the older province. The hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) made reference to the methods of inspecting wheat which he thought were wrong, and he gave as an instance that No. 3 wheat sometimes made better flour than No. 1, but he did not tell the House that No. 3 did not make as much flour as No. 1, and in that respect the grading is not too far wrong. I am glad the minister has decided not to interfere with the trade and commerce of the country by changing the name of our wheat. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) told us of a conversation he had with one of the large millers who said to him that our trade would not suffer any if the name were changed. Well, I have had conversations with large millers, and they expressed the opinion that if the government unduly interfered with the business of the country in attempting to change this name, there would be a great loss to the whole Dominion, and I fancy that the opinion of these millers has had something to do with the change of heart which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has experienced.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) stated that we had practically agreed at the last sitting of the committee that we should change the name.

Mr. TURRIFF. No.

Mr. STAPLES. Well, the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) certainly did make that statement.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no recollection of having made it.

Mr. STAPLES. My recollection is that nearly every man who spoke on the opposite side of the House stated that we on this side were agreed to change the name.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to say right here now that I absolve the hon. member (Mr. Staples) from having agreed, because I remember very distinctly his request for a different name.

Mr. STAPLES. That is just the point I want to come to, because I thought the hon. member (Mr. Oliver), had me in his mind when he made that statement. I was very careful to say that in case of a change I would prefer the name 'Prairie,' and I agreed to that only on condition that the word 'Manitoba' was to be changed at all. Of course, I would rather have the word 'Manitoba' remain. The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb), who is a practical miller, has told us that other millers in this country have stated to him that there would be a material commercial loss if we changed the name, and there is no doubt about that. I trust this committee will vote to retain the name 'Manitoba' which has done so much to establish throughout the world the high quality of wheat we are able to grow in Canada.

Mr. BRODER. We should consider the matter very carefully before we attempt to change this name. It is my opinion that whether you change it or not, the buyers on the markets of the world, who know the brand, will continue to call it 'Manitoba.' My advice is: let well enough alone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. We are often told that there is a broad spirit throughout the west, but some of the representatives of the west are very provincial when they get down here. The people of the other provinces were glad to call their wheat 'Manitoba Wheat' at one time, and that name has made a reputation well-deserved. Anybody who has experience of the markets of England, knows that there is great danger in changing a trade-mark, if that trade-mark has been satisfactory to the market, and that applies to wheat as it does to anything else. I believe we should retain the name 'Manitoba Hard' until we find something better.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Broder), has told us that no matter what name we apply to this wheat the millers will continue to call it by the present name.

Mr. BRODER. The change of the name would lead to confusion.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think so, there is no confusion when they grind Kansas wheat and call it 'Duluth,' and the hon. member (Mr. Broder), has said that the millers give the name 'Manitoba' to wheat that never saw Manitoba.

Mr. BRODER. I did not mention a word about the millers.

Mr. OLIVER. There is one point that I want to submit to the committee to show the absolute unfairness and injustice of the use of the name 'Manitoba' as applied to wheat. The higher grades are called Manitoba; the lower grades are not called Manitoba. So far then as the name goes as an advertisement, it is a notice to the world that the only high grade wheat is grown in Manitoba, and that wheat not of a high grade comes from other provinces. That is an absolute injustice to the other provinces. I produced here the other day the market quotations in the Manitoba 'Free Press,' and in these quotations the word 'Manitoba' was not used, because it happened, the grades that would call for that name were not on the market. I would like it to be thoroughly understood that this is not a mere matter of whim or caprice; I should think it is a case in which a very serious and grave injustice is done to three-quarters of the prairie area at the demand of one-quarter. That is not legislation that should commend itself to this parliament.

Mr. HENDERSON. As I stated the other day, I am not a resident of any of the prairie provinces and, therefore, I am not prejudiced in favour of one or of the other. I can quite understand that hon. members from Alberta and Saskatchewan may be prejudiced against the use of the name 'Manitoba.' The class of wheat and flour branded as 'Manitoba' has attained a high name in the markets of the world. I simply regard this name 'Manitoba Hard' as a name for a certain kind of wheat and I do not think it has anything to do with the particular part of the country in which it is grown. I believe that the western country would lose heavily if the name is changed. I think that people in Great Britain, and even Ontario, where they ask for 'Manitoba Hard' and are sent wheat called by another name, will have their suspicions aroused and will not pay the high price for it they otherwise would. I am conservative enough to stick to the old name and I do not think it is going to injure any of the other provinces. On the contrary, I believe it will be for the general benefit of the Dominion. I am glad the Minister of Trade and Commerce has decided to leave the matter where it was, where it is, and where I hope it will remain. For example, Indian corn is called Indian corn, no matter whether it is grown in Japan, or in Asia, or in The Argentine, and the giving it of the name Indian corn does not in any way injure

the corn grown in the states of the American union. Indian corn is simply the name of a certain grain, and so it is that 'Manitoba Hard' has come to be the name of a certain species of grain, irrespective of where it is grown. We should leave it as it is and not take any chances.

Amendment (Mr. Knowles) negatived. Yeas, 38; Nays, 72.

Mr. KNOWLES. The other day there was a diversity of opinion as to whether, in case a change was made, we would adopt the term 'Canada Western' or the term 'Canada.' My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) on that occasion was so convinced that 'Canada Western' was the proper term that he made a motion to that effect. I find on page 2831 of 'Hansard':

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I move that it be amended to read 'Canada Western.'

I had an idea that the hon. gentleman's views would remain in a certain consistency for this length of time, but the Bill has been deferred longer than we expected, and his views have evidently changed. I do not know what view he would have taken if the Bill had gone over to the week end. Probably he would have come back to the view which he held on February 9. Of course, he is entitled to his views after the question had been discussed, as the minister said, in the family; and I congratulate him on the fact that the family gathered in a good sized audience without any desertions. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) the other day spoke with considerable emphasis in favour of the word 'Canada;' and hoping that he has not had the same experience as my hon. friend from Souris of getting lame in his views, I am going to move:

That section 107 be amended by striking out, in line 18, the word 'Manitoba' and inserting in place thereof the word 'Canada.'

This was the view which the hon. member for Peel held when we last discussed this matter, and I am sure he will second the motion.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not think any member on the other side besides the hon. member for Moosejaw was not aware that I stood strongly for the word 'Manitoba' and I gave my reasons. I was the first man to speak in favour of the word 'Manitoba' being retained. I am not at all fond of post mortems. I wanted a name that would designate our wheat as a western wheat, and if the word 'Manitoba' was to be changed, I was in favour of 'Western Canada' or 'Canada Western.' But first and last and all the time I was in favour of 'Manitoba' if it was possible to retain that name.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is hardly fair to myself, who promptly seconded the motion he made. I think he should in fairness have consulted his seconder before he changed his views.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That would perhaps have been more parliamentary, but I like the word 'Manitoba' better.

Committee divided on amendment of Mr. Knowles: Yeas, 31; nays, 43.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. OLIVER. I notice that the hon. member for Peel did not vote, and I would ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no ruling to make.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). With regard to barley, I move that after the word 'grain' in the 32nd line be added the words 'and shall weigh not less than 48 pounds to the bushel.'

Mr. OLIVER. I do not want to delay the committee, but I think really that in this particular case the name 'Manitoba' is so utterly preposterous that it might very well be changed. I think even the Manitoba millers would consent to that change, because Manitoba is not the barley growing part of the west; that province has no prominence in barley. Not that it makes any serious difference, but still for the sake of appearance in the Act I would respectfully suggest that a change should be made. I should think there ought to be no objection to giving it the name which was given to the oats in the immediately preceding part of the section, 'Canadian Western,' or 'Canada Western.'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This is a matter entirely for the committee so far as I am concerned. We have a general list already adopted and under that, eastern barley has been already dealt with.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This deals with nothing but barley in the western division. Perhaps my hon. friend did not think of that.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to press it, but still it seems to me really so absurd that we could afford to make the change here so as to be conforming to the oats. The oats are classed as 'Canadian Western,' and it really seems to be very proper if the barley were classed in the same way, either 'Canadian Western,' or 'Canada Western.'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Then if the committee will consider this: 'No. 1 Canada Western Barley.'

Mr. OLIVER. 'Canada Western,' I think would be better. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we make the designation 'Canada Western' in the case of both oats and barley.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is so in oats.

Mr. OLIVER. 'Canadian West,' as it is in oats.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have it changed in my notes.

Mr. ROBB. Perhaps the minister will explain to us what is the difference between the barley in the eastern division and the barley in the western division. I can see no difference, excepting in No. 4 grade, it is practically the same specifications.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I find the same weight.

Mr. ROBB. Excepting in No. 4 grade. In the eastern division it is 44 pounds and in the western 45 pounds.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am not going to change the western. I find that although I made the suggestion and marked it in my notes, that in reference to oats, the title was left 'Canadian' instead of 'Canada.' I move to substitute 'Canada' for 'Canadian.' 'Extra No. 1 Canada Western Oats,' and the same in the other divisions 1, 2 and 3.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I move the same with regard to the items under the barley schedule. 'Canada Western Barely.' I move that the word 'Manitoba' be struck out in sections 1, 2, 3 and 4, and that the words 'Canada Western' be substituted. 'No. 3 Extra Canada Western Barley' shall be in all respects the same as No. 2 barley, except in colour, weighing not less than 46 pounds to the bushel.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I propose to make a little more change in the nomenclature or description of No. 3. Instead of No. 3, I propose to substitute the following:

No. 3 Manitoba barley shall be reasonably clean and reasonably free from all other grain and shall include weather stained and slightly shrunken or sound barley free from frost, and weighing not less than 44 pounds to the bushel.

And in No. 4 after the word 'All,' insert the word 'damaged.' The damaged barley comes down then from No. 3 to No. 4, and 45 pounds becomes 44.

Mr. ROBB. Would the minister explain what barley will come under No. 4? He says: 'All damaged barley.' Supposing that barley was so wet it would not be fit to ship, would it get the grade of No. 4?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend will refer to section 115 under all grains he will see where that was dropped.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Now at the top of page 30. We are going to be consistent and move that the word 'Manitoba,' in those two sections be struck out and 'Canada Western' substituted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). With reference to the next schedule, that of flaxseed. A conference was held by all the different interests represented, the growers of flaxseed, our inspectors, and the linseed oil men who manufacture from flaxseed, and some changes were unanimously agreed upon. I will give them, if members of the committee will follow the changes. No. 1 Canada Northwestern flaxseed should be mature, sound, dry and sweet, and contain not more than twelve and a half per cent of damaged seed, and weigh not less than 51 lbs. to the bushel of commercially pure seed. That is, 51 is substituted instead of 53, the idea being that flaxseed dries out rapidly. Instead of 52 pounds substitute 50, for the same reason. Then the third paragraph will read in this way: 'No. 2 Manitoba Flaxseed,' dropping out the word 'all' beginning the clause. Then it will read:

No. 2 Manitoba flaxseed should be flaxseed which is immature, or musty, or which contains more than twenty-five per cent. of damaged seed, and is fit for warehousing, and testing not less than 47 pounds to the bushel of commercially pure seed.

Mr. TURRIFF. Would that mean that it all had to be commercially pure seed?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, it has to be commercially pure seed.

Mr. OLIVER. Would not my hon. friend make that name 'Canada Western'?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is what I proposed.

Mr. OLIVER. Would not my hon. friend consent to make the name 'Canada Western' the same as in the case of oats and barley? I think it would be better to have it uniform.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is no objection. It is suggested that the first section should read as follows: 'No. 1 Northwestern Canada flaxseed.' Then the second one to read: 'No. 2 Canada Western flaxseed.' That makes it the same as oats except the first one.

Mr. OLIVER. I thought it would be well to make them all 'Canada Western.'

There is no possible significance in the words 'Northwestern Canada.'

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The commissioner thinks that it will be very much better to keep in the word 'Northwestern' because it is very well known.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the proportion of western flax that is grown in Manitoba, and particularly Northwestern Manitoba, is infinitesimal. I do not think that Northwestern Manitoba is a flax growing country at all and I know that northern Alberta and northern Saskatchewan are not.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is a grade that is widely and well known in the United States.

Mr. OLIVER. Having assented to one absurdity there is no reason why we should not assent to another. It is only for the sake of the credit of the grade and of the Act that I call the minister's attention to it.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If absurdities get deeply rooted in the market, whatever we may think of their getting into the law, I suppose they will have to stay.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the whole of the exported product of northwestern Manitoba for one year is about one car load. There is no doubt that most of the flax grown in Manitoba is grown in southern Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It has that name no matter where it is grown.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, my hon. friend is privileged to keep the name. I would like to ask the minister the reason for making the weight so far below the standard weight of flax as stated in section 58. In section 58 the standard weight of flax is placed at 56 pounds and we are making the maximum weight under this section 51 pounds. Would the minister give us the reasons for making that difference?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The weights under these grade standards are not put according to the weights in the section to which my hon. friend has referred: The section says:

58. In contracts for the sale and delivery of any of the undermentioned articles, the bushel shall be determined by weighing, unless a bushel by measure is specially agreed upon and the weight equivalent to a bushel shall, except as hereinafter provided, be as follows:—

Barley, forty-eight pounds;
Buckwheat, forty-eight pounds;
Flax-seed, fifty-six pounds;
Indian corn, fifty-six pounds;
Oats, thirty-four pounds;
Peas, sixty pounds;
Rye, fifty-six pounds;
Wheat, sixty pounds.

Mr. OLIVER.

the present standard is 53 pounds in the first case, 52 pounds in the second and 49 in the third, all of them, as my hon. friend will see, several pounds lower than the standard. These are lowered again as the result of a conference between the different interests on account of shrinkage by drying.

Mr. OLIVER. The matter comes with particular force because with all other grains we adopt a standard for the higher qualities which is higher than the weight laid down in the Act and I am afraid it will be argued that our flax seed is inferior on account of the lighter weight allowed notwithstanding the fact that we claim it is higher. That is a claim we make with respect to other grains for the higher qualities of which we prescribe a weight heavier than the standard.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is a matter that is more technical than my knowledge goes. I find that in the Minnesota grades in the United States the same disparity exists

Mr. OLIVER. What is their maximum?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Fifty-one pounds for No. 1 North Western flax seed. The others are exactly the same weight as ours.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think it is very advisable that our standard of flax especially should not be any higher than the standard in Minneapolis.

On section 115: no grade; condemned; rejected; scoured grain,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is proposed to remodel clause 115. The remodelling of the clause really brings things into parity with that which is now, and has been for years, the practice in the inspection followed by all the inspectors. I, therefore, propose that the clause shall read:

All good grain that has an excessive moisture, being tough, damp, or wet, or otherwise unfit for warehousing, shall be entered on the inspecting officer's books as 'No Grade' with his notations as to quality and condition.

Subsection 2 stands as it is in the present Bill. It is proposed that subsection 3 shall read as follows:

All grain which is unsound, musty, dirty, smutty, sprouted, or contains a large admixture of other kinds of grain, seeds and wild oats, or from any other cause is unfit to be classed under any of the recognized grades, shall be classed as 'Rejected,' with the inspector's notations as to quality and condition.

Subsection 4 and 5 stand as they are. As this is a change which is a little radical, although in accordance exactly with

the practice of the inspection, I will move that, and let it stand for consideration.

Mr. OLIVER. When this section was considered before there was some suggestion with regard to hospital elevators, and it was suggested that some provision be made in this section. Has the minister made provision further on for preventing the mixing of good grain with inferior grain in hospital elevators?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, we will come to that in section 124.

On section 120: receipt and investigation of complaints,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The subsections there are (a), (b) and (c). It is proposed to add (d) and (e), and the purpose of the addition will be seen when I read the clauses:

(d) Of any violation of the provisions of this Act or rules or regulations in pursuance thereof.

(e) For the purpose of any such investigation, the board shall have power to summon witnesses, to administer an oath, to examine such witnesses under oath, and to compel production of all books and documents relating in any way to the matter complained of.

In the preceding investigations, it was found that they were much more difficult and in some cases, that they fell through for lack of these powers.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 124.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There was an opinion expressed against the mixing of grain in hospital elevators, and I understand the suggestion was carried so far as to say that no good grain should be taken into these hospital elevators at all. If that were done, I am told that the existence of these hospital elevators would be jeopardized, as it would leave little chance for them doing any work in seasons when there is not much damaged grain. The hospital elevator has been in existence for some years and it has given added value to a great deal of grain that would be otherwise valueless. I am informed that the hospital elevator has been caried on in a satisfactory manner so far as our officials know.

Mr. OLIVER. I am aware of the difficulty of preventing the mixing of good grain with the treated grain, once it is allowed into an hospital elevator, but, at the same time, I would urge on the minister that it is desirable to declare in the Act that such mixing shall not take place and then we would have to trust to the administration of the commission to ensure that mixing did not take place.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The Act now expressly forbids any mixing of grain in an hospital elevator.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think it is explicit in that.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto). Yes, it prohibits mixing in a terminal elevator, and a terminal elevator is interpreted to include an hospital elevator.

Mr. KNOWLES. The restriction says that hospital elevators can only be at terminal points. I can conceive that there would be a possibility that an hospital elevator might be required at some other place. There is at present an agitation for the establishment of internal storage elevators and a concomitant of this is an hospital elevator. I believe the railways are regarding, with very considerable favour, the proposition to establish these internal storage elevators at different places. This past season has shown, as never before how it would have been profitable to have internal storage elevators to take grain away from the prairies to some railway centre where it could be stored and treated. If this plan were adopted by the railways at their own expense—I am not leaving out for the present the question of the government financing such internal storage elevators—there would be a necessity for hospital elevators in connection with them. A great many prominent farmers in the west are of the opinion that this question should be taken into serious consideration by the transportation companies and the government. If we had had such a system this year it would have meant the saving of millions of dollars to the farmers of the west. I would suggest that the restriction of confining hospital elevators to terminal points be omitted. Then again, the Minister of Trade and Commerce informed me some time ago that it was possible inspection might be arranged for at different internal places, calling them subdistricts within the inspection division. It is possible for the board, with or without the concurrence of the Governor in Council, to establish machinery, at points such as Saskatoon, Brandon and Moosejaw, for instance, without coming to parliament for further authority.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). So far as it appears to me now, I see no reason in the world why an hospital elevator should not be at at any other place as well as at Fort William or Port Arthur. In any case, there is no reason why at say an important place like Calgary, which may have a large storage elevator, there should not be an hospital elevator. If internal storage elevators are to be established throughout the west, it would be of the very greatest benefit that there should be hospital elevators in connection with them. While this sec-

tion would not permit it, and while I do not see any reason why it should not be done, I will not make any change without further consideration. As to whether the board has authority to establish complete inspection districts, within inspection divisions, and to equip them as order points and the like of that, I think my hon. friend will come to the conclusion, when he studies the question, that the lesser the number of these subdivisions the better for the general working of the Act. My information is that they should be extended very conservatively and not without great public necessity.

Mr. KNOWLES. Suppose in the town of Moosejaw an internal storage elevator were to be constructed, and there would be an hospital elevator in connection with it, one of the advantages which is spoken of as being a strong one if that were done is, that the farmers would be able to get certificates showing the amount of grain they have there and the grading of it, and then be able to finance as now, when they have it in the ordinary elevators. Would this Act give power for the appointment of such necessary government officials as would grade that wheat and give such a certificate, without coming back to parliament to get the Act changed?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Sections 18 and 20 give full power to the board and the Governor in Council to establish inspection divisions for the inspection of grain, and therefore for the granting of certificates.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is satisfactory.

Mr. ROBB. The minister has promised to consider the advisability of permitting other hospital elevators throughout the country. I would point out to him that one of the functions of an hospital elevator is to remove certain small seeds from the wheat, and perhaps the best market we have for these screenings is in Montana where they feed sheep. If an hospital elevator were permitted at a point like Moosejaw, there would be a considerable saving of grain, for instead of shipping this stuff out to and back from Fort William, it could go in a direct line to the consumer south. Then again, when the Grand Trunk Pacific is ready to do business, no doubt they will have terminal elevators at Superior Junction or some point there for all their rail business in winter, and the grain may have to go into an hospital elevator for treatment, so that it would be necessary to establish one there. I would like the minister to take that into consideration.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That seems very reasonable.

On section 126, subsection 8—grades not to be mixed—

Mr. OLIVER. Should not the word 'public' be inserted in the first line of this subsection, before the word 'terminal,' so that the prohibition against mixing would apply to public elevators as well as to terminal elevators in the Western division? If there is mixing to be done, it would be done in these elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will look into that.

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

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This clause has caused a good deal of protest, and I propose to divide the section into two parts, one referring to vessels and the other to cars; because under the conditions as they are to-day, and as they probably will be, it is pretty difficult to treat the two on the same plane. I propose to add to the marginal note after the word 'receipt' the words 'to vessels.' In lines 36, 39 and 45 I propose to strike out the word 'cars' and substitute the word 'vessels.' These changes will make the clause refer entirely to vessels, and they necessitate a second clause to meet the case of the delivery into cars. I propose to make that in this way: insert for the new sub-clause 2 as marginal note the following: 'delivery of grain on return of receipt to cars.' I propose this as subclause 2:

2. Sub-clause 1 shall apply in every respect to the delivery of grain to cars upon the return of any terminal warehouse receipt, with this exception, that the owner of such receipt or the terminal elevator warehouseman shall make demand in writing upon the railway or railways to place a car or cars upon the elevator track. Should their demand not be complied with within the said twenty-four hours, they shall have the right to apply to the board, who shall thereupon investigate the case. If upon investigation it is found that the railway company is not using due diligence in providing a reasonable number of cars, the board shall thereupon so notify the railway company. Should the railway company fail to comply forthwith, the board may make application to the Board of Railway Commissioners requesting them to issue instructions ordering the said railway company to forthwith provide the necessary cars. In case a reasonable number of cars are not so furnished the railway company shall be held responsible for such extra storage as is fixed by the board and shall upon demand pay the same to the board, which shall thereupon pay it over to the owners of the terminal elevator receipt.

The board shall make such regulations for application for and delivery of cars as may seem necessary to the Board for the proper carrying out of this clause.

There is nothing in the Act at present to make it necessary that the railway company shall furnish cars upon demand

The man whose grain is stored, and who wants to take it out for shipment to the east or anywhere else, surrenders his warehouse receipt and makes demand for transport, and the cars are requisitioned by the warehouseman; but if the cars are not provided, the grain of course cannot be moved, and the storage charges remain and are to be paid by the man who wants to take out his grain, but cannot get it taken out simply because there are no cars to carry it.

Now of course if we made the legislation in this way, that upon the surrender of the certificate the warehouseman, if it be a railway, should furnish the cars necessary, or in default of that should have to pay the storage himself, it could easily be seen that a very sharp game could be played on the railway. Those surrenders might be made over and above any possible chance for the transport being carried out, consequently storage would be thrown upon the railway company. It is proposed to guard against that in this way: That the cars shall be granted forthwith to the reasonable amount that that railway can be required to place at that point, and that if the railway do not acquiesce therein and the matter is brought to the attention of the board, then the board shall apply to the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the Board of Railway Commissioners shall give its instruction according to its findings in the case. That protects the railway against anything unfair, and it gives the parties who have the grain stored here, a recourse as far as the railways can reasonably reach the demand for carriage. For the moment I will move this, and then allow these amendments to stand.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 151, country elevators and warehouses defined.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I want to make provision for seed elevators, of which I think there are two or three at present in operation. The seed elevator men want to be relieved from the obligation of storing grain, as they contend that indiscriminate storage of grain brought in interferes with their selection of seeds. I propose to add the following as 151a:

Any country elevator which is used exclusively for the purpose of receiving, preparing and shipping seed grain, which is the property of the owner or the property of such elevator, shall not be obliged to store the grain therein for any other person or persons than themselves.

'They should not be obliged,' they may if they choose. Then the following sections should apply to any such elevator, namely, 152, 153, except subsection 4, 154, 155 and 178. That brings them under the operations of the Act for statistical purposes and for bonding purposes, and for the inspection of their books. I move that addition, but as hon. gentlemen opposite would perhaps like to consider the question, I will allow it to stand.

On section 153, owners to be licensed.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The drafting of this section is objectionable, and the law clerk has given me a clause which reads better. I propose an amended clause to read as follows:

No owner or lessee of a country elevator shall receive, ship, store or handle any grain in or for such elevator unless he has first procured from the Board a license for such purpose.

Mr. KNOWLES. Are you going to leave the rest of 153 as it is?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think there is need of re-drafting there. Clause (b) says the license shall specify the name of the person owning or operating such elevator. This would give to the applicant the alternative of giving the name of either the owner or the operator of such elevator. Supposing he wanted to suppress the name of the person operating, and to give only the name of the owner, he might do so. If it is important enough to have either one given, it should be necessary that the name of the person operating should always be given. If they give the name of the person operating, that is the person who would be the licensee.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The board will have that entirely in its own option. If it wants the name of the owner it can get it.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think it ought to be obligatory to give the name of the person operating, because that is the person who would be transgressing, if anybody did.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The important matter in this section is to get the name of the person operating the elevator in the license. I do not think it matters who owns the elevator, because the lessee would be the licensee, and he must be responsible. I would suggest to strike out the words 'owning' altogether, that would make it obligatory.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will strike out the words 'owning or' in (b).

On section 159, warehouse receipts.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) proposed that subsection 4 of section 159

be struck out and suggested a substitution which appears to be very satisfactory. I would move that subsection 4 be struck out and that there be substituted therefor the following:

Notwithstanding anything in this section the owner of such grain upon payment of all lawful charges as set out in subsection 2 hereof, may at any time within 48 hours after delivery of such grain at such country elevator, or at any time before such grain is shipped to a terminal elevator, require it to be shipped to any other terminal elevator herein provided, or to any railway station of the line of the railway on which the receiving country elevator is situated or on any line connecting therewith, unless the owner of such grain waives in writing his rights under the section.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 164, shipments out of elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would move to insert after the word 'may' the words 'upon giving twenty-four hours' notice to the owner or his local agent appointed in writing.' Also to strike out the words 'at any' in line twenty-four and the word 'town' in line thirty-four, and to insert after the word 'therewith' the words 'and on the Great Northern railway.'

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I fear that subsection 4 of section 159 will conflict with section 164. You have in section 159 forty-eight hours' notice while section 164 states that he may ship it at any time on giving twenty-four hours' notice. Twenty-four hours' notice is too short to be of any service in the Northwest Territories, certainly in the portion of the country from which I come. If section 164 were made to read 'subject always to the provisions of subsection 4 of section 159,' you would have something reasonable.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I thought that clause 159 was more general, but I see that it refers to the shipper. They both appear to have about the same range. The object of the amendments in both cases is to give the owner of the grain a little longer absolute control so that if in that time he wishes to transfer it to any other place differently from the original intention, or to the far-off terminals, he shall have the privilege of a change in his mind or in conditions. Section 164 does not appear to differ very much, except that it refers chiefly to the elevator man. I think that in order to make them consistent we will have to make this 48 hours instead of 24, so that there will be no clash between the two, and it is not of so much importance to the elevator people whether it is 24 or 48 hours.

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not want to oppose this because I have no doubt it is done with the good intention of helping the owner of the grain. Personally, I cannot see how it is going to help him. I think that in the country elevators their clerical work will get all balled up if they have to give notice to the owner before they ship any grain. They are busy men, they are working where a gasolene engine is going all the time, and there is a considerable amount of noise. They remember the quotation of wheat that they get by wire every day and that is about all they keep in their heads more than running the concern. If you are going to make a rule that the elevator man has to notify the farmer 24 hours ahead of time as to what wheat is going out and that he has to post up the notice I think you will get these men into such a condition that they will not be able to do their work well. What the farmers themselves want is good service. The farmer wants to get his grain out. The one nightmare that troubles him is the difficulty of getting his wheat to the terminals. You are putting a brake on the machinery that is not necessary. Although the farmers have asked for this I cannot see why the farmers are going to object if their wheat is sent on after it has remained in the elevator 24 hours. This provision is not of very much use to the average farmer. He probably gets his mail three times a week and he may not get it as often as that. If this were simply left with the operator and were made subject to subsection 4 of section 159 it would serve the farmer fully as well. I think this other would lead to confusion and put a brake on the machinery for getting the wheat to the terminals.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). 'This other,' as my hon. friend terms it, gives a wider leeway and just as much leeway as is given by the amended section 159.

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not think the minister is correct in that.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The object of the request and the practical agreement we came to the other day with reference to it was to give to the owner of the grain, after he had put it in the elevator, a short period of control to enable him, if he wished, to direct it to some other place than that which he had in his mind when he first put his grain in there. You cannot give too much leeway in that respect; otherwise you ball up the elevator in the matter of delivering itself of the grain which is in store for others and the only way in which it can be practically worked out is to have the farmer, who does not live in the town, have somebody there to represent him. This is not a difficult matter at all. Every farmer has a friend in town. I suppose a great many of them

make the elevator man their agent or ask the agent of the railway, or some friend, to become their agent. If you insist on a letter notice, registered or otherwise, you cannot give anything that will help the farmer and at the same time be fair to the transport and elevator interests. The simplest way seems to be that you should give notice to the agent of the farmer. The farmer can easily appoint in writing a friend, the elevator man, the station agent, or any one he pleases, as his agent. The agent can be notified and he will get word to the farmer if he thinks it is right to do so. I do not think that there will be any difficulty in the matter. As to balling up the elevator men about keeping track of their operations, I think they are quite able to keep track of their operations; in fact, the general impression out there among certain classes of people seems to be that they are quite too well able.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am not aware that the elevator men claim to be experts in clerical work. I do not think the minister has studied this matter as fully as he should have done. Subsection 4 of section 159 says that in any event after the wheat is put in the elevator it will remain 48 hours, unless the right to have it held is waived in writing. In any event it stays for that time. This clause has in contemplation to leave that wheat after it has been there probably a week or a month. The effect of subsection 4 of section 159 entirely ceases after the wheat has been there 48 hours. It has no more possible effect upon that wheat. This piece of legislation would have reference to wheat that has been there a month or three months. It will work out in this way. These elevator men do not know when the cars are going to come. My hon. friends on the other side of the House who live in the west know that nobody knows when cars will come. They will wait perhaps a week, when somebody gets busy down in the superintendent's office and then cars will be shooting in at the rate of eight or ten a day.

These men want to start loading as quickly as possible and they don't want to hang up everything until they write a dozen notices and mail them and wait twenty-four hours. If the minister is going to insist upon putting this provision in I am not going to protest against it any further, but I would ask him to insert in it the provision we have in subsection 4 of section 159, so that the man may waive the right to this in writing. I believe that when the farmers once understand it they will all waive their right and let their wheat go ahead.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Under subsection 4 of section 159 the man has to put his grain in the elevator and has his certificate and in that section the privilege is given to the owner and not to the elevatorman. That provision does not compel the elevator man to keep it there for forty-eight hours.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Not at all. This is a privilege granted to the owner provided his grain still remains there for that length of time and most of it remains longer than he wants it to remain. The owner has that length of time to change the consignment of the grain. If it is not previously shipped, he has that right unless he waives it. On the other hand section 164 deals not with the owner of the grain but with the operator of the elevator whose business is to store grain and also to get it forwarded. You should put no undue shackles upon him which will hamper him in getting the grain quickly away from his elevators and to the terminals. It was thought, especially by gentlemen on the other side, that to give the elevator operator the right to immediately without any notice at all ship the grain out, in a manner not contemplated by the owner of the grain, was a little arbitrary, and that the owner of the grain ought as far as possible, and to a degree which would not interfere with free transport, be warned or notified before his grain was shipped out by the operator to the terminal elevator. Then the difficulty arose as to how you were going to give a notice to a farmer living at a distance, and it was thought that the farmer should appoint an agent near the elevator to whom the elevator man would give notice. The two sections refer to different things.

Mr. KNOWLES. I cannot agree with the interpretation the minister puts on section 159. The minister interprets it to mean that a person may ship it where he likes only if it still happens to be in the country elevator, but I think the purpose of the amendment is that it must be in that elevator forty-eight hours unless the owner has waived that right in writing. There is no question in my mind but that the amendment gives to the person forty-eight hours absolutely, and he has the right to order that grain to be sent to any of these respective places within forty-eight hours, and he has a longer time if the grain happens to be there. However, I will let it go at that.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) mean to say that the grain must remain there for forty-eight hours? What is the object of providing that the grain will have to stay there for forty-eight hours?

Mr. KNOWLES. I will state what was the idea in our minds. Suppose grain is

put in at Swift Current, and the man wants to send it to Moosejaw mills, (which before they were burned down consumed a large quantity of grain, and which, when rebuilt, will require twice as much as they formerly did) and supposing these elevator people for some reason should endeavour to prejudice the business of another mill, they can tell the man the day after the wheat was put there that it had been sent to the terminal. This provision is to prevent that occurring. The elevators are sometimes owned by those who have interests in milling concerns and this provision is intended to prevent them in any way hampering the business of their competitors if they should think of doing so.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The man who stores his grain in the elevator with the idea of consigning it to a certain place can within 48 hours change his mind and consign it to another place. If he does not make up his mind within 48 hours, and makes it up later, if his grain remains there more than 48 hours, he will still have the same right. That is all that the section seems to me to convey. It imposes no obligation on the elevator man to hold the grain after the man's car comes.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would like the minister to ask his law clerk about that. It is a question of the interpretation of a statute.

Mr. STAPLES. Why should not the farmer have the right to order his grain where he sees fit so long as it is in the elevator, on giving due notice to the operator what he intends to do with it? As a farmer I have put wheat into an elevator, and before I could turn around it was forwarded to the terminals, when I could to my material advantage direct it to some other place. When I place my wheat in the elevator, I place it under the law that governs the charges. I am charged 1¼ cents a bushel for storing it for 15 days, and after that in proportion to the time it is there, and I do not think the operator has a right to send my wheat out without giving me notice. If I happen to be 10 or 15 miles away from the elevator, and the cars come, the elevator operator has a right to be protected. He may reach me by telephone if I happen to have one, but if he has to wait until he notifies me by letter, that takes a considerable time. If I want to protect myself as a farmer, the least I can do to facilitate the forwarding of that grain is to appoint an agent in town. I think the Bill as it stands covers the ground very fully.

Mr. KNOWLES. The wheat is tied up for 48 hours. I do not think the provision makes for the speedy handling of the grain if the car comes.

Mr. KNOWLES.

Mr. STAPLES. There could be difficulty only if the elevator were full and every man had to be notified; but there is always somebody whose grain is to go out without notice. It is a very extreme case that my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I suppose the operator of an elevator is not very much surprised when a car comes to his elevator. He keeps track of his orders, and knows pretty well whether he is to have a car or a couple of cars within a certain day. It seems to me there is no hardship to be apprehended on either side from the clause as it stands.

Section agreed to.

On section 191—loading platforms, location and dimensions—

Mr. STAPLES. I asked to have this section stand. The only suggestion I wish to make is that the railway company be compelled to make their loading platforms at least 24 feet wide. I ask for this not altogether for the convenience of the farmers in loading, but also for other reasons. It is found very inconvenient to unload such machinery as threshing outfits, separators, engines, etc., onto these loading platforms which are only 18 feet wide. The railway companies do not make them any wider or longer than the Act compels them to do. Therefore I ask that the width be made 24 feet instead of 18 feet.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to hear the opinion of the committee about that. These dimensions must have been fixed as being thought to be in the main satisfactory. Perhaps some other members of the committee would state their views.

Mr. STAPLES. I can speak from practical experience.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. STAPLES. I have loaded considerable grain on a loading platform and according to the way in which they are now constructed they are only 18 feet wide. You can only approach that car by driving alongside it, consequently you must build a spout from your wagon box in the car to slide your grain over. But I also have loaded off a platform that was some 20 feet in width. I discovered that I could drive on to that platform direct my horses as I thought fit, and back up to the door, and I was right up close to my work. I also found that two or three farmers utilized that very same platform, which is 54 feet long, and they could come up and do likewise. Three or four cars can be loaded from the same platform by extending the width just as you can load one from an 18 foot platform. Now the other point is

this: When you get in heavy machinery such as threshing outfits you can unload off a flat car on to an 18 feet platform. You have got to use all kind of appliances, to get it shifted over and to run your machinery off. But if you have the 24 feet you simply cramp your front wheels when you draw it off on to the platform, and go on about your business. These are points I have in mind and I think they are worthy of a good deal of consideration.

Mr. CRUISE. As a farmer I have loaded considerable grain off the platform, and I have loaded it also off the ground, and I must agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) who has just sat down. We have had great inconvenience with our platforms in Dauphin owing to their being too narrow. We have two platforms there and when you get two cars alongside of these platforms it is almost impossible to load them at the same time, whereas if they were extended to a width of 24 feet—and you might double that, but 24 feet is sufficient—that would be wide enough to back up to the car. I believe that if a platform is made 24 feet wide, so that the farmer can back up without any trouble there will be no trouble in loading the two cars off one platform. Of course there the platform is long enough to have three, but in the case of our platforms at Dauphin they are only long enough to load two cars, and it is very hard to load two cars when your teams have to be placed sideways to the car. My hon. friend (Mr. Staples) spoke of unloading traction engines. That recalled to my mind an incident that occurred a few years ago. We were unloading engines off the car on to one of these platforms, and owing to the narrowness of the platform the engineer, when he started the engine off the flat cars on to the platform, went right over the platform with the front wheels. He broke his collar bone—in fact was very nearly killed—and was in the hospital for three or four weeks. This is certainly a very important question, and in my opinion the platform ought to be at least 24 feet wide.

Mr. ROBB. Does the hon. member from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) claim that he can load three or four cars at the same time from a 54 feet platform?

Mr. STAPLES. I say that under the present conditions we can only load one practically, but you can load two, and if the farmers were agreeable and got their cars placed in the most convenient points, three cars could be loaded off the one platform.

Mr. ROBB. Off a 54 feet platform?

Mr. STAPLES. I never measured the platform, but I would say offhand that you can certainly load two.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). To give the Board of Grain Commissioners a right to say to a railway what the dimensions of their loading platforms and sidings should be, goes a long distance. I would rather not say positively in an Act that every loading platform should be 24 feet wide. At the same time, I would like to give some leeway to advice by the board. To say that the loading platform should be of such dimensions as may be prescribed by the board goes a little too far. You put into the hands of the board absolute power to make these loading platforms any length and width they please, and cause the transporting companies to build them and pay for them. They might make it very onerous for the transportation company.

Mr. CASH. These platforms are for loading grain on the car, not for loading machinery.

Mr. STAPLES. I would not like to extend to the board the powers the minister has just mentioned. I do not want to exact too much from railway corporations, and I do not think we are asking too much when we ask them to make these platforms at least 24 feet wide.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will let 191 stand as it is; we will not get through the Bill for a few days.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to draw attention to section 169, which I think is mixed up. It mixes up both the country elevator and the flat warehouse. It reads as follows:

> Nothing in this part shall be construed as permitting the owner or operator of any country elevator to allot special bins to any buyer beyond the time allowed by the provisions of this part, or for purposes other than as stated in the provisions of this part as to flat warehouses, or shall require the owner of a flat warehouse to insure grain while in his warehouse.

Now, the provision for leasing bins in a flat warehouse provides that a farmer can have a bin in a flat warehouse for six days, and then one day to load the car, or whatever time is necessary. I was talking to one of the senators about this matter. This clause is exactly as it was in Bill Q last year, but this senator, who is pretty well posted, said that it got in by mistake. I think that clause should be separated, and the part referring to flat warehouses should go into section 185. In the first part of the clause we are dealing with country elevators, in the last part we are dealing with the insurance of wheat in the flat warehouse.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will make a note of that.

On section 207: equitable distribution of cars during car shortage,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This relates to special powers given to the warehouse commissioner under the present Act, and to be given to the board under this Bill, giving them discretion to interfere with or make other disposition of cars in certain cases which seem to call for it. The two cases in which this can now be done are, first, the case of an elevator which is in danger of collapse; and, second, where the operator of any country elevator reports in writing under oath that some portion of the grain in such elevator is heated, and that it is necessary that the grain should be shipped for treatment in order to save it. The House also passed, and the Senate has to-day passed, a Bill to extend that discretion to two other cases, one for the purpose of distributing seed grain to any point in the western division, and to other places where the grain is damp, and thereby liable to become damaged. I propose to reconstruct that clause to include the provisions of the special Act just passed and to add thereto the following subsection:

Whenever after due examination the board considers it necessary and advisable in order to relieve congestion and facilitate the dispatch of grain.

I propose to have this added to the sections in the old Act and in the special Act, giving this further discretion to the board. As this is new matter I propose to leave the section in order that it may be printed and take it up at the next sitting of the committee.

Mr. KNOWLES. Has the minister had representations from the Credit Men's Association with regard to the legislation on the distribution of cars?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We have received a large number of petitions from this association. The prayer of the petition was that in order to effect the more speedy and economical transportation of grain, and, as it alleged, with the view of opening avenues for sales to farmers who have less than car lots to dispose of, the part of the Act relating to car distribution should be suspended. We have also received many petitions contrary to that from all parts of the country, and they are still coming in. At present there is a mild bombardment of opposing petitions, filling up the vacant spaces in the Department of Trade and Commerce. Western members will realize that the legislation on car distribution is very important and the prayer of the petition in that regard is not considered by myself to be one that can be complied with. In 1902 and 1905 the legislation was undoubtedly necessary, and I do not believe that it should now be suspended; but I believe that the commission may be trusted, in the case of great congestion or of unforeseen difficulties, to grant a further distribution of cars. It is a discretion which I believe a commission conversant with the conditions and disposed to do everything they can to improve those conditions would use with wisdom and possibly with very great advantage.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am in receipt of different communications, one a night telegram from Mr. F. W. Green, secretary of the Grain Growers' Association of Saskatchewan, who says that he has received many letters from people who had signed the circular petition of the Credit Association under a misapprehension and had asked to have their names removed, but the request had been refused, and from farmers generally denouncing the Credit Association's underhand trick. Could we have a copy of the petition?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Certainly.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am glad the minister proposes to allow this clause to stand over. When he comes to consider what, if any, amendments shall be made, I hope he will bear in mind that this petition of the Canadian Credit Association is probably engineered by the elevator companies. If there is one clause in the Grain Act that has been satisfactory to the farmers of the country it is the clause governing the distribution of cars, and while there may be certain odd cases where a small farmer may have been put to some little disadvantage, generally speaking it has worked extremely well and the farmers generally engaged in growing wheat in the west are very jealous of any change being made in that clause, as they feel that if any change whatever is made, it will work to their disadvantage. I am sure that every member from the prairies has received many circulars and letters from farmers and Grain Growers' Associations all urging that on no account should any change be allowed in the clauses of the Bill relating to car distribution.

I am merely mentioning that now, so that the minister will consider very, very carefully before he decides to make any change that would give any latitude more than there is at the present time on that particular subject.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think the remarks I have just made will satisfy my hon. friend and the committee of the way in which I regard that section of the Act. I am not going to hunt around for any motive behind the petitions that have been circulated by the Credit Men's Association. Everybody has the right to petition, and these gentlemen, whoever they are, whether they are elevator men or business men—and I should scarcely be inclined to believe that it was entirely engineered by elevator men—but whether

it be so or whether it be not so, the petition will be judged by the justice of its prayer rather than by how the petition was engineered or who got the names to be signed. I am quite aware of the importance of this clause to the farmers who wish to do their own shipping in car lots, or less than car lots. At the same time, I believe that in the hands of the commission a limited discretion may be vested and that it will be found to work well in the general administration and for the purpose at which this Act is aimed—the quick and speedy transportation of grain. The matter will stand, the amendment will be printed, and I invite members on both sides of the House to think this matter out and to help us to come to what will be the best conclusion in regard to it. Now, there is one other clause that I want to put upon the record. It is in regard to the completion of the Calgary district. In order to make the amendment which I gave notice of to-day, and which is upon the records, effective, something more has to be done and we are doing that in clause 208. It is as follows:

208. In line 35 strike out the words 'east of Winnipeg.'

Subsection 6, lines 17 and 18, strike out the words 'east of Winnipeg.'

Strike out paragraph (9) and substitute therefor the following:—

2. To the extent to which any provisions of subsection 1 of this section are stated therein to apply to Winnipeg or St. Boniface, such provisions shall also, to the like extent, apply to Calgary, and in every such case wherever the words 'Winnipeg,' 'Winnipeg-St. Boniface,' or Winnipeg or St. Boniface' occur, the said subsection shall be read as if the word 'Calgary' were inserted instead of the words 'Winnipeg' or 'Winnipeg-St. Boniface,' or 'Winnipeg or St. Boniface.'

3. The provisions of subsection 1 of this section shall have effect only from the 15th day of December in any year to the first of September in the following year.

The effect of this, when enacted, will be to erect Calgary into a point of inspection with a survey board and an order point as well, and to allow it to conduct operations from there as they are conducted in Winnipeg, in the eastern part of the division.

Section allowed to stand.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Then I propose the following amendment to section 247:

Insert at commencement of clause 247 the following:—

247. 'Except as regards the matters dealt with by section 105 and section 107 of this Act.'

And add the following to the end of the clause:—

'And as regards the matters dealt with by section 105 and section 107 of this Act, the said enactments shall be repealed on the first day of September, one thousand nine hundred and twelve.'

Section allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES.

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

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, in accordance with a notice I gave the other night, I wish to discuss for a short time the question of freight rates in Canada, and more particularly as they relate to the west. I wish to point out to the House the discrimination which exists not only as regards the freight rates paid by the people in the west as compared with the rates paid by the people in the eastern part of Canada, but also the great difference there is in the freight rates in the Canadian west as compared with the rates in the American west in those states immediately to the south of the Canadian boundary line, the rates in the Canadian west being much higher than those charged in the adjoining states. This matter has been up once or twice in the House during this session, but it is a matter of such immense importance, not only to the people of the west but to the people of Canada as a whole, that I feel I am quite justified in taking up a little of the time of the House to discuss it and to show in a practical form the great difference that exists. On a previous occasion when this matter came up for discussion I was asked by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, how came it that during all these years nothing had been done either by myself or other hon. members on this side of the House, and the hon. gentlemen opposite took it for granted that no effort had been made to bring this matter before the attention of the Railway Commission until the matter was brought to the attention of that body by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane). I want to tell these hon. gentlemen such is an absolutely erroneous impression, because, in so far as I am personally concerned, many months ago I went to the Railway Commission, took statements of the difference in freight rates, put them before the member of the commission who was particularly dealing with this subject and pointed out to him, on behalf of the people I represent in Assiniboia, that I complained of every overcharge that was specified in those papers.

I left these papers with him for over a week, and he pointed out to me that this was a very large question, that it would take a great deal of information to come to a decision, that there was the Vancouver rate case already before them, and that they hoped later on they would be able to give a decision that would be satis-

factory generally. Therefore, the Chairman of the Railway Board was speaking without full knowledge of the facts, when he said that the case had not been brought to the attention of the commission until the Minister of Railways submitted it. In addition to that, I also brought this matter to the attention of Mr. Graham, the late Minister of Railways, and of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and I had the promise of Sir Wilfrid that if the matter were not dealt with before this present session—at that time he thought he would be in office still—he would end the discrimination against the west by action taken in this parliament.

Mr. STAPLES. Did the hon. gentleman ever bring up the question on the floor of the House?

Mr. TURRIFF. I brought it before the Railway Commission, where gentlemen opposite have told me time and again was the proper place to bring it. I gave Mr. Graham, then Minister of Railways, notice that I intended to bring it up last session, but the obstruction tactics of the gentlemen now in power who were bound to prevent a vote being taken on reciprocity, precluded any possibility of my carrying out my intention then.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is a poor reason.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, the hon. gentleman from Souris (Mr. Schaffner), and his friends are now in power, and I intend to show them to-night the extent of the discrimination we are suffering under in the west, and it will be for them to remedy the existing evil.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We will do it as you never did. You never brought the question before the House when your friends were in power.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am willing to admit that the late government did not do as much as they might have done, and perhaps were derelict in their duty in that respect, but they have been punished for their sins. Now that gentleman opposite are in office they have the power to give a remedy. Is there any hon. gentleman in this House who will defend the principle that the people of the western provinces should pay from fifty to one hundred, and in some cases one hundred and fifty per cent higher for the same service than is paid by the people of the east? Will any one defend that state of things in face of the testimony of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves that it costs very much less to operate the railways in the west than it does in the east. This is not a political matter; Liberal and Conservative alike have to pay the freight rates. The question is what remedy shall be applied, and in my judgment the best remedy is for this House to express the opinion that the time has come when the discrimination that exists against the west in the matter of freight rates shall be put an end to. The only thing that would justify that discrimination against the west would be if the cost of building railroads there and operating them were greater than in the east, but we have the testimony of the Canadian Pacific railway, as I have said, that the reverse is the case. I purpose to-night moving an amendment which is practically in the words of the resolution adopted by the Winnipeg Board of Trade, a body of business men largely interested in the welfare of the west, a body composed of men on both sides of politics, and that board has come to the conclusion that there should be no further discrimination against the west. I want to give credit, where credit is due, and I say here that a very large part of the information I purpose putting before the House to-night was obtained by me from the articles in the Manitoba 'Free Press' on this subject. The particular editor of the Manitoba 'Free Press' who had charge of this work, has done more in the last year to help us to get a change in these freight rates than did the late government, or this government, or the Railway Commission, or any other body. I admit, with regret, that before the publication in the 'Free Press' I did not know one-tenth of the extent of the discrimination against the west, and I do not believe that the former government, or this government, ever realized it. The man in charge of that particular work for the Manitoba 'Free Press', has I say, done more to bring about a change in the existing conditions than all the rest of us in Canada put together. Why, if the Board of Railway Commissioners had appointed one man like this gentleman on the 'Free Press' to do the work, they could get all the necessary information to enable them to take hold of the question and to deal with it. The chairman of the Railway Commission wrote to the Minister of Railways that no specific case has been brought to his attention, but if wrong-doing exists on the part of the railways, it is not necessary, and it ought not to be necessary, for some one to lay a specific complaint before that board.

The Board of Railway Commissioners is appointed for the express purpose of dealing with these matters, and in the Act appointing them they are given special powers to act on their own initiative. For such a board to say that there was any amount of wrong-doing going on, but that nobody had brought it to their attention, is to my mind only begging the question. They are there for the purpose of finding it out, and they have or

should have a staff of experts to give them the necessary information. I do not want to say anything in criticism of that board. As I have said in this House before, I believe its chairman is the best man for the position in the Dominion of Canada. There are other good men on the board. But they have been crowded with work, much of it of a trivial character. They have been kept busy by the railway companies on one pretext or another, so that they have not had time to give, or at least have not given, the attention that should have been given to the subject of freight rates.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If they have not had time, what are you censuring them for?

Mr. TURRIFF. There are plenty of good men to be engaged. How did the Manitoba 'Free Press' get all the information? I do not suppose that its chief editor had time either, but he had the common sense to hire a man who could get it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why didn't you have the common sense to advocate what you are doing now when you were on this side of the House six months ago?

Mr. TURRIFF. I did go to the Railway Commissioners six months ago, and if I sat on the other side of the House, with my friends in power, I would have brought the matter up before this time, and just as strongly and earnestly as I am doing now. This is not a matter of party politics at all There is an injustice to be rectified, and our hon. friends opposite are in a position to be able to rectify it. We on this side of the House can only bring it to their notice. But I think my hon. friend the Minister of Customs will have enough to do if he rectifies everything that is wrong in his own department. He may have trouble enough on his hands without trying to take the weight off the shoulders of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, who, I am sure, is quite able to look after his own department, and will be quite willing, when he sees the extent of the injustice, to relieve the people of the west. In order that the Board of Railway Commissioners may be enabled to handle this work, I am satisfied that that board must either be enlarged in number or be given more money and more help. They are not able, with the help they now have, to handle properly the business that comes before them. This House for the last three or four years has been placing one thing and another on the shoulders of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and I think they have more than they can do. My judgment is that the board should not be divided into an eastern and a western section. I do not think that is necessary. I have no doubt there are injustices in the matter of freight rates existing in the east as well as in the west. My view is that one of these sections should deal solely with freight matters from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and that there should be on it representatives not merely of the east or west but of both. If this parliament expects the board to do the best work that is possible, it must supply it with the necessary amount of money to enable it to engage the proper kind of staff, so that it may be able to attend to the business. Suppose it did cost $50,000 or $100,000 per annum more than it costs to-day to bring that board up to the point of efficiency, it would be the best spent money this House could vote. Why, if you take the extra rates that have been for years imposed on the people of the west over and above the rates charged in other parts of the country for the same services, you would not count it by hundreds of thousands, but by millions and tens of millions. We are not going to argue that we in the west should be given cheaper freight rates than obtain in the east; but we think the time has come when the railways should not be allowed any longer to charge more in the west than in the east for the same service, unless they can prove that it costs them more to handle the business, which I am satisfied they cannot do, because they have already proven that it costs less. Some years ago a change was made in the passenger rates. Up to four or five years ago there were different rates charged all over the country. One branch of a railway would charge one rate, and another branch a short distance away would charge a higher rate. The matter was brought up in the House, and the rates were made equal from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic ocean—a flat rate of three cents a mile. If the railways can carry passengers at the same rate in the lower provinces, the centre provinces and the western provinces, why should they not carry a ton of freight at the same rate in the western provinces as they carry it in the eastern provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would it be inconvenient for the hon. member at this stage to give us his amendment?

Mr. TURRIFF. No. I will be most pleased to do that. It is as follows:—

Moved by Mr. Turriff, seconded by Mr. Martin: That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when the government of the Dominion should, by legislation, lay down the principle that the rates to be charged by the railways in the western provinces shall not exceed those charged in Ontario and Quebec for a similar service, to a greater

extent than necessary to cover any excess there may be in the cost of operation in the west over that in Ontario and Quebec.

As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, this resolution was adopted by the Winnipeg Board of Trade, practically in its entirety. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it goes without saying that if we are to have anything like unity of feeling throughout this Dominion, if we are to have the good feeling that should exist between one end of the country and the other, you cannot possibly bring that about if the people at one end of Canada feel that every day, from the first day of January to the last day of December, they are being deliberately robbed by the railway companies charging them from 50 to 150 per cent higher freight for the same service, that is given in eastern Canada. Nobody will say for a moment that the railways are not getting a good paying price for the freight they are carrying in this part of the country. We had evidence of that when a strike occurred a year or two ago on the Grand Trunk railway in eastern Canada. That company refused, or objected, to pay the same rate of wages that was being paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. And what was their plea? That the Canadian Pacific railway had a large traffic in the west, where they got a very much higher rate of freight for the service rendered than either railway received here, and that the Grand Trunk, under those circumstances, could not really pay their men as high wages as the Canadian Pacific paid; but as soon as the railway to the west was completed, and they were able to get into that part of the country and obtain the high rates that the Canadian Pacific railway were then getting, they would be able to give their men better pay. I have not the slightest doubt that when the Grand Trunk Pacific railway is completed, that company will, if allowed, charge just as high rates of freight as the Canadian Pacific railway is getting now. And the Canadian Northern will do exactly the same thing. But it is for this House to say whether the time has come, or whether it has not, when we should lay down the principle that unless it costs the railway companies more to handle the freight and to build their lines, they should not be allowed to charge more in one part of the country than in another. We thought at one time than when the Canadian Northern commenced to operate in the west they would reduce the freight rates. Well the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific railway in some places run into the same town, from Winnipeg say, and thus we have the peculiar fact that in places where the two railways are operating the freight is higher for the same mileage in the Canadian Pacific railway. That is one of the things no man, apparently, can understand. That is one of the things, it appears to me, that the railway commission should look into and settle, without waiting for somebody to make a specific complaint. That is their duty, that is their work, that is what they were created for, and they should carry out that principle and see that there are fair and even rates in existence all over the country. Another matter that I might bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me a moment?

Mr. TURRIFF. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. gentleman tell us at what point this difference in rates becomes apparent between the east and the west?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes. If my hon. friend will just wait about five minutes I will reach that branch of my subject. There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, that we in the west have to complain of, and it is this: In the eastern part of Canada the weight for a carload on which you can get carload rates is much less than it is in the west, and, therefore, it costs the western shipper just that much more to ship his product.

Mr. COCHRANE. Can you give us the difference, what the weight is in each case?

Mr. TURRIFF. I am not sure that I can give that to-night to the hon. minister, but I will look the information up and hand it to him to-morrow. There is another matter of complaint. If a shipper here in Ottawa, for instance, wanted to ship a carload of goods to Windsor, Ontario, or Port Arthur, Ontario, or to Montreal, St. John or Halifax, he can put in one part of that carload as fifth-class goods and the other part as fourth-class goods, and then he can get that carload rate by paying on the fourth-class a carload rate on fourth-class goods. But if he ships that car one station west of Port Arthur he cannot do it; he has got to pay by the 100 pounds on the whole lot because there is not a carload of it. If he has half a carload of fourth-class goods and half a carload of fifth-class goods, and he ships to any station west of Port Arthur he has to pay by the hundred pounds and cannot take advantage of the carload rate, and pay that rate on the highest class. If he ships out of Winnipeg to Vancouver, or out of Winnipeg to Calgary, or out of Winnipeg to Port Arthur it is the same thing; he has to pay by the hundred pounds. Why should there be—and I ask the Minister of Railways to think that over—why should there be this discrimination against the west? Is there any reason for it? Is there any common sense in it? It is just simply that when the railways started out

there was but the one line, and as a matter of fact there is still but the one through-line to eastern Canada. They have practically done as they wished in spite of, or irrespective of the Board of Railway Commissioners and they have done anything and everything. They are doing just as they like to-day and they are charging us up to 150 per cent higher, for the service rendered out there, than they charge for the same service in the east. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the one way to deal with this matter is for parliament to lay down the principle enunciated in my resolution, and in future to make the railways disclose to the Board of Railway Commissioners exactly what it costs them to handle the traffic. The Interstate Commerce Commission in the United States make the statement in one of their reports that you can ascertain the cost of carrying freight on a railway as exactly as you can the cost of manufacturing nails, it is merely a matter of compelling the railway companies to give this information. In the past these companies have hedged around this matter of freight traffic, freight rates and railway operations as if it were something sacred, something mysterious that the ordinary man knew nothing about, and that nobody but one well versed in railway work could speak on, or give any statement regarding the cost of operating. But as I pointed out a few minutes ago an enterprising newspaper in the west has, by the expenditure probably of a thousand or two dollars, placed an expert at work and gathered information that has been a surprise to everybody who perused it.

Here let me read again what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company stated as to the respective cost of handling freight in the east and in the west. You will remember that a year or two ago the city of Vancouver entered a case before the Railway Commission complaining of the high tolls that were charged by the Canadian Pacific railway for carrying freight to that city. The company, in order to justify the freight tolls they were exacting, produced before the commission evidence as to how much it cost them to handle the traffic in British Columbia, and also what it cost them to handle the traffic on other parts of their road. This is the information they gave the Railway Commission:

> In the Vancouver case, which has been before the Dominion Railway Commission for a considerable time, application was made for an order by the Commission that the C.P.R. should furnish the figures of the cost of operation in each of the divisions of its system.
>
> The order was made, and the statement that has been furnished to the Commission by the C.P.R. shows that the actual cost of hauling one thousand tons of freight one mile (exclusive of interest or fixed charges) is as follows, for each division of the C.P.R. system:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Eastern division—Montreal to Chalk River, Ont., and branches | $5.45 |
> | Lake Superior division— Chalk River to Port Arthur | 3.70 |
> | Central division—Port Arthur to Swift Current, and branches | 3.73 |
> | Western division—Swift Current to Field, and branches | 4.71 |
> | Pacific division—Field to Vancouver, and branches | 7.12 |
>
> So you see, that while it costs $5.45 to carry a thousand tons of freight one mile in the province of Ontario, or the eastern part of the province as far west as Chalk River, and in the province of Quebec, it only costs about $3.75 to carry a thousand tons of freight one mile in places between Chalk River and the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. LALOR. Does the hon. gentleman think that the freight rates are higher in the west, proportionately, than they are in the older provinces?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. LALOR. I would like to read an extract of his own speech last session, in which he takes an entirely different stand. On page 105 of 'Hansard' of last session, in speaking upon freight rates, the hon. member for Assiniboia makes this statement:

> The freight rates charged by the railways in the west are practically on the same basis as the rates charged in Ontario and Quebec. I think my hon. friend will find there are as many overcharges for freight on the C.P.R. and G.T. and the C.N.R. in Quebec and Ontario as there are in the west, so that the hon. gentleman does not need to put all the blame on the west. If there is such work to be done he can commence in Ontario.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, I remember very well making that statement, as I said a while ago, I acknowledged when I began my address that I did not know more about the subject, and it was only——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is all right, I am quite willing to acknowledge when I am in the wrong, and that is more than some hon. gentlemen I am looking at are willing to do. I stated I regretted that I did not know more about the subject, and I pointed out that it was not until this expert was put at work by the Manitoba 'Free Press' that either I or anybody else had any idea of the extent of the difference in the rates that were charged. I said a little while ago that I had no doubt there were overcharges made in the east as well as in the west, and I still have no doubt. So my hon. friend who thought he was doing something very smart in reading that out was doing nothing of the kind. I had already stated that I had not realized, until this information came out from the 'Free Press,' how bad the situation was in the west.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Is the hon. gentleman sure he is right now?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, quite sure. I can assures the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), that I am right now.

Mr. COCHRANE. According to the 'Free Press'?

Mr. TURRIFF. That I am right now according to the 'Free Press,' and there has not been one railway man on the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway or one member of this government, or any member supporting them, who has been able to put their hand on one single item the 'Free Press' has brought out, and show that it was wrong, and what is more, they cannot do it. If any hon. gentleman thinks he can, it is open to him to do so. But I say now that I am right, and it is for the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), to show if he can that I am not.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman think that his resolution can have any possible effect unless he amends the Railway Act in about 25 or 30 different sections?

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, I have great respect for the legal opinion of my learned friend (Mr. Lancaster). At the same time if this House realized, as I do, that an injustice exists, and should be remedied, and if this House expresses an opinion to that effect, I have not the slightest doubt that the Railway Commission can issue an order that will remedy all these matters. The Board of Railway Commissioners have it in their power to say what the freight rates shall be, and if this House expresses an opinion, the Board of Railway Commissioners should take that stand, and should put an end at once to the existing discrimination.

Mr. LANCASTER. Notwithstanding what the Railway Act says?

Mr. TURRIFF. This parliament is in session and can amend the Railway Act if it is necessary, and my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), knows that very well. I do not think, possibly, that he is very anxious to have it amended.

The following are the rates for the first five classes of freight for corresponding mileages east and west.

—	Miles.	1st Class.	2nd Class.	3rd Class.	4th Class.	5th Class.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Montreal to Cardinal, Ont	105	0 30	0 26	0 23	0 19	0 15
Winnipeg to Carberry, Man	106	0 42	0 36	0 29	0 23	0 20
Western rate higher by		30 p.c.	27 p.c.	11 p.c.	5 p.c.	20 p.c.
Montreal to Collins Bay, Ont	181	0 36	0 32	0 27	0 23	0 18
Winnipeg to Virden, Man	181	0 57	0 48	0 39	0 30	0 27
Western rate higher by		50 p.c.	40 p.c.	33 p.c.	16 p.c.	40 p.c.
Montreal to Oshawa Junction, Ont	300	0 44	0 39	0 33	0 28	0 22
Winnipeg to Wolseley, Sask	296	0 83	0 70	0 57	0 43	0 38
Western rate higher by		82 p.c.	72 p.c.	63 p.c.	43 p.c.	64 p.c.
Montreal to Brampton, Ont	356	0 46	0 40	0 35	0 29	0 23
Winnipeg to Regina, Sask	358	0 93	0 78	0 63	0 48	0 42
Western rate higher by		98 p.c.	87 p.c.	71 p.c.	55 p.c.	74 p.c.
Montreal to Berlin, Ont	397	0 50	0 44	0 38	0 31	0 25
Winnipeg to Moosejaw, Sask	400	0 99	0 83	0 67	0 51	0 45
Western rate higher by		92 p.c.	82 p.c.	70 p.c.	55 p.c.	70 p.c.
Montreal to Stratford, Ont	423	0 52	0 46	0 39	0 33	0 26
Winnipeg to Mortlach, Sask	426	1 03	0 86	0 69	0 53	0 47
Western rate higher by		92 p.c.	80 p.c.	70 p.c.	51 p.c.	73 p.c.
Mont'l to Hyde P'k Jct., Ont	460	0 56	0 49	0 42	0 35	0 28
Winnipeg to Caplin, Sask	453	1 08	0 91	0 73	0 56	0 49
Western rate higher by		87 p.c.	79 p.c.	66 p.c.	51 p.c.	68 p.c.
Montreal to Northwood, Ont	513	0 58	0 51	0 44	0 36	0 29
Winnipeg to Swift Current	510	1 18	0 99	0 79	0 61	0 54
Western rate higher by		100 p.c.	90 p.c.	73 p.c.	61 p.c.	79 p.c.
Montreal to Windsor, Ont	556	0 58	0 51	0 44	0 35	0 29
W'p'g to Crane Lake, Sask	574	1 26	1 05	0 85	0 65	0 58
Western rate higher by		112 p.c.	100 p.c.	80 p.c.	72 p.c.	93 p.c.
Quebec to London, Ont	626	0 64	0 56	0 48	0 40	0 32
P't A.th'r to Foxw'r'n, Man	625	1 42	1 19	0 94	0 71	0 63
Western rate higher by		120 p.c.	112 p.c.	96 p.c.	77 p.c.	97 p.c.
Quebec to Coldwell, Ont	869	1 05	0 86	0 70	0 50	0 42
P't Arthur to Parkbeg, Sask	864	1 88	1 57	1 25	0 93	0 84
Western rate higher by		79 p.c.	82 p.c.	78 p.c.	86 p.c.	100 p.c.
Windsor to Jackfish, Ont	995	1 05	0 86	0 70	0 50	0 42
P't A'th'r to St. Alphege, Sask	998	2 11	1 76	1 40	1 05	0 95
Western rate higher by		101 p.c.	105 p.c.	100 p.c.	110 p.c.	126 p.c.
Quebec to Rossport, Ont	1,050	1 16	0 97	0 79	0 58	0 48
Port Arthur to Senlac, Sask	1,047	2 19	1 83	1 46	1 09	0 98
Western rate higher by		89 p.c.	89 p.c	85 p.c.	88 p.c.	104 p.c.

I ask you, Sir, I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals, I ask any hon. gentleman in this House whether he thinks that that is a reasonable condition of affairs. I ask any hon. member if he thinks it possible to have a happy and contented people when one section of the country is being robbed to that extent, because there is no other word that expresses it. That condition has existed for a long time and I ask this House if the time has not come when this matter should be remedied once and for all.

Let me give you a comparison of rates between the rates in the western prairie country and the prairie country on the south side of the line. The Canadian Pacific railway is operating on the American side just as it is on the Canadian side of the line. On the Canadian side, in connection with the Soo road, the Canadian government gave the Canadian Pacific railway a large cash subsidy to build their line from North Portal in my own constituency, up to connect with the main line a few miles from Moosejaw. On the American side of the line they received no assistance from anybody, they had to put into the line every dollar that went into it, yet the Canadian Pacific Soo line on the American side of the boundary is hauling freight for the American settlers for about two-thirds or less of what it charges the Canadian farmers on the Canadian side of the line.

Let me give you a few examples. I beg to submit a table contrasting the rates for varying distances for different classes of goods on the Canadian and American side of the line in the west.

	100 miles.	200 miles.	300 miles.	400 miles.
Implements re-shipped from Kirkella, Man., and from Fargo, N.D., carloads.				
Western Canada rates higher by	140 p.c.	55 p.c.	44 p.c.	43 p.c.
Binder twine re-shipped from Kirkella and from Fargo, carloads, each car stopped in transit to unload 10,000 lbs.				
Western Canada rates higher by	180 p.c.	100 p.c.	82 p.c.	86 p.c.
Cement Building blocks, dimension stone, carloads.				
Manitoba rates higher by	55 p.c.	44 p.c.	27 p.c.	33 p.c.
Saskatchewan rates higher by	64 p.c.	56 p.c.	36 p.c.	42 p.c.
Drain or sewer tile, building tile, fire bricks, fire clay, carloads.				
Manitoba rates higher by	118 p.c.	100 p.c.	82 p.c.	92 p.c.
Saskatchewan rates higher by	136 p.c.	112 p.c.	90 p.c.	108 p.c.

Is there any justification for that state of affairs? I feel sure that I need only call it to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals in order that he may see that this is an absolute injustice to a large section of Canada, a notable injustice that if continued is bound to cause dissatisfaction and trouble. It is so manifestly unfair that I am sure I need only bring it to his attention to have him take the matter up and have it remedied.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman want us to understand that the Railway Commission are refusing to deal with the state of affairs which he has described as such an injustice?

Mr. TURRIFF. I am not going to say that the Railway Commission have refused to decline or deal with it. My statement is simply that this state of affairs has existed for the last 10, 20 or 30 years and that the Railway Commission have not dealt with it.

But that is the proper body to deal with it and there is no doubt that it will deal with it especially if this House expresses the opinion that this is an unsatisfactory state of affairs and that it is a state of affairs that ought to be remedied without unnecessary delay. It has always been stated that the grain rates of the west were very moderate. I am free to confess again that I was under the impression that the grain rates in the west were very reasonable, but when you come to compare the grain rates we are paying in the west with the rates that are paid in Ontario and Quebec for the same service you will find how very unreasonable the western rates are. I find that we have been overcharged in the past and that we are being overcharged at the present time, and I say that that condition of affairs should be put a stop to, and that the rates should be reduced in the west to the same level as they are in the east. I have here a comparative statement showing the rates on grain in carload lots charged by the railways in the eastern part of Canada and in the west per 100 pounds:

	Rates, in cents, per 100 lbs., carload shipments.					
	100 miles.	200 miles.	300 miles.	400 miles.	500 miles.	600 miles.
Eastern rates	6c.	9c.	11c.	13c.	15c.	17c.
Rates in Manitoba	12c.	16c.	20c.	23c.	27c.	31c.
Rates in Manitoba higher than rates in Eastern Canada by	100 p. c.	78 p. c	82 p. c.	77 p. c.	80 p. c	82 d. c.

The rates in Saskatchewan are higher still as compared with the eastern rates than those in Manitoba. The rates in Saskatchewan are as follows:

Rates in Saskatchewan	13c.	17c.	21c.	25c.	30c.	34c.
Rates in Saskatchewan higher than rates in Eastern Canada by	117 p.c.	89 p.c.	90 p.c.	92 p.c.	100 p.c.	100 p.c.

Surely every one will acknowledge that this is an unsatisfactory and an unfair state of things. Now, take the rates on grain per 100 pounds in less than carload lots:

Eastern rates	9c.	14c.	17c.	20c.	23c.	26c.
Rates in Manitoba	23c.	34c.	43c.	53c.	61c.	69c.
Rates in Manitoba higher than rates in Eastern Canada by	155 p.c.	143 p.c.	153 p.c.	165 p.c.	165 p.c.	165 p.c.
Rates in Saskatchewan	25c.	37c.	47c.	57c.	67c.	79c.
Rates in Saskatchewan higher than rates in Eastern Canada by	178 p.c.	164 p.c.	176 p.c.	185 p.c.	191 p.c.	188 p.c.

Mr. BURNHAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the late government was a party to this outrageous extortion?

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) asks if the late government was a party to this. I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that the late government was a party to it. I say it is to their discredit that they did not remedy it. I will say further that it was never brought to the attention of the House. I brought it to the attention of the late Prime Minister; I asked him if he had read these statements and he said he had. He said further that it was the most damnable state of affairs that he had ever heard of and that if the matter was not remedied by the railways themselves before the House assembled after the election, if he was in power, as he expected to be then, and as I expected he would be then, he would take the matter up in the House and put an end to that state of affairs. The question of the hon. member for Peterborough was a fair question and I do not object to it. I do not believe that there was a man in Canada, except the railway people themselves, who knew how bad the state of affairs was. I am satisfied in my own mind that had my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), been in power to-day he would have remedied it, and I am satisfied that the right hon. gentleman who leads this House (Mr. Borden), with the assistance of his Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), of his genial Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), who is as much interested in this matter as any one can be, and of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), will remedy this matter now that it has been brought to his attention. I am not going to say that I have no confidence that these gentlemen will rectify this evil. I know that, as one of the supporters of the government the hon. member for Peterborough agrees with me, that it is an unfair condition; all we have to do is to bring it to the attention of these hon. gentlemen and they will rectify it, and rectify it thoroughly. I will be very much disappointed if they do not.

It has been stated by the railway people —I have heard them state it time and again—that every time they haul a train load of grain they lose money, but that they make it up on package freight. According to their statement it has been figured out that the net profit on a train

load of fifty cars from Brandon to Lake Superior is $2,674. For this result we take their own sworn figures that they have returned to the government. It is no further use for any railway company, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway, the Canadian Northern or any other, to go before the Railway Commissioners or before the government and make the statement that they are not making any money hauling grain at the present rate. There are a great many figures in this book which I hold in my hand that I am not going to give now, but there are one or two other points that I want to touch on for a moment. I have heard it stated by the railway authorities that they have to charge higher rates for the short haul than for the long haul because the cost is very much less per ton per mile for the long haul than for the short haul. Everybody who knows anything about railways realizes that. If you load up a train with goods, haul it a hundred miles and then unload it, it will cost you more per ton per mile than if you send that train 1,000 or 2,000 miles. That is the excuse the railway companies always make when they give very low through rates where they have a long haul of 1,000 or 2,000 miles. Let us see how our friends the Canadian Pacific railway have worked that business. They have just simply reversed the position and they charge the low rates for the short haul while for the long haul of the goods which come out into our country they charge high rates. I am sure that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who represent Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia are particularly interested in this matter, because thousands of carloads of goods go out from this country to the west. Let me give you some of the Canadian Pacific railway rates for the short and the long haul.

The following table shows the all-rail car load rate in cents per 100 pounds on the fifth-class freight, and shows also the same rate figured out on the per ton per mile basis and the same rate figured out for a carload, from Montreal to Port Arthur (or Fort William), from Montreal to Winnipeg, and from Montreal to each of the divisional points on the Canadian Pacific railway, west of Winnipeg as far as Calgary, Portage la Prairie and Regina, which are not divisional points, being included in the table for the sake of making the showing full and fair:

From Montreal to—	Miles.	Per 100 lbs.	Per ton per mile.	Per carload.
Port Arthur... ..	991	$ 42	·847c.	$126
Winnipeg..	1414	0 71	·976c.	213
Portage la Prairie...	1470	0 75	1·020c.	225
Brandon..	1547	0 82	1·060c.	246
Broadview..	1679	1 02	1·210c.	306
Regina..	1772	$1 04	1·17c.	$312
Moosejaw..	1813	1 07	1·180c.	321
Swift Current ..	1924	1 21	1·240c.	363
Medicine Hat. ..	2071	1 31	1·260c.	393
Calgary..	2251	1 35	1·200c.	405

It was once stated by Sir William Van Horne that as soon as the Canadian Pacific railway had their traffic properly organized, the Canadian Pacific railway would see to it that the longer the haul the cheaper the rate, but the Canadian Pacific railway has done exactly the opposite, and now the longer the haul is the greater the price per ton per mile. It was stated here the other night that the Canadian Pacific railway were anxious to lower their freight rates and that they were willing to do so, but that they could not do so because, while they could stand it, the other railways could not stand it. I want to tell the Minister of Railways and the House that on many lines of freight the Canadian Pacific railway are charging much higher rates than they charged four or five years ago. In spite of the Railway Commission and right under the nose of the Railway Commission the Canadian Pacific railway raised its freight rates in many respects. Several glaring instances of that will be found in the following table which shows how much higher the freights levied on a carload of oats—60,000 pounds—are now than they were on September 14, 1907, from the points named to Winnipeg:

From.	Sept. 14, 1907.	Present.	Increase.
Moosomin	$ 96	$108	$ 12
Regina	108	132	24
Moosejaw.	108	150	42
Swift Current..	120	186	66
Medicine Hat ..	132	222	90
Calgary	144	246	102
Red Deer	162	252	90
Strathcona... ..	168	240	72

Just imagine the farmer at Calgary, or at Red Deer, or at Edmonton, who raises a car of oats and ships it to Winnipeg, where there are hundreds and, I suppose, thousands of cars used, paying from ninety dollars to one hundred and two dollars a car more than he paid five years ago. The farmer is just bled that much extra over the rates charged five years ago. Will any one say that is a satisfactory state of affairs; will any one say that during all the years prior to the 14th September, 1907, the Canadian Pacific railway was not charging a paying rate to haul oats from Calgary, or Edmonton, or Moosejaw, to Regina or Winnipeg. Nobody would believe such a thing; everybody in the west knows that the Canadian Pacific railway were charging high rates even previous to that. Were not the old rates high enough? Certainly, they were, and the Canadian Pacific railway raised them right under the nose of the Railway Commission of Can-

ada. I say again that the Railway Commission has apparently not been able to handle their work. They have too much work to do, and what they want is a man, or two or three men, or a half-dozen men on the job, men of the calibre of the man who prepared that information for the Winnipeg 'Free Press.' Let them get a man of that description and they will soon be able to get the facts. It is not necessary that the Railway Commission should have furnished to them a special complaint by the people who are suffering and suffering every day. Time and again, when the excessive coal rates have been brought to my attention and I have asked: Do you want the matter brought up, the answer was: No, we don't want to get into any fight with the railway companies. The fact is that the shippers prefer to be bled rather than to get into a fight with the railway companies. The Railway Commission should not wait for anybody to make a complaint. What are we paying them for? Pay them $50,000 a year more if necessary to get the commission up to the mark. The men themselves are all right; give them the experts they require and give them the duty of finding out what is wrong throughout the country and then let them dictate that the excessive freight rates of the west shall be brought down to the level of the freight rates in the east.

I tell the right hon. the Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Railways that until you do that you will never have contentment and peace and satisfaction in the western part of Canada. We have suffered long enough, and the time has come when this state of affairs should be remedied, and I believe I have only to bring it to the attention of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways and the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the ex-Minister of Railways at the last session of parliament to state that the freight rates to the farmers in western Canada were cheaper than the freight rates to the farmers in the western part of the United States.

Mr. TURRIFF. I heard the ex-Minister of Railways make that statement, exactly as my hon. friend from Peel has said. I think he spoke of the freight rates on grain; I would not be sure. But whether he referred to the freight rates on grain or anything else, he was absolutely mistaken. I have quoted figures to-night to show that the rates on the Canadian side of the boundary line are much higher than those on the American side.

Mr. BLAIN. I quote the following from page 5247 of 'Hansard' for 1910-11:

Mr. GRAHAM. My honourable friend (Mr. Maclean) has referred to rates in western Canada. During a recent trip in the west, I had prepared for me a comparative table of rates on farm products from the interior of Western Canada to Port Arthur and Fort William, and of rates from the interior of the western states to Duluth, and these were the rates I was discussing in the House when I said that the farmers of the Canadian west had cheaper rates on their products to the Great Lakes than had the farmers of the western states, and I have no reason to change my mind on that.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend is perfectly right. I was in the House when that statement was made, and it just goes to prove what I have said, that apparently nobody, either the late ex-Minister of Railways or the late government or the Board of Railway Commissioners knew the facts of the case, and it remained for the man whom the Winnipeg 'Free Press' put on the job to get at the exact facts of the case and to show how much more we were paying in the west than the people of the east were paying, or than the people of the States immediately south of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were paying. I think a great deal of credit is due to the Manitoba 'Free Press' for the information it has brought out on this subject, and I feel satisfied that it will have a very good effect. I believe that the very fact of the people of Canada understanding the condition of affairs will bring about a remedy, because it is too extreme to be allowed to continue. Now, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to you and to the House for taking up so much time, but I felt that the subject was worthy of the time and attention of parliament, and I trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will see his way clear to do something in the near future to put an end to this state of affairs.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I trust that my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff), who has just taken his seat, will not consider me discourteous when I say that he cannot expect the hon. members of this House or the people of this country to treat any statement or resolution coming from him in regard to the freight rates that prevail in western Canada in any serious manner. If my hon. friend had a desire to be serious, there was a fitting time and place for it. He might have taken that course when the government that he supported sat to the right of the Speaker and had it in their power to remedy the condition of which he complains to-night. But, as has been shown, when this parliament was in session last year, the then Minister of Railways, and even my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) declared that the railway freight rates in western Canada were fair, just and reasonable to the people. Now my hon. friend undertakes by

his resolution to say that nothing but the cost, especially the cost of operation, must be considered. There is more than the cost of operation to be considered in determining the railway freight rates that are charged to the people of this country. We had an exhibition in this House yesterday which I am sure will long be remembered by every hon. member who was present at the time, when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways laid upon the table a statement that went to show that, as a result of the incompetency of the late Administration, we have a condition of affairs in the railway life of our country to-day which is most deplorable. I say more: We had presented to the people of this country through that official statement of the Department of Railways and Canals a state of affairs that goes to show not only the incompetence of the gentlemen who had in charge the government of this country, but a state of affairs that should make every member of that government and every gentleman who supported them in this parliament for the past 15 years hang their heads in shame before their fellow countrymen. If the hon. gentlemen who formed that Administration, and the hon. gentlemen who supported it, do not feel keenly enough their position to hang their heads in shame, I can tell them that there is not an intelligent citizen in this Dominion of Canada to-day who understands the railway situation and will study that statement as presented by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, who will not blush with shame owing to the fact that we have had in the government of this country for the past eight or ten years men who are so utterly incompetent to discharge the public trust that has been reposed in them.

We had, Mr. Speaker, a statement to show that the eastern division was to cost us $250,000,000—I think that was the amount—and in addition we had the extraordinary statement—

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point is that this speech should have been made yesterday. I think the hon. minister ought to speak to the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think there is any point of order raised. The hon. minister is quite in order.

Mr ROGERS If we are to have an intelligent understanding of what our railway freight rates are to be, we must take into consideration the cost of construction, and not, as my hon friend (Mr Turriff) said, the cost of operating alone. And it is because of the necessity that arises for us to take into account the cost of construction that I am dealing with the figures I have just quoted. We have in addition the extraordinary cost of the prairie section, and the very extraordinary cost of the mountain section which, in the case of the two, will amount to over $100,000,000. Therefore, we have, Mr. Speaker, a National Transcontinental railway being built, according to the latest statement, at a cost of something like $350,000,000 to the people of this country, instead of $15,000,000, as was stated. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who now leads the opposition, appealed to this parliament for its support and endorsation nine years ago, pointing out, as he pointed out yesterday, that there was then necessity for the construction of such a railway, by reason of the fact that we had in western Canada great development in progress; and that need existed for a reduction in the railway freight rates in this country, and especially western Canada. He appealed for support in the first place in order that he might be allowed to spend $13,000,000 to accomplish these results. His Finance Minister a few months later, discovering that a mistake had been made by the right hon. gentleman, rose in his place, and presented a supplementary statement showing that that railway should cost $51,000,000, instead of $13,000,000. And just a day or two ago the official figures were published, showing that the cost will actually amount to $350,000,000. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) has talked of the necessity of reducing railway freight rates notwithstanding the conditions which his party have created, and with which we, as a new government, have to grapple at the present time. Not only did the right hon. gentleman, at the time, I speak of, appeal to this House for support and endorsation, but he went outside this parliament and appealed to Heaven in order that he might be protected in carrying out this great work, and in order that the railway freight rates should be reduced in the interests of the people. Sir, he was protected in respect to that policy in the elections which followed, and he was similarly protected in the elections of 1908. But last year, when it was discovered that his humbugging policy was not productive of any good results to the country, a change took place, and not only Heaven, apparently, withdrew its support from him, but the great majority of the people in Canada withdrew their support, and relieved him of the high office which he held. Having those conditions to grapple with, nevertheless the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) rises in his place and declares that this parliament should at once dictate what the means of remedy should be. We have a Railway Commission of which we are all proud. We have vested in that commission all the powers necessary to remedy the evils of which my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) has

complained to-night. He has treated us to a dissertation by the hon. member (Mr. Turriff), but let me contrast it with a statement made about a year ago from his place in the House by the late Minister of Railways. Speaking on the 17th of January, 1911, Mr. Graham said:—

I am not sure that they are so ready as that. However, the Railway Commission has complete control of rates in Canada. I agree with my hon. friend from South York, and I disagree with him. I believe that the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada is the best body, with the widest jurisdiction, of all such bodies in the world. I have had reason lately to make some investigation of this matter. In Germany, though the railways are government roads, the freight rates there do not compare for one moment with the rates in Canada. They are three times as high as our rates. Their hauls are short, it is true, but their rates should be low, because their cars are all loaded. France has not approached the control of rates as we have. England has a board, but in the control of freight rates it does not compare with the Interstate Commerce Commission or with ours, and the control exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission does not for a moment equal with the control exercised by the Canadian Commission. Our commission can take anything they like as a basis for fixing the rates of the Canadian Pacific railway; they can take the dividend paid on the stock or the actual cost of the road, or they can have the company file a tariff, which will be as they see it a fair tariff for the transportation of freight and passengers. Let me call my hon. friend's attention to another point. I am not defending the Canadian Pacific railway. But if you take the rates in the United States——

——I want the House to bear this in mind because one hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) dealt especially with the rates in the United States.

—from the west to Duluth, and take the rates for a corresponding distance in Canada, you will find that our rates are lower in every instance. A statement which I had compiled last summer showed that the people in the United States were paying higher freight rates for the same distance than the people on our side. I have no hesitation in saying that, with all the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and with the great population in the United States and the great strength of their western railways, the rates to and from the west are higher than those in this country for the same distances. Being very much interested in this matter, it strikes me that whatever we are to do in this House, we ought to keep clearly in mind this fact, that we have established a board composed of able men. No part of the government of Canada does it more credit than the Board of Railway Commissioners. Their judgments are quoted as my hon. friend quoted them in the case of the express companies, and they have done a great deal of good; and I would not like to see anything done that would have a tendency to take out of their hands the complete jurisdiction we have given them, because they can exercise it better than we could and with more beneficial results to the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a statement made by the late Minister of Railways and Canals from his place in this House. What does the resolution of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), mean? If it means anything, it means that we are asked to vote want of confidence in the Railway Commission. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this government accept and acknowledge the Board of Railway Commissioners as the only legitimate child of the late government during their whole career. So accepting that Railway Board in that form and in that manner, we are not going now to vote want of confidence in their administration. We are not going to take the course taken by our predecessors, because they never appealed to that Railway Board, notwithstanding the statement of the late Minister of Railways that the Board of Railway Commissioners have complete control, and that they can exercise that control according to their own judgment. We recognize on this side of the House the conditions in western Canada, not alone with regard to freight rates, but the deplorable conditions that exist in the prairie provinces, conditions for which the late administration are solely and entirely responsible. Now, Sir, recognizing that fact, having the most complete confidence in the Railway Commission, having asked them to take up and consider all complaints with regard to freight rates with a view of dealing with them in a fair and reasonable manner, not alone in western Canada, but throughout the Dominion, having also employed three of the ablest lawyers we could find to present the case of the people before the commission, then I say, having gone that far, it would be treating the commissioners, in whom we have the utmost confidence, with disrespect, it would be showing a lack of confidence in their judgment if we were to pass this resolution. Therefore, I take objection to this resolution on these grounds, and I ask hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to reject it, believing as we do, that it will serve no good purpose, inasmuch as this government have already taken the only legitimate course open to them of securing a remedy of the grievances of which the people complain, in the matter of railway freight rates.

Mr. OLIVER. I regret that I was not present to hear all the remarks of my hon. friend, but I take it that his remarks apply to one point, namely, the question whether this House should make a declaration as to the authority to be exercised by the Railway Commission over freight rates in western Canada. It is desirable, before we reach a decision as to whether we should pass or reject this motion, fully to

consider the important question that it has raised, and the attitude of the people who are most directly interested. I understand that my hon. friend who opened this discussion moved a resolution which had been adopted by the Winnipeg Board of Trade on November 14. I happen to have in my possession certain correspondence connected with this subject, which will show more fully the position taken by the Winnipeg Board of Trade, that is to say by the business men of western Canada on this matter. The resolution was passed by the board of trade on November 14, and was forwarded, I understand, to the Minister of Railways for his consideration. The Minister of Railways referred it to the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the Chairman of the board communicated with the Winnipeg Board of Trade under date of November 24, as follows:

The hon. the Minister of Railways has forwarded to me a copy of a resolution passed at the general meeting of your board, held on Nov 14th instant. This is the first complaint that has been made directly to this board regarding freight rates generally in the west. There is no necessity in calling upon the government to deal with the matter, nor is any further legislation required. The powers of the board are ample to deal with not only specific rates but those generally. The resolution you have forwarded is of an extremely general character. If you desire the whole subject to be investigated by this board, it would greatly facilitate matters if you would have your traffic officials formulate a specific case. Our rules are by no means hard and fast, nor do we confine ourselves to the specific case set forth in the complaint but it is a difficult matter to take up in the way it is placed in this resolution. Indeed, strictly speaking, the resolution is not a complaint to this commission at all, but is a request that the government pass legislation. I should be glad to hear your views upon the foregoing.

Yours truly,
J. P. MABEE,
Chief Commissioner.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the date of that?

Mr. OLIVER. It was dated the 24th of November, 1911.

That is the reply which the Minister of Railways did not give to the communication he received from the Board of Trade. He apparently handed the communication of the Board of Trade to the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners and the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners answered.

Mr. COCHRANE. That was a letter directed to the board and not to me. I had not it in my possession. This letter was in answer to the resolution of the Board of Trade and was not to me, so you need not lay any charge to me for not producing the letters.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not making any charge.

Mr COCHRANE. I did not have the letter.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to be understood as making any such suggestion. Such a thought was not in my mind. I said that the Board of Trade had communicated their resolution to the minister; the minister did not reply direct to the Board of Trade, but handed the resolution to the chairman of the Railway Commission, who replied to the Board of Trade. The Board of Trade, on receipt of this communication from the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, wrote direct to the minister as follows:

Winnipeg, Manitoba, December 4, 1911.

Sir,—The Board of Trade has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of November 20, 1911, in reply to the resolution of the board, forwarded to yourself and the hon. the Premier of the Dominion, stating that the rates charged for freight within the prairie provinces are greatly in excess of those charged for a similar service in Ontario and Quebec, and asking that the principle be affirmed that the rate of charges shall be no greater in these provinces than in Ontario and Quebec.

And the board is also in receipt of a communication from the chairman of the Railway commission stating that the said resolution has been turned over to him and that the commission has full power to deal with the same and that no further legislation is require, and the board now desires to lay before yourself and the members of the government the reason for asking that the principle be affirmed by Act of parliament namely: That the Railway Commission has now been in power for a considerable number of years.

That is the view of the Winnipeg Board of Trade after hearing direct from the Railway Commission on the point raised by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, so I would ask the House to give it especially careful attention as being the statement of the position as understood by people who were not political partisans but who were speaking simply for the business interests of the western country. The letter continues:

That the Railway Commission has now been in power for a considerable number of years, and this board complained of the freight charges in this country in 1907 when a stated case was prepared showing the charges which were then being put in force by the railways operating in western Canada and which were not only higher than those charged in the east but were a material advance upon those previously in force in Manitoba, and that on that occasion they were refused relief.

And further, that during the summer now passed the express companies were authorized to put into effect a scale of charges based on $5 per hundred pounds in this territory for a similar service for which they were allowed $3 in the east, or an advance of 66⅔ per cent. over eastern rates. And this board has felt that a grave injustice was done to the western country by the continuance of such a state of affairs and felt that the prairie provinces were entitled to be put on an equal basis with the east except to the extent that it could be shown that the cost of operation in the western country exceeded that in the east.

This principle this Board believed to be a fair, and equitable one, and one that as a matter of public policy should be affirmed and carried out and that the government and parliament of Canada are the right parties to affirm and see to the carrying into effect of the same.

The Board begs to enclose herewith a copy of the letter received from the Chairman of the Railway Commission in which it asks that our traffic officials should formulate a specific case. This is exactly what the Board objects to doing. Their charge is that the whole scale of rates in the prairie provinces is in excess of those charged in the east. They attached to their original resolution a copy of rates covering distances respectively in the east and west and covering from 100 miles to 1,050, showing that in each case the charges in the three prairie provinces were materially in excess of those in the east, the whole averaging an increase of 78 per cent, a copy of which statement is hereto attached, and it is this whole matter of grave injustice in the west that it wishes to have taken up and remedied, and the Board believes that the cost of operating in the three prairie provinces is no greater, if as great, as in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

That if it is the desire of the government that the matter should be relegated to the commission and an investigation held by them and the facts ascertained, under such circumstances this Board would urgently request that under the terms of the Railway Act, the Board of Railway Commissioners be instructed to inquire into the facts regarding the whole scale of charges in the prairie provinces, and their relation to those in the east, and that an investigation held with this object in view, should be held in the city of Winnipeg, and elsewhere in the west, if necessary, and in view of the fact that it is a matter of public policy in which the whole people of the west are concerned, they would further ask that counsel resident in this city and free from all railway corporation control, be appointed to act with this Board and other public interests, in establishing the facts complained of, and that further, as soon as such facts are established the railway companies be required to reduce their charges in the west to the basis before alluded to.

To this letter from the Winnipeg Board of Trade the minister replied on December 19, 1911:

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 4, in reference to western freight rates and must apologize for not replying sooner. Your letter was mislaid and hence has not had attention. It seems to me that your Board has made out a pretty strong case and I shall be pleased to go into it with Judge Mabee of the Railway Commission, and shall urge that the Board investigate these charges on the ground.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) F. COCHRANE.

C. N. Bell, Esq.,
Secretary Board of Trade,
Winnipeg, Man.

The position so far as this correspondence shows then is that while the Minister of Railways takes the same ground as is taken by the Minister of the Interior that the Railway Commission has full power to make such regulations as the Board of Trade asks, provided the Railway Commission thinks these are fair reductions and decidedly holds out the hope or prospect that the commission will hold an investigation and, if satisfied of the facts, make these reductions. On the other hand, the Board of Trade points out that a specific request was made in the year 1907 and that the request was ignored or that action as requested was not taken by the Board of Railway Commissioners, and further they point out that when a parallel case, that of the express rates, was brought to the attention of the Board of Railway Commissioners, the Board of Railway Commissioners accepted the principle that express rates in the western country should, of right, be 66 per cent higher than in the eastern country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to understand how my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, speaking as a representative of the western country, can justify the position which he took here to-night in view of these facts which are unquestionable and which are set forth by such a responsible body as the Winnipeg Board of Trade. It does not matter what the theoretical authority of the board of Railway Commissioners is; the actual authority rests with this parliament and if the Board of Railway Commissioners, for good reason or bad, did not see fit, or have not yet seen fit, to do substantial justice to the western country in this important matter then the responsibility rests upon this parliament, upon this government, upon the members of this government and, may I say, particularly upon that member of the government who especially represents the western country, to see that justice is done.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Did not the two cases that the hon. gentleman quoted in which he claims the commission were derelict occur some years ago, one in 1907 and the other the following year?

Mr. OLIVER. One occurred in 1907, I do not know whether the other occurred in the following year or the year after, but

the fact is that both occurred when the authority of the commission was just the same in that regard as it is now, and if the commission did not do justice then I submit it is the business of parliament to see that it does justice now or that justice is done.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who was Minister of the Interior at that time?

Mr. OLIVER. I had the honour of being Minister of the Interior at that time. If I might digress for one moment, I perceive the trend of my hon. friend's question as also that of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) and I would only say this that it never was expected of the late Liberal government, any more than it is expected of the present Conservative government, that everything that could be done would be done. If any government, during any possible term in which it might hold office, could do everything that the country required to be done there would never be any need for any more government. When these gentlemen rise in their places and say: Oh, you should have done that, they make no argument whatever. If any government of any country ever had reason to be proud of what it did the late Liberal government had reason to be proud.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is another joke.

Mr. OLIVER. If that is a joke, I beg to repeat it, and to say that the history of this country written in the last 15 years under the administration of the Liberal government, is the proudest chapter in the history of Canada to date, beyond any question and, certainly, if the chapter that shall be written during the tenure of office of our hon. friends opposite approaches to it, they will have great reason to congratulate themselves and the country will have to be congratulated as well. There is a condition which, according to the opinion of the business community of western Canada, is a condition of injustice and whether the late government was remiss or was not remiss, is not the question to-day. The question is: What is this government going to do about that condition of injustice? Is it going to permit it to be perpetuated? Is it going to be a party to the perpetuation of that condition? In order that there shall be no misunderstanding, let me say that I do not wish to throw any discredit upon the Railway Commission, but if it is asserted that this question is new to the consideration of the Railway Commission, I will ask the House to bear with me while I read from a document, which has been placed in my hands, a document which is the rejoinder of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, or a section of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, to the reply of the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway companies to the allegation of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, or a section of that board, made to the Railway Commissioners protesting against the freight rates then in force. This rejoinder is dated November 29, 1911, shortly after the resolution which was presented to the House and agreed to by the Board. I shall take the opportunity of informing the House with regard to the contents of this document, or a portion of them at any rate. It is addressed to A. D. Cartwright, Secretary of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and is the 'answer of shippers' section of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and the Winnipeg Exchange to the contention of the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern railway companies.'

2. The contention of the shippers section of the Winnipeg Board of Trade and Winnipeg Grain Exchange was that the local tariffs in the territory west of Lake Superior on grain and grain products are too high (a) Because such rates are higher than similar rates in eastern Canada, and (b) Because they are too high in themselves.

3. (a) The contention that the rates are higher than the rates in eastern Canada does not mean merely that the rates themselves are higher, but further, that the rates on the commodities mentioned in western Canada are a much higher proportion of the maximum standard rate (flour and grain products classify 8th class) than the rates on the same commodities in eastern Canada are of the maximum standard rate there. A statement was put in by Mr. Carpenter, Traffic Officer Shippers' section Winnipeg Board of Trade, at a sitting of the board held at Montreal, a copy of which is attached thereto.

I would ask your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the permission of the House to have this statement embodied in 'Hansard,' without my being required to read it. If I am not granted permission, I will be compelled to read it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the Speaker has authority to give permission. It is the rule of the House that nothing can be inserted in 'Hansard' except what is read other than official lists and figures given by the ministers. I think that has been the practice.

Mr. OLIVER. Then, I will give the House this table as well as I may:

Miles.	Eastern Canada.			Manitoba.			Saskatchewan and Alberta.		
	Standard 8th Class.	Flour and Grain.	Percentage of Standard.	Standard 8th Class.	Flour and Grain.	Percentage of Standard.	Standard 8th Class.	Flour and Grain.	Percentage of Standard.
			p. c.			p. c.			p. c.
50	10	4	40	11	9½	86	12	10	83
100	14	6	43	15	12	80	16	13	81
150	14	6	50	18	13½	75	19	15	79
200	19	9	47½	20	16	80	22	17	77
300	22	11	50	25	20	80	27	21	78
400	25	13	52	29	23	79	31	25	81
500	29	15	51	32	27	64	35	30	86
600	34	17	50	36	31	86	39	34	87

In eastern Canada the flour and grain rates average about fifty per cent of the standard eighth-class rate, but in Manitoba the flour and grain, which are the great commodities carried in carloads, average eighty per cent of the eighth class rate, and in Saskatchewan and Alberta they average about the same. I am sorry to have had to take up so much time, but it is desirable that the facts in regard to this matter should be placed where they can be got at in a convenient way. The statement of the Winnipeg Board of Trade goes on to say:

This statement shows a comparison between rates in western Canada and eastern Canada. For example, for 50 miles in eastern Canada the maximum standard rate is 10 cents, and for the same distance on grain and grain products is 4 cents, the grain and grain products rate being, therefore, in eastern Canada 40 per cent. of the maximum standard rate. In Manitoba for the same distance the maximum standard rate is 11 cents, whereas the grain and grain products rate is 9½ cents, the grain and grain products rate thus being 86 per cent. of the maximum standard class rate. In Saskatchewan and Alberta for the same distance, the maximum standard class rate is 12 cents, while the grain and grain products rate is 10 cents, the grain and grain products rate being, therefore, 83 per cent. of the maximum standard rate. The statement filed by Mr. Carpenter shows that approximately there is a similar difference as regards all distances. Why should not the grain and grain products rates in western Canada be the same percentage of the maximum standard rates as they are in eastern Canada? The Railway Companies have made no answer to this question.

(b) We further urge that the rates are too high in themselves, the rates being such as to unduly increase the cost of grain and grain products for local consumption on the local markets of western Canada, especially such markets as Winnipeg and the lumbering and mining districts between Winnipeg and Fort William where large quantities of grain and grain products are consumed. For instance,—

Wolseley, Sask., to Winnipeg	296 miles.	20 cents.		
Reynolds, N.D., to Minneapolis	300 "	11 "	82 per cent less.	
300 miles in Eastern Canada		11 "	" "	
Moosejaw, Sask., to Winnipeg	399 "	25 "		
Keith, N.D., to Minneapolis	400 "	13 "	92 per cent less.	
400 miles in Eastern Canada		13 "	" "	
Waldeck, Sask., to Winnipeg	498 "	30 "		
Norwick, N.D., to Minneapolis	499 "	15½ "	94 per cent less.	
500 miles in Eastern Canada		15 "	100 " "	
Maple Creek, Sask., to Winnipeg	594 "	34 "		
Tioga, N.D., to Minneapolis	595 "	17½ "	94 per cent less.	
600 miles in Eastern Canada		17 "	100 " "	
Routledge, Man., to Kenora, Ont	299 "	20 "		
Berthold, N.D., to Foston, Minn	300 "	16 "	25 " "	
300 miles in Eastern Canada		11 "	82 " "	
Wapella, Sask., to Wabigoon, Ont	457 "	28 "		
Manitou, N.D., to Grand Rapids, Minn	459 "	17 "	65 " "	
457 miles in Ontario		15 "	87 " "	
Regina, Sask., to Dryden, Ont	565 "	33 "		
Buford, N.D., to Floodwood, Minn	570 "	19 "	74 " "	
565 miles in Eastern Canada		17 "	94 " "	
Wapella; Sask., to Savanne, Ont	583 "	34 "		
Williston, N.D., to Cloquet, Minn	584 "	18 "	89 " "	
585 miles in Eastern Canada		17 "	100 " "	

Mr. BLAIN. Have you given the points in eastern Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. The points in eastern Canada are not given here, but I presume my hon. friend would not question the statement of the Winnipeg Board of Trade on this subject.

Mr. AMES. Is the quotation between Wapella and Savanne for way-freight rates or through rates?

Mr. OLIVER. They are way-freight rates.

Mr. AMES. There is no grain stopping at Savanne, Ont.

Mr. OLIVER. This whole question is a question of local rates and not a question of through rates.

Mr. AMES. What is the use of discussing what it costs to take grain from Wapella to Savanne when in all probability there never has been a bushel of grain left off at Savanne? Tell us what it costs from Port Arthur or Fort William.

Mr. OLIVER. We are not discussing through rates; we are discussing local rates.

Mr. AMES. You are discussing a condition of affairs which never exists.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is at issue with the Winnipeg Board of Trade, which purports to know something of the conditions in western Canada.

Mr. AMES. Even in the face of the declaration of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, one can hardly be expected to put aside his common sense.

Mr. OLIVER. If it is a question between the common sense of my hon. friend from St. Antoine, and the statement of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, my vote will be with the Board of Trade.

Mr. AMES. It was not with the Winnipeg Board of Trade on reciprocity.

Mr. OLIVER. It is possible even for the Winnipeg Board of Trade to be mistaken on a question of theory, but not on a question of facts and figures within their knowledge.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Was reciprocity only a theory?

Mr. OLIVER. It was a theory, and hon. gentlemen opposite prevented it from becoming practical; that is what is the matter with the country to-day. Now, as having some bearing on the point which my hon. friend has raised, the Board of Trade goes on to say:

While the Canadian Pacific local mileage rates apply on all local shipments west of Fort William, in U.S.A. territory the terminal rates to Duluth, Superior, etc., apply as a maximum between intermediate points. In some cases this would mean a reduction in the local rates of almost 94 per cent, and we contend that as a matter of fact that a large volume of local shipments of grain in the United States territory covered by Mr. Lanigan's statement is handled under the terminal rate (applying as a maximum), and not the local rate at all.

Mr. MARSHALL. Are these carload rates, or less than carload rates?

Mr. OLIVER. They are carload rates. This is a rejoinder to the statements made by the representatives of the two railway companies. In paragraph 11 they say:

Regarding Mr. Lanigan's statement (page 6462) that only 12 per cent of the grain crop moves under the rate complained of. The Northwest Grain Dealers' Association estimate of the 1911 grain crop in western Canada, is 304,207,500 bushels. 12 per cent of this would be 36,384,900 bushels, no inconsiderable amount.

Now, if my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is under the impression that there is no local business doing in that western country, here are the facts given by the Winnipeg Board of Trade on the authority of Mr. Lanigan of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to assert that the whole 300,000,000 bushels moved, and that 12 per cent of it ought to move in this particular way?

Mr. OLIVER. The whole crop does not move.

Mr. AMES. Then, is it not only 12 per cent of what does move?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, precisely.

Mr. AMES. Then give us what moves.

Mr. OLIVER. Instead of giving us the figures given by the Board of Trade, suppose we cut them in two. I suppose that my hon. friend will admit that half the crop does move.

Mr. AMES. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I do not think I need argue with my hon. friend any more.

Mr. AMES. I do not think anybody will admit that 160,000,000 bushels of the grain of the west does move.

Mr. OLIVER. Then my hon. friend and I do not agree, and I think he had better take his own opportunity of placing his views before the House. When he makes such a statement as that, I would not undertake to argue with him at all. Suppose we say that only half the crop moves, then, according to Mr. Lanigan's calcula-

tions, that 12 per cent is carried under local rates and these would affect the handling of 18,000,000 bushels of grain. Again I would say, with all due respect to this honourable House, that this is a matter of sufficient importance to take its attention for a few minutes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the Railway Commission deal with that complaint?

Mr. OLIVER. This is a rejoinder to the defence made by the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern railways to a complaint made by the Winnipeg Board of Trade.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then it is all a part of a case before the Railway Commission —the complaint, the rejoinder and the reply. It is all before the commission still.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say what has become of it; but the expectation of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, as expressed in the letters which have been read, was such that they believed that it was necessay to get an authoritative statement from this House as to what was required in the case. On the basis of the judgment given by the Railway Commission in the express case, they did not expect substantial justice from the Railway Commission.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did not the Railway Commission tell them in the early part of the proceedings that the law was ample and provided fully for dealing with the case?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly they did.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then why should they want more law?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not that they ask that the commission should have more authority. The commission has authority, but it has not exercised that authority to remove this stupendous injustice, and the Board of Trade come to this honourable House and asks it to remove the injustice.

Mr. LANCASTER. The commission is trying the case.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all, there is no case to try.

Mr. LANCASTER. The case is before the commission still.

Mr. OLIVER. It may, or may not, I cannot say, but I am taking the liberty of putting the case before this House, if I may, and it is of sufficient importance, both in matter and in principle, to warrant our attention. Speaking of the rejoinder of the railway companies, the Board of Trade says:

Mr. OLIVER.

A comparison is made of local mileage rates in Ontario, with rates from western points to Fort William. We submit that this comparison is unjust for the reason that a local mileage rate is compared with a terminal or proportional rate governing a part of a through haul, and necessarily the latter is much lower.

The board goes on to say:

Regarding paragraphs 5 and 7 of Mr. Shaw's answer of October 12th wherein he contends that the price paid the farmer for his grain is based upon its expert value, and that, therefore, while a reduction in mileage grain rates would not increase the value of the grain to the farmer, it would needlessly reduce the railway's revenue. We contend that for the purpose of this investigation it is immaterial to the commission whether the producer or the consumer suffers as a result of the unduly high local mileage grain rates. Of necessity it must be one or the other. However, as a matter of fact, the prices paid for feed grain are not in many cases based upon its export value but its value for feed in the locality to which it is consigned. However, in all cases, whether for feed or for export, the freight charges are deducted from the price paid for the grain in making settlement with the farmer. Therefore, the producer pays the freight charges.

The defendants contend that their local mileage grain rates between points in western Canada are reasonable because these rates compare favourably with rates shown in local mileage grain tariffs in the Dakotas and Montana. We submit that in so much as it is clearly shown in paragraph 9 of this letter that the local mileage tariffs in Dakota and Montana do not as a matter of practice govern the cost of moving grain and grain products between local points, for instance, between local points and such large centres of consumption as St. Paul and Minneapolis, and intermediate points to Duluth, Superior, etc., the unduly high rates charged for the movement of grain and its products between points west of Lake Superior cannot be justified by the comparison made by the defendants.

The defendants further contend that all privileges etc., connected with the milling of grain in eastern and western Canada must be considered in arriving at a reasonable rate for the carriage of grain and its products between points west of Lake Superior, and endeavour to justify such rates by stating that different privileges are granted western millers than those extended to eastern millers. We submit that because a carrier applies different regulations for the milling of grain in transit is no reason or justification for charging unduly high rates on grain and letter, the same regulations govern the milling of Manitoba grain in eastern Canada as in western Canada. Furthermore, in placing this argument before the commission, the carriers omitted to state that in eastern Canada special less than carload commodity rates are granted on grain products out from the mills, whereas in western Canada full class rates are exacted. For instance:—

Miles	Eastern Canada C.P.R. Tariff No. E 1520, C.R. C. No. E 1929.	Western Canada C.P.R. Tariff W. No. 50, C.E. C. No. W 2 Manitoba.	C.P.R. Tariff 56, C.R.C. W. 3 Sask. & Alta.
100	9	21	23
200	14	31	33
300	17	39	43
400	20	48	52
500	23	55	60
600	26	62	68

Rates in cents per 100 lbs.

The board says further:

We do not request, nor have we ever asked, that rates on grain and grain products between local points west of Lake Superior should be on as low a basis as the terminal rates to Fort William and Port Arthur. These terminal, or proportional rates as they are specified in the tariffs, are simply one charge for part of a through journey, or in other words, part of a through rate, and those terminal rates, as has already been pointed out, were a matter of contract with the Manitoba and Dominion governments where the railways received value for the reductions made. We submit therefore, that it cannot be urged that because these terminal, or proportional, rates are low that local rates between points west of Lake Superior should be unduly high.

At the hearing in Montreal on July 23, 1911, our representative asked that local rates on grain and grain products between points west of Lake Superior should be reduced so as to show no greater difference over rates for similar service in eastern Canada than the 8th class maximum standard rates in western Canada shows over the 8th class maximum standard in eastern Canada (grain and grain products classify 8th class in carloads).

Since that time, however, copy of the evidence in the Vancouver rate case has been received, and the exhibit filed by the Canadian Pacific in that case shows a greater cost to move 1,000 tons of freight one mile in a portion of the territory where the eastern Canadian rates referred to in this answer apply, than in the territory west of Lake Superior where the rates complained of govern. For instance—

Cost to haul 1,000 tons of freight 1 mile, exclusive of interest or fixed charges.

Exhibit 17, eastern division, Chalk River to Montreal.. .. .. $5 45

Exhibit 7, central division, Port Arthur to Moosejaw.. .. .. 3 73

Exhibit 7, western division, Moosejaw to Field.. .. .. 4 71

We submit, therefore, that no higher rates should be charged for the movement of grain and grain products between points west of Lake Superior to the mountains than is charged on the eastern division of the Canadian Pacific railway, where the cost of haulage is greater than in the former territory, and we would respectfully urge the commission to order that rates on grain and grain products handled under local mileage tariffs between points west of Lake Superior and the mountains should be reduced to an equivalent of those charged upon the eastern division, or, at least, that rates on grain and grain products handled under local mileage tariffs west of Lake Superior should not exceed the 8th class maximum standard rates in the western Canada by a greater percentage than the local mileage grain rates in eastern Canada exceed the 8th class maximum standard rates in eastern Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the liberty of placing before the House the statement of the Winnipeg Board of Trade in regard to this important matter. The board contends first, that the local rates on grain and grain products in western Canada are higher than the service rendered warrants. They are higher in proportion to the rates charged for like service in eastern Canada or in the United States, and they are higher in proportion to the rates charged by the same railway for carrying goods of the same class in western Canada than they are in eastern Canada. What they ask, and all they ask, is that the rates be placed on the same level, and made in the same proportion for the like service rendered, west of the lakes as east of the lakes. The conditions which exist in the prairie provinces at the present time makes it a question of more than ordinary importance. We have had the action of the government, taken in conjunction with the railway companies, for the purpose of securing the transportation and an outlet for the grain that is blockaded in the western provinces to-day, or a portion of it, to Duluth and Minneapolis. It is proposed to secure that outlet by a reduction in the rates Here is a condition which, according to the showing of the Board of Trade based on the figures given by the railway company, reduced again at the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames), which affects 12,000,000 bushels of that product in reaching its market.

It affects the transportation of 12 million bushels of the product, that to-day lies in the fields because it cannot reach the markets of consumers. If it was right and reasonable that this government should take action with the railway companies, and take action with the United States Commerce Commission in order to secure a reduction of the rates to United States points, surely it was just as right and reasonable that this government should take action with our own Railway Commission to secure a reduction in the rates within our own country. To-day, because the grain cannot be transferred from the

field where it is produced to the local points of consumption, there is a burden on the transportation of that grain of from 40 to 90 per cent more than it should properly bear, according to the value of the service rendered, and the charges made for like service in other places, and on other lines, and even on the very same lines of railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has not our government taken exactly the same action with regard to our commission as the United States government have taken with regard to their commission?

Mr. OLIVER. Not as I understand it, and not as the Winnipeg Board of Trade understands it.

Mr. LANCASTER. We are not responsible for their understanding.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend sized himself up with the Winnipeg Board of Trade, he would find that he did not have much advantage over them. They are generally reputed to be able to hold their own, intellectually or otherwise, with other people in this country, and perhaps to have some advantage. Now, is this a case of sufficient importance to warrant the consideration of parliament and of the government? The contention of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and the contention which I make, is that the case is of sufficient importance to warrant the consideration of this parliament and government. Then the question is, is this government and parliament to take no action, on the pretext that the matter is one for the Railway Commission and that they are entirely responsible for it? In my judgment on the case, as stated to the Minister of Railways by the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and from the fact that the Railway Commission decided that a discrimination was proper between the east and the west in the matter of express rates, I think I have made out a strong case why this government should take immediate action in order to relieve the very undesirable conditions that exist in the west. This government and this parliament are responsible for the continuation of those conditions, and the people of the west will not cease earnestly to ask them to act without undue delay.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the hon. gentleman contend that the Railway Commission has not jurisdiction over rates in western Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I said repeatedly that the Railway Commission has jurisdiction under the law. But in practice, the Railway Commission has not exercised that jurisdiction in order to bring about a general reduction in the rates such as the resolution asks for.

Mr. HEPBURN. As I understand it, just as soon as the attention of the Minister of Railways was called to this matter he took up the question with the Railway Commission, and has been assured by them that they will immediately look into the freight rates in western Canada. The chairman of the board asserts that they have full jurisdiction over all rates, and will attend to the matter at once.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver). I wish to make my position clear in regard to this matter. We have in British Columbia, as the House is aware, a strong grievance, the same as other sections in the west, and we have been fighting this question before the Railway Commission for a number of years. This week we closed a very long and technical argument on behalf of the Board of Trade of Vancouver before the commission. This whole question is going to be dealt with, and the initial steps were taken on Monday last. It seems to me therefore that the offering of this resolution is simply embarrassing the action of the board, that is, it is placing on the decision of the board, which is not yet given, the condemnation of this House. We all acknowledge that this Board has been created for the purpose of dealing with just such matters as this, that the board has been constituted in such a way, that its personnel is of such a character as to make it very efficient. This board has done noble service for the people of Canada. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite are asking this government to condemn the board before they have had an opportunity of considering the question. As I have said, the board have already taken the initial steps to deal with this question, and the present government have appointed counsel to look after the interests of the people on the prairies. I can assure hon. gentlemen that while the question, on the face of it, seems simple, it is one of the most intricate and difficult questions that can possibly be dealt with. Everybody who has had anything to do with traffic questions knows that railway traffic rates, the equalization and adjusting of those rates, is one of the most intricate questions that come before the Railway Commission. I have taken a deep interest in this matter for a number of years, and I think it would be exceedingly unwise to bring this question to a vote. Hon. gentlemen themselves will acknowledge that this is a political move pure and simple. I will go this far with them, I will agree to a large extent with the statements made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and with the statements made by the Winnipeg Board of Trade. I myself have a mass of figures to substantiate those statements, to a large extent. But what is the use of making arguments of this

kind to the House, and condemning the Railway Commission who are pursuing the only course that they can pursue? If we take action of that kind, we should logically follow it up by abolishing the Railway Commission, and I do not think that even hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to do that. As I understood it, the Winnipeg Board of Trade is objecting, apparently, to the decision of the commission on express rates. I have not gone through the whole evidence and argument but I venture to say, from the experience I have had, that the board must have had good, sound reasons for the decision they have given. We in British Columbia suffer a great deal more than they do on the prairies, that is the percentage is increased as you go west.

Mr. TURRIFF. Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS. But I do feel that we should leave it to the Board of Railway Commissioners to deal with, give them all the assistance we can; I think it is well to air these things once in a while in the House, but I feel that to adopt a resolution of this kind, which must be construed as one of want of confidence in the commission, is inadvisable. The hon. member who moved the amendment (Mr. Turriff), has had the opportunity of getting this mass of information on 'Hansard' and he might withdraw the motion. I feel that to adopt his amendment, would be to cast a reflection on one of the finest institutions we have in Canada.

Mr. JAS. McKAY (Prince Albert). Mr. Speaker, before making a few remarks on this motion, I would ask the hon. member for Edmonton, if, when the question of express rates was brought before the Railway Commission, the public was represented by counsel?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say.

Mr. McKAY. While I am not in favour of the rates that now prevail in the west, I must say that I cannot support the amendment for the following reasons among others: The trend of the remarks that have been made by opposition members, who have spoken to this amendment, is, that although the Railway Commission had jurisdiction to deal with this matter, they remained passive, and in a decision given in a previous case somewhat analogous to this, that of the express rates, the board did not follow the principle which hon. gentlemen endeavour to lay down in this amendment. Consequently, hon. gentlemen fear that in this other case, which is now before the Railway Commission a similar decision may be given.

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McKAY. The hon. members who have spoken, are seriously endeavouring to redress the grievances that prevail in the west, and I am with them in the statement that such grievances exist with regard to railway rates, but I would remind them that in a case now before the Railway Commission with reference to freight rates, the present government has taken hold of that matter, placed it before the Railway Commission and employed counsel to watch the interests of the public.

Mr. TURRIFF. In connection with the express rate investigation, counsel was employed to represent the public.

Mr. McKAY. Even admitting that, the hon. member who moved this motion, himself admitted that on a previous occasion, when he made a speech in this House, he was not in possession of facts with which he is now familiar, and I presume that as these facts had not then become public property, the gentlemen who were conducting the case with regard to express rates, were not in possession of facts of which hon. gentlemen and the country at large are now in possession. I submit that the principle which it is endeavoured to lay down in this House, will be followed by the Railway Commission as the facts are now before the members of the Railway Commission and the counsel who will conduct the case for the public. I cannot conceive why that principle should not be followed to a great extent by the Railway Commission when it deals with this case, because it is a just and proper principle. I am against the amendment, for the reason that the Railway Commission now has this case in hand. it is in possession of the facts, and will deal with them in a proper manner. If the case is not dealt with in a proper manner, why then it can be dealt with by this House so as to afford the west relief from the grievances under which they are now suffering.

Amendment (Mr. Turriff) negatived on division.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Mr. MONK. There are two votes at page 62, which I wish to dispose of.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have done a good day's work, and I hope my hon. friend will not insist on going on to-night.

Mr. MONK. There remain only one or two resolutions, and I have been bringing the officers of my department up here for a week. I am anxious to complete the preparation of the supplementary estimates, but that cannot be done until these items are disposed of.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand the hon. the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), has something to say.

Mr. MONK. I have postponed them twice already. I do not think the hon. member for St. John can have any objection to these two resolutions which are yearly votes, for the lighting and heating, etc., of Rideau Hall, and public buildings.

Mr. OLIVER. I certainly do not wish to delay the passage of the estimates, but the votes that my hon. friend speaks of relate particularly to the city of Ottawa, and I would like to give my hon. friend the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), who is partly representing the city of Ottawa, an opportunity to be heard when the votes are being considered. If my hon. friend will amicably consent to allow these items to stand until to-morrow, so that the hon. member for Russell can be here, I would be very glad, and if the member for Russell is not here I will promise that I will withdraw all objection to the items going through.

Mr. MONK. I do not like to be disobliging, although it seems to me that I have been as patient as possible. If it is desired that the hon. member for Russell should be here when we discuss these items having reference to the city of Ottawa, I will consent to what my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) proposes. There remains one item with reference to harbours and rivers in Prince Edward Island which we might pass and then adjourn.

Harbours, rivers and bridges—generally—repairs and improvements, $10,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not think that the hon. gentleman is fair at this hour of the evening in asking us to take up this item, and I would strongly object to passing any more estimates.

Mr. MONK. I proposed that we should dispose of that item and then leave the items for Ottawa.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). I have to ask the minister for some information in regard to this matter. I find that a number of items that were in the estimates passed last year and submitted by the late government have been dropped, particularly in regard to the county I represent. More than fifty per cent of the amount that was voted last year for harbours and rivers in Prince Edward Island has been left out of the estimates this year, and I would ask the minister if he could tell me the reason why.

Mr. MONK. The main estimates for Prince Edward Island were prepared in a hurry. Parliament was assembling a very short time after the new government took office, and it is intended to restore many of those items in the supplementary estimates. I can give that assurance to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) right now.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). There are some things I would like to point out to the minister before he prepares the estimates.

Mr. MONK. Would it not be more convenient for my hon. friend to give me a list of the works that he proposes?

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). I wrote to the minister giving him a list and asking him if he would give me an interview at any time and place that would suit himself and I would be glad to go over the items with him and point out the reason why I thought they should be put in the supplementary estimates. The minister answered my letter, but he did not reply to that request.

Mr. MONK. I will be glad to meet my hon. friend at any time.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings). If the minister would give me that privilege I will meet him in his office at an early date.

Mr. MONK. Yes, certainly, any time that will suit my hon. friend.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. MONK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. What will be the order of business to-morrow?

Mr. MONK. We will take up the estimates of the Public Works Department to-morrow.

Mr. OLIVER. That will be the first order?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 16, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following letter from the secretary of His Royal Highness the Governor General:

Office of the Governor General's Secretary,
Ottawa, February, 16th, 1912.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Right Hon. the Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Royal Highness the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at 3.30 o'clock for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to

certain Bills which have passed the Senate and the House of Commons during the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
H. C. LOWTHER,
Lieut.-Colonel,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable, the Speaker
of the House of Commons.

SUPPLY—CABLE RATES TO GREAT BRITAIN.

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

Mr. LEMIEUX. Before you leave the Chair, I would like to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to the question of cable rates. This question has already come before the House in a previous debate, but I thought this occasion favourable for bringing it again to the attention of the country. We all know that the news received some months ago, through the channel of the Post Office Department, that cheaper rates had been granted by the cable companies was welcome news to Canada. When it was announced to the House by the Postmaster General, I was the first one to congratulate him over this signal success of our many efforts to obtain a reduction in the rates. For several years past, and notably since the time of Sir William Mulock until the present, there has been a continuous effort on the part of our postal authorities to join hands with the many British subjects abroad who are interested in the solution of this problem, namely, cheap telegraphic communication between the mother country and the various British colonies. I said, however, to my hon. friend the Postmaster General when he announced some weeks ago that a small reduction in rates had been agreed to by the cable companies and the British government, that in my judgment it was but one instalment, and that we should expect more from future pourparlers between the companies the British Post office and our own post office authorities in Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to say to the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), before he speaks further, that it seems to me doubtful whether he is not infringing a well understood rule of the House by anticipating a discussion of a notice on the order paper. The hon. member or Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has a notice on the order paper which now stands at the head of Public Bills and Orders.

Further consideration of the proposed resolution of Mr. Armstrong (Lambton), that, in the opinion of this House a commission should be appointed to investigate the systems of national telegraphs and telephones, wireless telegraphs and cables.

A discussion took place on that resolution, and now stands to be resumed. I would like to be advised by the House whether it is the judgment of the House that the hon. gentleman is or is not infringing the rule which would prevent another discussion taking place at the present time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I somewhat anticipated the objection, but I thought that, as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) had a fixed purpose to his motion, that of the appointment of a commission to investigate these various questions and problems, my own motion—because I will conclude with a motion—would be in order. Of course, the hon. member for Lambton has mentioned several questions in his motion, while I desire to draw attention only to one of those subjects. I think our purposes are different. My hon. friend moves for a commission; I wish simply to obtain an expression of the opinion of the House my motion reads as follows:

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

I do not think the two motions clash.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish again to submit the question to the judgment of the House. While there is considerable force in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) says, I am not fully convinced that his motion is not an infringement of the rule. But if it is the desire of the House that the hon. member should continue, of course the Speaker has no objection.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am in the judgment of the House. If my hon. friend the Postmaster General sees no objection I might be allowed to proceed.

Mr. PELLETIER. The motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) seems to be along the same line as the motion of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), whose motion, it is true, refers to only one of the many branches contained in the motion of the hon. member for Lambton. Personally I have no objection to this matter being gone into. If the hon. member for Rouville wants a discussion of the matter in the House, it might help us on the other side of the sea to know the opinion of the House of Commons of Canada. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not intend to press the motion very far. I do not think there could be much objection to his going on; anyway, I hope he will be short.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN. (Prime Minister). As there seems to be some difference between the new motions, as this

is an important subject, and as the time to be occupied will not be very great, perhaps it might be considered in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman continue the debate?

Mr. HENDERSON. Before that motion is passed I would say that I think it would only have been fair to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), to have had notice that this discussion was to go on so that he could have taken part in it. I understand that, under the rules of the House, he is debarred from continuing the discussion which he was obliged to drop at six o'clock on a Wednesday night, and which he will not be permitted again to take up. But, if the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), is to be permitted this afternoon to discuss the same question, I think it only fair that the hon. member for East Lambton should have notice. He should have been notified, and he should have been given an opportunity of being here to take part in the discussion and to continue his speech to the end.

Mr. BORDEN. I think that is fair, perhaps under the circumstances, and as my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), does not appear to be here, it might be convenient to postpone it until another day. When I suggested that the discussion might go on I was not aware that my hon. friend was not here.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not wish to press the matter, but I may say that I understood the other evening that the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), was allowed to proceed with a motion of a similar nature which dealt with one of the many subjects mentioned in the omnibus motion of the hon. member for East Lambton, and it seems to me that the same rule should prevail.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not suggesting that it should not prevail, but I was suggesting that it would, perhaps, be convenient to postpone the debate until my hon. friend from East Lambton is here.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Under the circumstances I bow to the desire of the Prime Minister. We might fix a day when this question might be brought up. I have no objection under the circumstances to the postponement.

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

SUPPLY.

Ottawa—grounds, $25,000.

Mr. MONK. This item of $25,000 is asked to be voted to make provision in accordance with an estimate submitted by the chief architect for keeping the grounds in connection with the public buildings, the Lover's Walk, Major Hill Park, and the mint and archives buildings, in proper condition during next year. For the grounds of Parliament Hill the estimate is $14,000, and for Major Hill Park $11,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there any plan of the work to be done in these grounds? I understood there would be a bridge connecting this side of the hill with Major Hill park?

Mr. MONK. There is a project of that kind, but that does not enter into the calculation of this estimate. I can give my hon. friend the details if he wishes them. This is the usual appropriation for plants, pay-lists, lawn mowers, arc lamps, electric lights and repairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad that my hon. friend has mentioned arc lamps in Major Hill park. At the present time Major Hill park is not lighted. I am glad to see that my hon. friend has taken some measures towards lighting it. We had some pour parlers with the city of Ottawa in regard to the lighting of the park. It has never been lighted up to the present time. Nepean Point park is lighted by the commission but the other park has not been lighted up to this time and the park has been of very little use to the public, because it could not be used at night. Has anything been done with respect to the matter?

Mr. MONK. I had that question under consideration two or three days ago, and I asked my officers to look up the deed of agreement between ourselves and the city of Ottawa in regard to Major Hill park so as to make sure of the conditions under which we held that park. I believe there is an old deed between the city of Ottawa and the government in regard to the park. At any rate, we have placed in the estimates an item of $139 for additional arc lights in that park.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I understand the deed, I do not think the city of Ottawa will dispute that they are bound to light the park—I never understood them to dispute that point—but what they wanted was to have a plan showing where the lights should be placed. That was the condition of things when we left office and I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman has taken the matter up because the hotel will be ready early in May and we will be deprived of a great deal of the advantage it will be to the city if the park is not lighted.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What does the government intend to do with the grounds which

were expropriated on Sussex street to form the site of the new departmental buildings? There has been quite an agitation in favour of leaving this space vacant so as to round off the parliament grounds and make it a sort of a park. Does the minister intend to erect the departmental buildings on this vacant place or is he expropriating land elsewhere for that purpose?

Mr. MONK. The appropriation is the annual one for the care of the parliament grounds. I stated the other day in the House that the government had not yet come to any conclusion as to the use to be made of that space on Sussex street acquired by the late government, nor has it come to any conclusion as to the plans for erecting a departmental building. A Committee of the Privy Council has been named to give the matter careful and prompt attention, but it has been utterly impossible during the progress of the session for that committee to give such a large subject the attention it requires. We will proceed in the matter as soon as possible. The late government acquired that site on Sussex street several years ago, and yet, so far as we have been able to discover, it had not formulated any plan for erecting buildings there. If the hon. gentleman wishes to know what I think myself, I may say that it has occurred to me that we might utilize that space which has been so long idle, and in which we have made such a large investment, for the erection of a justice building, which would accommodate the Department of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Railway Commission, the Exchequer Court, and all other branches in connection with the administration of justice. There was a plan prepared by Mr. Maxwell, architect of Montreal, for a very handsome Justice Department building on that space on Sussex street, and I think it might be properly erected there, leaving large open spaces around which would give a park effect. It is out of the question to hope that we could put all the departmental buildings that will be required on that long narrow strip of land, and it puzzles me to know how such a thing could ever have been contemplated. We are considering the acquisition of other lands where a departmental building might suitably be erected.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was delivered by Major Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Right Honourable the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the Royal assent to the following Bill:

An Act to amend the Manitoba Grain Act.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. MONK. When the present government assumed office, we found that we were paying a very large amount as rental for accommodation in the different parts of the city of Ottawa. The amount has increased greatly within the last five or six years, and more space is wanted. At present, I believe, there is not one department in Ottawa that is adequately accommodated, and every day requisitions are made to the department for further accommodation. The departments are broken up one part of a department being in one building and another in another, so that communication between the segregated branches of the department becomes inconvenient and costly. It seems to be absolutely necessary for us to settle now definitely what space we shall require for the erection of departmental buildings, and to begin that erection without delay, so as to avoid as far as possible incurring new liabilities for rental, although I do not imagine that it will be possible even if we begin building next summer, to continue much longer without leasing additional space for the accommodation of the departments. This work the government will undertake as soon as it has been relieved of its sessional duties.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman has mentioned some eastern ground. Will he please state where it is located?

Mr. MONK. The ground around the three main buildings here.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Surely my hon. friend does not anticipate such vandalism. I am quite sure the public will be aroused if it learns that he intends to take any of that space for the erection of new buildings. We have gone, I think, to the very limit by the additions which have been made to the House of Commons and to the Eastern Block. If my hon. friend has any feeling for the artistic and architectural beauty of the parliament buildings, he surely will not encroach further on the remaining land.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend misunderstood me. There is no thought of adding

to the present buildings except some addition to the Library. The idea is to acquire land to the east of the present buildings on which to erect new buildings.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would that be on Wellington street?

Mr. MONK. In that direction. I cannot speak positively, because nothing has been decided.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman contemplate erecting a building on Sussex street for the Supreme Court and the Department of Justice and the Railway Commission, might not the space at present occupied by the Supreme Court building be utilized for the proposed extension?

Mr. MONK. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like to call the minister's attention to the fact that the long-distance telephone at present in the basement is very inconveniently placed for the use of members. If there is any way by which the minister can have it placed on this floor, near the Chamber, it would be a matter of great convenience, I am sure, to every hon. member of the House. I would be much pleased if he would immediately direct some of his officers to look into the matter.

Mr. MONK. I will attend to this request. I may say that as soon as we are free I intend taking up the question of the installation of telephones generally for government purposes. We pay from $20,000 to $23,000 for telephone service. It has been suggested to me by several who have some knowledge on these matters that our whole telephone system needs to be reorganized in the interest of both comfort and economy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What does my hon. friend mean by saying 'when we are free?' Is he not free now?

Mr. MONK. My right hon. friend surely knows what I mean. It is extremely difficult during the sittings of the House to attend to the matters that have been referred to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In view of the fact that there are so many telephone connections with the parliament buildings and the public offices generally, would it not be well for the hon. gentleman to have prepared a special telephone directory covering the several departments and the House of Commons?

Mr. MONK. I do not think that it is in that direction that we can very much improve, because the present telephone directory seems to be very correct. I have been told, however, that we might have one, two, or three exchanges—for instance, one in each block by which means communication would be much easier and more prompt, and there would also be a great saving of public money.

Mr. CRUISE. I would like to ask if it is the intention of the government to build a customs house next summer at the town of Dauphin, in Manitoba?

Mr. MONK. I cannot answer that question off-hand. I do not think it is the intention of the government to proceed with that construction this year; but the supplementary estimates are not yet completed. If my hon. friend can give me a special reason for that construction, we will consider it.

Mr. CRUISE. I would like to take this matter up with my hon. friend at some time. It is very important that there should be a customs house built there in the near future, and it is not necessary to buy any land for the purpose, as the new building could be erected on the ground on which the post office is now built. At present the post office is in an upper room, and it is not very convenient.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is the maintenance of the parliament grounds done by contract?

Mr. MONK. No, it is done by day work, I believe, as in the past.

Mr. LEMIEUX. How many men are employed for that work?

Mr. MONK. About 25.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When were the men appointed whose names figure on that list?

Mr. MONK. I have not on this list the date of appointment of each of the men, but I am under the impression that there are men who have been employed for quite a long time. Most of them are employed during the summer. I do not think there have been any appointments lately. I can give the names to my hon. friend, but I have not the date of appointment. There has been no appointments lately in this branch of the Public Works that I am aware of.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does the minister take care that competent elevator men are selected? Are they required to undergo an examination as to their ability to run an elevator safely, or are they appointed merely on the recommendation of the members for the city?

Mr. MONK. They are not appointed merely on the recommendation of the members for Ottawa, and they are chosen only after they have undergone careful examination by the heads of the branch. As a rule these employees are very competent and capable men.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Who examines them?

Mr. MONK. We have a superintendent, and I think his name is Mr. Shearer. The elevator men, I may say, are fully tested. Although we may make mistakes sometimes, I have had no complaints at all about these employees except that one of them was past the age when a man could carefully handle an elevator. That case will be investigated.

Mr. MACDONALD. Those of us who come from distant parts of the Dominion and are immured on the third floor have to use the elevators very frequently, and especially on Saturday. Referring more particularly to the elevator which is used by the public who go to the galleries, the man in charge, and who has been there since Christmas, is not only incompetent to discharge that duty, but he lacks the necessary intelligence which every elevator man should have. This elevator is probably used three times as much as any other elevator in the building, and I would suggest that this man be removed and stationed somewhere else. I think those in charge of elevators should be bright and intelligent young men, who, in addition to a knowledge as to how to run an elevator, should possess some additional features of intelligence that would render them useful servants. Another complaint I would make is that on Saturday, when the elevator is most required, the man goes away. I would ask the Minister to give instructions not only to place a proper man in charge of this elevator, but that it shall be kept running on occasions like Saturday when it is so much in demand by members from a distance.

Mr. MONK. I will make a note of the remarks of my hon. friend, and we will try and see that the difficulties of which he complains are remedied. Of course we cannot expect to have perfect men in charge of elevators.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The question is a more serious one than the hon. minister seems to think. Elevator men are usually subject to very severe examination because the lives of the passengers who use the elevators are in their keeping. In all large cities a rigid examination is required by the civic authorities. In the city of Montreal no man is appointed to take charge of an elevator without having passed a very severe test. I would call the minister's attention also to the fact that the elevator men smoke whilst on duty. This is objectionable to members of the House and also for the ladies who use these elevators. On one or two elevators which I have occasion to use daily the elevator, men may be seen smoking vigorously, and the smoke they puff is quite offensive. That is not at all respectful to members, and these men should be compelled to discontinue the practice. I have also noticed other officials, probably recent appointees, indulging in smoking in the lobbies. You would not see that in any great building owned by a corporation or controlled by a legislature. You never see elevator men, watchmen, and any officials smoking and puffing their smoke as do these men in this building.

Now, as we are talking about elevators, might I mention that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) dismissed the elevator man in the eastern block soon after he took office. The man is a good officer, works faithfully, from early morning till late in the evening. But he was seen speaking with some of the ex-Cabinet ministers, and, of course, was spotted at once by the spies, and his head was cut off by the guillotine erected by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) on Parliament hill. This man is the father of thirteen children—it seemed to be an unlucky number in his case. But, fortunately, this country has as Prime Minister, a man with a big heart. He found the head in the basket, replaced it on the shoulders of the poor elevator man—for this purpose acting over the head of the lord high executioner —and reinstated to his old post, the father of thirteen children. In the name of the country, and especially on behalf of those who have large families, I thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) for his kindly act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The minister has evidently had previous notice of the incompetency of one of the elevator men, and, apparently, the one to which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) referred. There was no justification for the appointment of such a man to the place he holds, and I submit to the minister (Mr. Monk) that he had no right to take time to consider the matter of the man's dismissal. He ought never to have been appointed, and he ought to be dismissed.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) is not so generous, apparently, as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). The only report I had about this man was that he is afflicted with old age. I am very cruel, perhaps, but I do not dismiss men because of their age alone. The matter was mentioned to me by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Boyer) who thought that this man was too old to be able to handle the crowds that use that elevator. I thought that deserved investigation. If my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) thinks the man is so thoroughly incompetent that he must be dismissed at once, I will take that into consideration; but I do not think that on the strength of a passing remark I should have dismissed him at once. But I will look into the matter. As regards the state of affairs reported here by my hon. friend about dismissals, I can only say that it is absolutely with-

out foundation. Notices were sent out to some employees in the Public Works Department. Representations were made to me and I at once appointed an investigator, one who seemed to me a fair minded man, and to that investigator every man was entitled to go and explain his case, whether he had received notice or not. The man to whom my hon. friend referred came before this investigator, and it was found that there was no ground for removing him. There are a number of other similar cases. The investigation is going on, and nobody has been dismissed without investigation. Every man in my department has an opportunity of laying his case before the investigator. Some of them are assisted by counsel, as I believe my hon. friend is aware. That is very different from what happened at the last change of government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) refer to Mr. Chauvin's investigation?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is the one who investigates these cases in Ottawa? Now, has my hon. friend a list of the day labourers who are appearing before Mr. Chauvin? In other words, has he the black list?

Mr. MONK. The list of those charged with infraction of the rules of the department was placed in the hands of the investigator, and the parties were invited to go to him and explain the accusations made against them by members of parliament and others.

Mr. MACDONALD. Are parties permitted to be represented by counsel?

Mr. MONK. Certainly.

Mr. MACDONALD. The man appointed by the Department of Railways and Canals in the eastern part of Nova Scotia to conduct these dismissals is a partisan so violent that I have no hesitation in saying, on the responsibility of my position, that he is not the man to hear or adjudicate on any matter involving questions of party politics. He will not permit counsel, nor will he permit the party to ask a question of the witness, unless that question is first submitted to him; and if he does not approve of it, he will not put it. I am glad to know that in the Public Works Department methods different from those of the notorious Judge Jeffreys are followed in these investigations. I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) to the fact that the Jeffreys methods ought not to be encouraged or permitted in the Railway Department.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. BORDEN. I have not had my attention directed to any such matter. I shall inquire into it. I am afraid the commissioner referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) must have been misled by the example of the late Insurance Commission.

Mr. MACDONALD. He should not follow a wrong precedent.

Mr. BORDEN. No. But I did not hear my hon. friend's voice raised against the action of that commission. I am glad that we discern in him the symptoms of a newly-awakened conscience.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not wish to get into a general discussion. But I think that when I made such a statement as I have just made, the Prime Minister of this country should not rely upon so old-fashioned a method of reply as the tu quoque argument. I think he has pretty thoroughly exhausted that form of reply. It must surely seem clear to him that the course taken by the Public Works Department, of which we have the assurance of the minister (Mr. Monk), is the one to be followed.

Mr. BORDEN. I think it is; and I have said that I will inquire into the matter the hon. gentleman mentions. At the same time, it is proper to call attention to the fact that, under a commission of very wide-reaching powers issued by the late administration, precisely these methods were adopted.

Mr. MACDONALD. Not into an inquiry into partisanship.

Mr. BORDEN. That is a distinction without a difference. However, apart from that, I agree that every person who is under investigation should have an opportunity of being represented by counsel and of cross-examining witnesses if he desires to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would the right hon. gentleman say, if a case is not proven, who should pay the costs? The poor day labourer?

Mr. BORDEN. That is a question upon which I would not like to pronounce an opinion at the moment; I do not know whether there is any precedent in regard to that. It is, however, a fair matter for consideration.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what disposition he will make in cases where a man is declared to be innocent. Will he restore him to his position again? I have had some cases in the Marine and Fisheries Department, in my constituency, where lighthouse keepers have been turned out of office

without trial. In one case the minister has agreed to give a trial; he informs me that the man has protested that he is not guilty of any partisanship, and he will give him a trial. There is not much use of our going through the expense of a trial unless it amounts to something afterwards. I would like to have the Prime Minister's view of a case in which nothing whatever has been proven against the official, and he has been dismissed after trial.

Mr. BORDEN. No case of that kind has been brought to my attention. If any such case shall arise, it will be a matter, in the first place, for the head of the department. Eventually it might have to be considered by the government.

Mr. STANFIELD. Last week I was present at two investigations being held by the Commissioner of the Railway Department. In both those instances Mr. Lane told the gentlemen that they could be represented by counsel if they wished.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am quite prepared to believe that. I know Mr. Lane, who is an old schoolfellow of mine, and I would expect him to do that. The gentleman whom I referred to is Mr. Duchemin, and I did not expect him to do it, from what I knew before; and I am not surprised to learn that when he did undertake to do it, the commissioner said he didn't do it. Therefore, I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the case.

Mr. MONK. I would not like to lay down the principle that an investigation is to be granted in all cases, far from it. I was induced to do that here in Ottawa because there was so great a number of complaints. It was alleged that the employees of my department had been turned into a regular political organization, of which I have the proof. I stated on previous occasions that it is extremely unfair and cruel for candidates to insist that public employees, poor day-labourers, men who would not meddle in politics, men who drive a team or who are engaged in a similar humble occupation, should necessarily attend committee meetings, go out canvassing, and represent the candidate at the polls. These things are all forbidden, and I say that any candidate who asks a public employee to do that is committing a great injustice, because he knows what the consequences are. But where the minister is perfectly satisfied that these practices have been resorted to, and that an employee has infringed the rule, violated the regulations and laws, is the government to investigate simply because the employee asks it to investigate, although the minister is perfectly satisfied without an investigation? That would involve the country in immense expense, without any utility whatever. Something must be left to the discretion of the head of the department. I had a case where a good employee was accused, and I thought I had convincing proof that he had been an active partisan and had violated the regulations. I explained the law to him, he was a good man with a family; he insisted that there was no proof whatever against him. I caused an investigation to be made—it must have cost $300 or $400, I suppose, when all the expenses have been paid, and there was evidence absolutely uncontradicted, that he had violated the regulations. That case is still pending before me. I do not admit, therefore, that in every case there must be an investigation. In Ottawa there were a very large number of men accused, and when I saw the number and knew that the accusations might or might not be well founded, as I could not investigate them myself, I named an investigator. I am satisfied that justice will be done.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). All these expressions of sympathy from the hon. minister are very good, but what we are concerned with now is to secure a fair investigation in all cases so that justice may be done. As far as the commissioners are concerned, I am afraid there is too much in what my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has said. I am afraid that in some cases the partisanship of the commissioner gets the better of his judgment, and causes him to conduct investigations in a manner that would not be tolerated in any judicial inquiry. I could instance a case with which the commissioner to whom the hon. member for Pictou has referred had to do. He did not confine himself to the charges that were made against the person to be investigated, but he constituted his court a fishing commission. He goes around looking for evidence against others than those against whom charges are made; he tries to ascertain who constituted the executive committees and controlled the party organization in certain places. He inquires who are the men that had contributed towards legitimate election expenses and furnished teams, &c. He is an inquisitor, and goes outside the functions of a court. I saw a copy of the evidence in a certain case that was taken before the commissioner referred to by the member for Pictou, and I have described the nature of the investigation he was conducting in that case. He was supposed to investigate a charge of offensive partisanship against a man whose position somebody else wanted, and he went on with an inquiry into the conduct of the whole campaign in that locality. I think that, in addition to giving the accused an opportunity of being heard in his own defence, it is only right that these commis-

sioners should confine their inquiry to the specific charges made. Surely any person who makes a charge of partisanship and tries to take the means of a man's livelihood away from him, though the latter is only exercising his right of citizenship, should be prepared to make his charge specific, and not go outside it.

Mr. McKENZIE. There is one matter I have for some time wished to bring to the notice of the Prime Minister, namely, his understanding of what is meant by an 'official'. It always occurred to me that a man who works with pick and shovel around these buildings, shovelling snow, or doing some menial work of that kind, can hardly be called an official. I notice that, in a discussion which took place on the 6th of December, the Prime Minister gave two reasons for his decision on this point. He gave two grounds, one was a section of the Civil Service Act of 1908; the other a resolution of this parliament. The section of the Civil Service Act which he read was:

No official, clerk or employee of the Civil Service shall be debarred from voting at any Dominion or provincial election if under the laws governing the said election he has a right to vote. But no such officer, clerk or employee shall engage in partisan work in connection with said election.

The resolution which the right hon. gentleman read was this:

That while it is desirable that every official in the employ of the government of Canada should enjoy perfect freedom of political opinion and the untrammelled exercise of his franchise in accord therewith, no official should be engaged or be permitted to engage in partisan work of any description in the election of a representative to the provincial or the Dominion legislature.

In the first place, he deals with those who come within the operation of the Civil Service Act, and who are not allowed to take any part in election campaigns, or otherwise interfere politically. The provisions of the Civil Service Act do not take in such men as I have mentioned—men working on the sections of the Intercolonial railway, doing ordinary day-work, and men who are handling freight in the freight sheds of the Intercolonial railway, or loading cars. Men of that kind are not covered by the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and they would not be subject to dismissal under that section. In the same way, the resolution dealing with officials certainly does not contemplate men who are working round the grounds here, shovelling snow, or running elevators.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman want us to understand that men doing this particular kind of work should be at liberty to take part in elections?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish).

Mr. McKENZIE. I think that every man who is earning $1.50 or $2 a day has a perfect right to do what he pleases, and that he should not be interfered with because he is politically one way or the other. I certainly say that it is degrading and bringing too low the idea of government supervision in this country to interfere with men in matters of this kind.

Mr. LANCASTER. What about the interest of the public?

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not know that when a man cuts a drain so many inches wide and so many feet long and does a good day's work, or when a man shovels so much snow and does it well, the public is particularly concerned as to what his mental outfit is politically. I do not think that it would interfere with the character of the snow shoveling or the water carrying capacity of the drain. The hon. member for Lincoln might have a different idea.

Mr. LANCASTER. I learned my idea in Lincoln where the late government dismissed everybody without cause.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not aware that the late government has ever dismissed a man from employment of that kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANCASTER. In Lincoln county they dismissed everybody.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not familiar with what has taken place elsewhere, but in the part of the country from which I come such a thing certainly has not happened. We have the Intercolonial railway from the Strait of Canso to Sydney, and I defy the hon. gentleman to name one man who was working at day's labour on that road who was dismissed by reason of his politics. The records of that stretch of road, which is the only part of the Intercolonial railway of which I can speak with knowledge, are before him, and he is at liberty to inquire into them. I am not, at all events, addressing any person in particular except the Minister of Public Works and the Prime Minister, and I say that the line of demarcation should be drawn somewhere. There should be some distinction between a head officer in a department who is getting a big salary and has a comfortable position, and the man who is doing small things. If he does his work well I think it beneath the head of any department to interfere in a case of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understood the other day from the Minister of Public Works, that under no circumstances—he was very emphatic—had a man been dismissed without being given an investigation, if he claimed the privilege. That statement was published broadcast in the press and im-

mediately after I received a letter from an old friend of mine in the county of Gaspé, Mr. Geo. T. Harbour. Mr. Geo. T. Harbour is a good old Scotchman, a fine old Presbyterian, and a most respectable man. He wrote the following letter:

Sandy Beach Centre,
January 23, 1912.

Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have been dismissed from the position I held——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I must remind the committee that the discussion has travelled a little far from the item under consideration. If it is the intention of the committee to go on with a general discussion upon dismissals, it is for the committee to so decide.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This will be the last name. We are getting to the climax. I will read this letter and that will be all. It is in order to put my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works right. I want him to explain and justify himself, and I feel quite sure that he will be able to offer some explanation.

—held at the Deepwater wharf, and I just wish to tell you that I took no part whatever in the September election, as I held a government appointment, and it is against the law to do so.

This is a good old Scotchman who has a deep reverence for the law. He says: It is against the law to do so and so and, therefore, I have taken no part in the election.

I read in the papers that Mr. Monk says no one is dismissed except those who took an active part in the late elections, but he must have been misinformed in my case unless he calls being deputy returning officer taking a part. Will you be so kind as to state that ——fact to the Minister of Public Works——

I am merely carrying out his wish:

—not that I expect to regain the position but simply to let him know that I was dismissed without cause.

With best wishes, I remain,
Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) GEO. T. HARBOUR.

Here is a man who has taken no part whatsoever unless being a deputy returning officer and fulfilling a public duty is regarded as taking a part in politics. He was the representative of the Crown at the poll, not of the candidate, and he acted in the most honourable way. Then he was dismissed without any investigation. He is a most respectable citizen, and I must warn my hon. friend that he is a Scotchman too and that there is a large number of Scotchmen in the country. 'Nemo me impune lacessit'—the hon. gentleman must remember that if he did an injustice to one Scotchman the whole Scotch community of Canada will resent it. I appeal to the many clans of Scotchmen in Canada to stand up in defence of George T. Harbour, who is a true and faithful descendant of the Highlands, and who has been dismissed without cause.

Mr. LANCASTER. Let me ask the hon. gentleman if this wandering Scotchman ever stopped to contemplate the fact that he was paid by the government to work at something else than being deputy returning officer that day, and that if he had been performing the service for which he was paid he could not have acted as deputy returning officer in the election, I suppose, in the interest of the people who appointed him.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is a very good lawyer; at least I was told so the other day by the Prime Minister that he was so good a lawyer that his cases are submitted to the Privy Council. I will have this case submitted to the Privy Council.

Mr. LANCASTER. And his answer was the same as it is to my hon. friend that he had better talk common sense in this House.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Now that the discussion has ranged to matters of this kind, I may mention that I have the case of a French Acadian——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The committee asked me to rule that the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I have only a word to say. If necessary I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. MACDONALD. I want to say a word, Mr. Chairman, about your ruling and your attempt to interfere with and prevent debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD. It is well known

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MACDONALD. Excuse me; I want to take exception to the ruling of the chairman and to his putting off debate. When we are voting Supply is the time, under every British precedent, when the rights of the public have to be ventilated by the representatives of the people. The chairman has applied a limitation to debate which I have never seen applied previously in this parliament. I want to object most strenuously to the rule being interpreted in the way in which the chairman has attempted to interpret it because

I intend to assert my rights as a representative of the people to discuss these questions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member has his recourse by appealing from the ruling of the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am protesting against your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My duty is to see that the committee should follow the rules of the House. I have allowed the debate to wander from the subject to a large extent, but when I see that this irrelevant discussion is extending, and that it is likely to last for some time, my duty is to remind hon. gentlemen that the rule is not being followed.

Mr. MACDONALD. I want you to understand that I am protesting against any such attitude on your part, and I intend to assert myself——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will say what I please.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) should conduct himself in that way; he cannot say what he pleases.

Mr. MACDONALD. I object to the Chairman limiting the rights of the representatives of the people here.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman surely knows that there are certain rules enacted for the governance of the House and its committee, and the rule which is invoked by the Chairman is a very plain one. That rule is that the discussion must relate to the matter before the committee. The discussion has proceeded in a general way for some time, and I do not think the Chairman did any more than his duty in calling the attention of the committee to that fact, saying at the same time that if the committee desired that the discussion should be continued he would permit it to proceed, or otherwise he must enforce what is a very strict rule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Had my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) been presenting something which was not in connection with the Department of Public Works it would be out of order, but we are now discussing the public works estimates, and anything which refers to that department is quite in order. The question is whether the minister who is now at the head of the department has or has not done something which ought to be discussed in parliament. Of course, under the present Act, it would not be in order to discuss dismissals from the Department of the Interior or from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but certainly when these dismissals have occurred in the Department of Public Works the discussion is in order.

Mr. BORDEN. I think that is a very fair statement of it, but the right hon. gentleman surely knows that we have been wandering over every department of the government.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). The matter to which I am about to refer comes under the Public Works Department. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) when discussing the dismissal of a public servant who was of that nationality, has spoken about the Scotch people being clannish. But I am now going to bring to the attention of the House the case of a French Acadian. I may say that in the province of Nova Scotia we have a large number of French Acadians, and better citizens in every respect we have not in this country. It is remarkable that the only French Acadian in the employ of the government on the dredges was dismissed by the present government without an hour's notice. He was dismissed within a very few days after the present government took office; he was harshly treated, he was given no notice that there was any accusation against him, and he was not allowed an opportunity to defend himself. When the Minister of Public Works tells the House that he did not dismiss any employee without charges being made and without an inquiry, the minister is labouring under a misapprehension. It is my opinion, after reading the papers, that in this case the minister was imposed upon and deceived. But, that is a very good reason why the minister should proceed very carefully in these matters, and not take the word of some person who may have a grudge against an official, without making due inquiries. In this case, the captain of the dredge 'Cape Breton' was dismissed without any explanation, or without any charge having been made against him, and so when he seeks employment elsewhere naturally the first question asked him is, where was he last employed, and if it is ascertained that he was dismissed without the reason therefor being assigned, then he might be suspected of incompetency, or dishonesty. It was in order to vindicate this man to some extent that I moved for the papers, for of course I had no expectation that he would be reinstated or that justice would be done him by this government. I believe that the result of making the facts public will demonstrate that there is no stain on the reputation of Captain Decoste. Let us see the evidence on which this man was dismissed. There is

here a letter from Thomas Gallant, who was Conservative candidate in Inverness last election, and the letter was written on October 14, very shortly after the present government came to power. In that letter Mr. Gallant says:

I would beg leave to recommend that Captain Peter Decoste of the dredge 'Cape Breton' be dismissed and Captain Dan Gillis of Port Hawkesbury succeed him. Captain Gillis is a most capable officer. He was dismissed in 1896 for absolutely no reason but that he favoured the Conservative party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Hon. gentlemen say: 'hear, hear' but I will have something to say about that later on. The letter continues:

I think I can safely say that all the members from the Island of Cape Breton and eastern Nova Scotia are thoroughly in accord with this proposition.

Yours very truly,
THOMAS GALLANT.

Now, if it were true that Captain Gillis was dismissed in 1896 for no other reason than that he favoured the Conservative party, it would be a very high handed act on the part of the Liberals and possibly Captain Gillis should be reinstated. But the record of Captain Gillis must have been in the department and there is nothing here to show that the Minister of Public Works examined that record to find out whether the reason given for the dismissal of Captain Gillis in 1896 was the right reason. As a fact, the record will show that that was not the reason why Captain Gillis was dismissed, and, as to the statement in the letter that all the members of the Island of Cape Breton and eastern Nova Scotia are in favour of Captain Decoste's dismissal, it is only necessary to point out that all these members are Liberals, and it is not likely they would ask for the dismissal of one of their own friends and the reinstatement of a man who was said to have been dismissed solely because he was a Conservative.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would not these Liberal members ask for the dismissal of their own political friend if it was in the public interest?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Your mind is too acute for me, I cannot follow you. I can say it is not true that a single one of the members from the Island of Cape Breton or the eastern part of Nova Scotia asked for the dismissal of Captain Decoste. I may say in justice to Mr. Gallant that probably what he really meant was that the defeated Conservative candidates at the last election and not the members from the Island of Cape Breton and eastern Nova Scotia wanted to have this gentleman dismissed, and the other statement was probably an error in typewriting. I do not think that Mr. Gallant intended to misstate the facts because I know him to be a thoroughly respectable gentleman and one who would not deliberately mislead the Minister of Public Works or any one else. But I think he was used as a tool in this case, that he was imposed upon, that he was not seized of the actual facts before writing the letter. And there are other letters on the record which sustains this assumption or belief on my part. There is a letter from one William Macdonald, president of the Pictou Conservative Club, who says:

As far as I know, the whole of eastern Nova Scotia and Cape Breton insists on this appointment.

That is, the appointment of Captain Gillis. It is evident that there is some fine Italian hand behind the attempt to get Captain Peter DeCoste out of his position. How is William Macdonald in a position to speak for the whole of eastern Nova Scotia and Cape Breton? But to show how confident these men were of being able to secure anything and everything they wanted from this government in the way of beheading unfortunate Grits, he winds up his letter by saying:

Kindly communicate your decision to me as soon as possible, as Captain Gillis is at present here.

They could not wait for an investigation; there was no suggestion that an inquiry should be made. All that these men wanted was the place for Captain Gillis, and they felt sure that the minister would fall into the snare and do what was asked without an inquiry. Next I find a letter from J. A. Gillis, who was the Conservative candidate in Richmond county. I mention this to remove any idea that Thos. Gallant tried to deceive the department. Mr. Gillis says:

I beg leave to recommend the dismissal of Captain Peter Decoste of the dredge 'Cape Breton' and the appointment in his place of Captain Daniel Gillis of Port Hawkesbury, Cape Breton, at present of Pictou, Nova Scotia, Captain Gillis is an exceptionally competent man and was dismissed without cause in 1896 to make way for Decoste.

What is the first thing that the minister should have done when he received that letter? Should he not have inquired whether it was really the case that Captain Gillis had been dismissed without cause in 1896? I cannot find any evidence to justify that statement. You will also observe that there is not a single scintilla of evidence to show that Captain Decoste was a partisan, or was in any way offensive to the community.

Mr. DAVIDSON—Why was Captain Gillis dismissed?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). The records of the department are there, and the minister will be prepared to explain that, I presume.

Mr. DAVIDSON. You said that the statement made by Mr. Gallant that this man was dismissed without cause was incorrect.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I made the statement that the minister should have looked up the records and ascertained whether that statement was correct or not. He had no right to assume such an alleged fact. I will go further to satisfy my hon. friend, and will say that Captain Gillis was not dismissed because of offensive partisanship. He was continued by the late Minister of Public Works as an employee on one of the government dredges up to the day of the election; after the day of the election, and up to the time he took the place of Captain Peter Decoste. I would be sorry to say anything against Captain Gillis. I think he is a pretty good Liberal, but I hope that will not hurt him, and that the minister will not dismiss him from the service on that account. He was dismissed for other reasons. I think the member for Cumberland county made some charges against him, but they were not charges of offensive political partisanship. I do not want to go into that, because I do not want to say anything against Captain Gillis. But I do blame the Minister of Public Works for not having ascertained whether the charge made in these letters which I have read, was correct or not, that Captain Gillis had been dismissed for political partisanship; and I blame him for dismissing Captain Decoste without any accusation having been made against him. He should at least have insisted that J. A. Gillis, Thomas Gallant and William Macdonald and the others disclosed and undisclosed or some of them should have made a charge that Peter Decoste was guilty of offensive partisanship and on that account was not entitled to remain in charge of the dredge 'Cape Breton.' All through this correspondence you will not find one hint or suggestion that Captain Decoste was an offensive partisan, or that he had done any wrong, according to the standard by which the minister has been judging officials since he came into office. I find a letter here from John McCormick, who also was a defeated Conservative candidate in North-Cape Breton, as follows:

> I beg to recommend the dismissal of Captain Decoste of the dredge 'Cape Breton' and the appointment in his place of Captain Daniel Gillis of Port Hawkesbury Cape Breton, who in 1896 was dismissed without cause to make way for said Decoste.

How does he know that Captain Gillis was dismissed without cause? There is no doubt that he was sincere in the matter, but why did the minister act on this statement? Why did he not verify the facts for himself? You will observe that in this letter there is no hint or suggestion that Captain Decoste is a partisan. There is a similar letter from J. W. Maddin, the late representative for Cape Breton South, who goes one better. He says:

> Captain Gillis is a man of great experience in the dredging business, and was dismissed in 1896 to make room for Decoste.

If that is so, it would be only right that Captain Gillis should be reinstated. Is it so, however? Where is the evidence of it from the record or otherwise? But if we go a little further, we find Finlay Macdonald, president of the county of Cape Breton Liberal-Conservative Association saying:

> Captain Gillis is a most competent man against whom I believe no complaint was ever made. Captain Decoste's record you will be able to get from your officials.

Is this correct? Was there no complaint ever made against Captain Gillis? Here is another reason why the minister should have asked these men to make their charge against Captain Decoste, unless there was something in his record which satisfied him that Captain Decoste should have been dismissed. But I have a copy of all the correspondence relating to this dismissal, and I cannot find a single word against his record. Then, we have a letter from the Liberal-Conservative Association of Inverness county. In that letter it is said that Captain Decoste is a man of no experience whatever.' That is ridiculous. He has had experience under the late administration from the time he took the place until he was dismissed. His record was good, excellent. But behind that he had the experience of a quarter of a century as a navigator and had the highest certificates. How was this dismissal brought about? The only information he had of it was in a telegram dated October 26, 1911, from the assistant engineer to Mr. Graham, the superintendent of dredging as follows:

> Kindly arrange to have Captain Gillis of Port Hawkesbury replace Captain Decoste of dredge 'Cape Breton' giving him all necessary instructions regarding his work.

Then Mr. Graham writes to the assistant engineer under date of October 27, 1911:

> I am to-day in receipt of the following message from Mr. A. R. Dufresne, assistant chief engineer, Department of Public Works, Ottawa:—'Kindly arrange to have Captain Daniel Gillis of Port Hawkesbury replace Captain Decoste of dredge Cape Breton, giv-

ing him all necessary instructions regarding his work.' The above telegram is self explanatory and I have instructed Captain Gillis to report at my office to-morrow morning in connection with the same. When Captain Gillis arrives at the dredge I will feel obliged of you will give him any information you can in connection with the work being performed at St. Ann's, and also as to the operation and maintenance of the dredge. On his arrival on board the dredge, Captain Gillis will take charge of the plant.

Evidently Mr. Graham felt that Captain Gillis was not competent to take charge of the dredge 'Cape Breton' without first having received instructions from Captain Decoste—without first being schooled in the work to be done. Now, you will observe that immediately after this government came into power, or a very few days afterwards, the minister, without any investigation whatever, and without any notice to Captain Decoste, sends a telegram to Mr. Graham, the superintendent of dredging, and asks for the dismissal of this man, Captain Decoste. The mails in due course would be too slow; the lightning rapidity of the wires had to be used. That certainly was high-handed dealing and gross injustice towards Captain Decoste. But I desire to say, in all justice and fairness to the minister, that I believe he was imposed upon. Possibly he read the letters, or somebody else read them for him, and then he assumed that there was a charge of partisanship against Captain Decoste.

He thought that these men who had written these letters would not ask for a dismissal on any flimsy charges, or without having some justification for such action, and he took it for granted, perhaps, that Captain Decoste was an offensive partisan, or that these letters contained an accusation of offensive partisanship. But the correspondence does not show any charge whatever against Captain Decoste. The whole thing is simply this: it was desired to make a place for Captain Gillis, and, therefore, Captain Decoste was removed. I would ask the minister whether in justice to Captain Decoste, and in justice to himself, he will not insist upon charges being made against Captain Decoste first, that then the charges should be communicated by the government to the accused, and that he be given an opportunity of exonerating himself.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would ask the minister to inquire into the charges upon which Captain Gillis was dismissed. I am informed that he was dismissed not for political partisanship, but because of insubordination, or trouble of that kind, and I think the records will bear that out.

Mr. MONK. I must take the liberty of telling my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) that in my opinion he is making a great to do about nothing. I can assure him there will be no investigation in the case of Captain Decoste; we are well rid of him. He was quite unfit for the work of commander of that dredge, and in any event he would not have been retained in command any longer. The proofs of Captain Decoste's unfitness are in the department.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). If there are charges against him, why have those charges not been brought down?

Mr. MONK. There were complaints against Captain Decoste.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). We have no record of it.

Mr. MONK. There is a record in the department where my hon. friend can see them. There are quite a number of reports and my superintendent of dredging told me that Captain Decoste was not a satisfactory man. I have no doubt whatever that he was an unsuitable man to command that dredge, and I would not have maintained him there anyway. As to Captain Gillis we will see. I have never pretended that there would be an investigation in all cases where charges were made against officials. What I stated the other day, and what I repeat to-day, is that in Ottawa no dismissal would be effective without the man accused having an opportunity of going before the investigator. Some notices of dismissal had been sent out, but the general order regarding inquiries was given, and Mr. Chauvin was appointed to investigate every case without exception. I do not by any means intend to apply that rule everywhere. Where there is ample proof before the minister that the employee has transgressed, he will be dismissed without any unnecessary investigation. In Ottawa the circumstances were different. The charges covered over 100 cases, and I thought it was better to have a general investigation. And I was right in saying that in Ottawa no employee has been dismissed without an investigation of the charges against him; and in every case where the investigator reports to me—some reports have already been presented but I have not yet had time to look into them—that the charge is unfounded, justice will be done, whatever notice the accused man may have received. Replying to my hon. friend from Cape Breton I would say that every man employed in my department has had clear intimation, whether he is temporarily or permanently employed, that he is not to become an offensive partisan. Violations of this notice will be treated in the same way without any exception whatever. Of course the hardship is much greater where the

person concerned is a permanent employee, but to make a distinction which my hon. friend invites me to make would be extremely unwise. The law is there, and the regulation is in force, that no man employed and paid by the public can meddle in politics whether his employment be of a permanent character or not, and I intend to adhere to that rule in my department as strictly as possible.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is Mr. Chauvin paid a per diem allowance of $15 or is he paid so much per case?

Mr. MONK. All the investigators are paid the same per diem rate of $15.

Mr. SINCLAIR. How many commissioners are engaged in investigating charges against officials? Can the minister give their names?

Mr. MONK. I have not the names of all of them. If my hon. friend will move for that information it will be supplied to him.

Mr. KNOWLES. I want to call the minister's attention, but not in any critical spirit at all, to the desirability of a public building for the town of Swift Current, and I trust that he will take the claims of that place into his consideration when he comes to prepare his supplementary estimates.

Mr. MONK. All the facts in regard to Swift Current were placed before me yesterday by a delegation, and they are now being considered by the officers of the department who have charge of the preparation of the supplementary estimates.

Mr. KNOWLES. I thank the minister for giving me that information, but I still deem it urgent and necessary to press upon him as strongly as I can the necessity for the construction of this building. The town of Swift Current has grown faster, proportionately, than any other town in Saskatchewan. It is a very important centre for the reason that no other town of any consequence is located within anything like reasonable distance of it. It is 111 miles from Moosejaw, and 89 or 90 miles from Maple Creek, and the territory to which it ministers extends southward for probably 100 miles, and northward for 50 miles. The town is going to be an important railway centre. The main line of the Canadian Pacific railway passes through the place, and construction of two other lines, one to run in a southeasterly, and the other in a northwesterly direction, has been commenced. The amount of business that is transacted in the federal offices in Swift Current indicates the importance of the town. In this connection let me read a letter I have received from the accountant of the Post Office Department dated Ottawa February 2, 1912:

Dear Sir,—Replying to yours of the 1st instant addressed to the secretary of the department, I beg to inform you that the revenue of the Swift Current, Saskatchewan, office for the calendar year ended 31st December 1911 was $11,912.91.

Yours truly,
W. J. GLOVER,
Accountant.

I want to read a similar letter from the Department of Inland Revenue showing the revenue of that department at Swift Current:

Department of Inland Revenue,
Ottawa, February 2, 1912.

Dear Sir,—Replying to yours of the 31st ultimo, I beg to inform you that the moment of duty collected during the fiscal year ending the 31st March 1911 at Swift Current was $9,268.01.

I regret that I cannot give you the figures for the calendar year as the books of the department only indicate the amount collected during the fiscal year.

Yours truly,
WILLIAM HIMSWORTH.

That is a good criterion. Now, let me read for the information of the minister a similar communication from the Department of the Interior, and, with all due respect, I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has this information:

Department of the Interior,
Canada.
Ottawa, 5th February, 1912.

Statement of Revenue of the Dominion Lands Office, Swift Current, for the calendar year 1911, including payments made direct to head office.

Dominion Lands Revenue.

	Total.
Agency	$246,238 26
Head office	14,214 10
	$260,452 36
School Lands Revenue.	
Agency	$1,080 34
	1,080 34
	$261,532 70

Then I have the following from the Department of Customs, showing the revenue at Swift Current through that department:

Department of Customs,
Ottawa, 5th February, 1912.

W. E. Knowles, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 31st ultimo, I have the honour to advise you that the customs revenue at Swift Current, during the calendar year 1911, was $30,362.85.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner of Customs.

So the minister will see that there was a total revenue of well over $300,000 at Swift Current in the last year. I submit that the minister might well use that town very generously. If he will contemplate the enor-

mous revenue which is received by the government through this town, he must see that that puts the town in a different class from ordinary towns in the different parts of Canada. There are the two facts —a revenue of over $300,000 and nothing whatever in the shape of a public building. There is great need of a public building. The post office service suffers for lack of it and is very poor there at the present time. The Postmaster General is paying a large rent for accommodation there, also the Customs and Interior Departments. It would be economical to put up a public building; it would be just to put up a public building, especially in view of the enormous revenue which comes to the treasury of this government from that centre.

Mr. MONK. Would the town give us a site?

Mr. KNOWLES. I have not heard that point discussed. As a representative of the people I must say that I do not see why the town should be asked to give a site. The people of that town are paying up to the hilt in the way of customs and one thing and another, the town and district as I have shown, paying over $300,000. I should think that this is one of the towns in whose case the government would not be justified in insisting upon a site.

Mr. MONK. Many towns give us a site.

Mr. KNOWLES. But very few of them can present so good a case as that which I have been able to make to-day. I doubt if he can show any other town yielding a revenue of over $300,000 and without anything in the way of a public building. The site need not cost a great deal. At the same time, I doubt if the town will give it. I have not consulted my constituents; but I would not recommend them to furnish a site when the town affords so large a revenue. I hope the minister will decide to buy a site; he could probably get it for $40,000. And I hope he will not think the cost of the site too much. A large sum besides this could be put into a public building and still keep within lines of economy. He could probably put up a building for $125,000 that would meet the present requirements of the town and reasonably anticipate the growth which is sure to take place there. I would ask the hon. minister to give me the assurance this afternoon that he will give the matter consideration with a view to providing means for a public building, not next session but this session, because the need is imperative and very urgent.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think this is only another illustration of the maladministration or lack of proper administration during the regime of the Liberal party.

Mr. KNOWLES. How so?

Mr. HENDERSON. Here, according to the hon. gentleman is a most urgent case He pointed out the large revenue derived from Swift Current. But while these large revenues have been coming into the treasury for years and years past the government of which he was a strong supporter paid no attention to his request and left the town without proper accommodation for its business. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should make such an exhibition of the incompetence and neglect of the administration of which he was an ardent supporter. Had the place been represented by an opponent of the government, I should not have expected, under the rules laid down by the previous government it would pay much attention to his request. But there would be a candidate who would be responsible for bringing the claims of that town to the attention of the government. But this is only another illustration of the lack of interest of the late government in many parts of the country.

Mr KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) is entirely in the dark. His assertion that this revenue has been received 'for years and years' is without foundation. The Customs Office in Swift Current the Dominion Lands Office, and the Inland Revenue Office there are not two years old. If the hon. gentleman would come west he would understand that the conditions that prevail in my riding, have not existed 'for years and years' to use his own beautiful expression. But the fact is that, had our Conservative friends in the last parliament not adopted that remarkably stupid system which they did adopt of obstructing all His Majesty's estimates, it is probable the late government would have provided for the case. Prior to that, there was no great urgency and immediate need such as now exists. Perhaps the hon. member will take my word for it that he does not understand the condition. I presume that he knows something about Ontario that he thinks highly of it, and is highly thought of in that province. But he is absolutely at sea when he attempts to discuss the situation in a western town. And I am sorry that he, so prominent a supporter of the government, should, in this indirect way, throw cold water on my request for favourable consideration of this matter on the part of the government.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am surprised, indeed, at what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) says, that the town of Swift Current is only two years old.

Mr. KNOWLES. I did not say that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, that the town was of no importance until two years ago—that is what I infer from what he says.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman infers too much.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then, I do not know what he did say. I remember going through that country twenty years ago, and I am pretty sure there was a place called Swift Current then.

Mr. KNOWLES. The Tories were in power then; why did not they put up a public building?

Mr. HENDERSON. It had not a revenue of $300,000 at that time. But it was growing and has grown very rapidly. The 'current' has been 'swift' for the last two years, yet the government of which the hon. gentleman was such a swift supporter did not do anything to help the town to accelerate its motion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) says that we who were of the opposition of the day were responsible because we obstructed the estimates. Well, I do not know that the late government's majority ever came so low that any obstruction that we could offer would prevent them from putting an item through if they desired it. We criticised the estimates—very true. But I have no recollection of an item respecting Swift Current being criticised. The hon. gentleman has not told us that he had an item in the estimates for Swift Current. The probability is there was no such item. So, the hon. gentleman has no right to find fault with the government for not giving attention to this important place. It is only an illustration, as I have said, of how the former government, when they thought they had a constituency absolutely certain to return a supporter, failed to give it attention. I am not opposing this estimate. The Minister of Public Works tells us that a deputation waited on him no later than yesterday and had presented the needs and demands of Swift Current more forcibly, if possible, than the hon. gentleman has presented them.

It was not necessary for the hon. gentleman to come forward at this time and repeat what had been so well stated by the deputation, because the minister has all the facts, and probably the minister will listen to the deputation, and the hon. gentleman will find to his surprise that there will be a public building there—I will not say of the dimensions he speaks of. But is was a matter of curiosity to me why the hon. gentleman rose at all, when he knew that the government had been already provided with the information, and that everything was going along smoothly. Perhaps he wanted to make a little cheap political capital by causing the people out there to think that the very forcible speech which he delivered this afternoon in support of a public building in Swift Current was the reason for its erection. I hope the hon. gentleman will succeed in getting his building, proportionate to the size of the important town to which he refers.

Mr. KNOWLES. We all well remember that when the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), was in opposition, he had a hardy annual request to the government then in power for something for his riding.

Mr. HENDERSON. And I never got it.

Mr. KNOWLES. My hon. friend is not finding fault with me because I haven't got it, but because I asked for it. Great as is my respect for that hon. gentleman, when I think well to ask for a public building I will ask for it, and I will keep on asking, and he can make his little speech as often as he likes. It is a matter of absolute indifference to me. But my hon. friend knows nothing about the circumstances. Let me tell him that the town of Swift Current, although it did not give me a majority in 1908, in 1911 it gave me a majority of 80. I do not think the people will find that I am neglecting their interests. No matter what deputations may come down here, I have my duty to discharge to my constituents.

Mr. MONK. I did not understand the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) to throw any cold water on this request.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not at all.

Mr. MONK. But he was endeavouring to point out the real reason why the town of Swift Current was put off so long in getting this request. I have in my department a number of public buildings that are either being terminated or will have to be paid for, whose erection had been decided upon by the late government, but where one-tenth of the necessity did not exist that exists in the town of Swift Current, and where there is not one-third of the business done that is done in Swift Current. There is no doubt that the late government started upon a lavish erection of public buildings, and we have fallen into that hereditas damnosa, where there is nothing like the need that there is in Swift Current. It is surprising that the late government should go into those towns in the west where the price of sites is so terrifically expensive, where you have to pay for comparatively new towns, all the way from $40,000 to $125,000 for sites. It is astonishing to find that there was so little foresight in the last administration, and that they did not acquire sites at a time when they could have been purchased comparatively cheap. But they thought nothing of the future.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is always difficult to predict what changes will take place in a

country like Canada, and especially in the west. It is also hard to implement promises that have been made in the past. For instance, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who was so lavish in his promises when he sat on this side of the House of what he would do in the future, now that he is in office is very reluctant to implement those promises. The other day I asked what he was going to do with the harbour of Montreal, if he was going to make it a national and free port. My hon. friend said: No, not now, I am too busy, we have had no time to consider it.

Mr. MONK. I do not recollect saying anything of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, my hon. friend has no recollection at all, he is sleeping all the time. He promised his electors the Georgian Bay canal, to make Montreal a free port——

Mr. MONK. That is coming quickly.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is like Rip Van Winkle. After sleeping for a century, probably he will wake up and find that all these things have been done, not by his friends, but by us.

Mr. MONK. Much you did for Montreal.

Mr. LAW. I would ask the Minister of Public Works what he proposes to do to give increased accommodation to the post office in the town of Yarmouth. The late government purchased a property directly south of the public building there, but I see nothing in the estimates this year for the extension of the post office so as to give the needed increased accommodation. I may say to the minister that the people of Yarmouth have complained for some time of the inadequacy of the post office quarters there. The late government purchased a building directly south, and it would require quite a sum of money to extend the post office to that building. I trust the minister, in his supplementary estimates, will put an amount sufficient to give this increased accommodation to the town of Yarmouth.

Mr. MONK. I will do my best.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I wish to bring another matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works before this item is carried. Last November, I asked him why the captain of the dredge 'Cape Breton' had been dismissed. He did not intimate that his services were not satisfactory, that he was incompetent, or that he had discharged his duties in a way that did not meet with the approval of the officers of the department. On the contrary he suggested that I should move for the papers in the matter. I got the papers, and read them to the House, and there is not a word in them to indicate that a charge had ever been made during the whole fifteen years or thereabouts that Captain Decoste was in the employ of the government. He never had any accident to his men during all the time that he was employed, he never lost a tug, or steamer, or any of the equipment used on a dredge. His record, to my own knowledge, has been good. If since the change of government, my hon. friend the minister has discovered anything against the ability or the fitness of Captain Decoste to hold that position, why didn't he bring those papers down with the rest of the correspondence? I asked for all the papers, letters and correspondence in connection with his dismissal. I have a right to assume that all the charges that could be made against Captain Decoste are found in the papers that are brought down, but there is not a single line in the form of a charge against him. Now it is decidedly unfair to Captain Decoste that the minister should shift his position, and say: that might is right, I am Minister of Public Works, I am a member of a government with a strong majority behind me, and Decoste must get along the best he can, he is only an insignificant French Acadian down in the county of Antigonish, and he has got to face the music. Now, the minister practically says to those who inquire on behalf of Captain Decoste that he dismissed him without having any charges made against him, and he refuses an investigation. I submit that such conduct is not what you would expect from a minister of the Crown, it is not compatible with those protestations of fairness and justice from the lips of the Minister of Public Works again and again since this session began. I submit that it is only fair to Captain Decoste, that he should know what the charges are against him, and that he should be given an opportunity to vindicate himself.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is very lengthy in his complaint, but I do not say there were charges against Captain Decoste. I said that my officers reported to me that he was a very unsatisfactory captain of the dredge. I can demonstrate that to my hon. friend if he will come to my office. I can show him the complaints——

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Are they in writing?

Mr. MONK——and produce before him the officials of the department who will confirm what I am saying now. As to Captain Decoste being a French Acadian, as alleged by my hon. friend, I may say that side of the question was never considered by me. He is probably an Acadian of French descent, and as such is extremely interesting to me. But, there was no national question, fortunately, in this matter at all. I believe that Mr. Gallant is also an Acadian

by descent. Mr. Girouard is an Acadian. I believe, and he was dismissed in 189t without any reason whatever by my hon. friend and had to go and earn his livelihood in the United States. I do not think that the national question will help my hon. friend very much in this matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have the honour to represent several thousand French Acadians in my constituency adjoining the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Chisholm, Antigonish); I am acquainted with Captain Decoste and I feel I should enter my protest against what the minister has been saying with regard to him this afternoon. I was sorry to hear the minister say that Captain Decoste would not have any investigation. I do not say that because he is a French Acadian, but because he is a British subject and a good citizen of this country, a man who has the respect of his neighbours and of people generally in eastern Nova Scotia who know him. I think that for these reasons he ought to be accorded an investigation. The minister has told us that there are some charges against him by some officers of the department, which he has not produced to the House. It is a serious matter to Captain Decoste, it means his livelihood, it means his future, it means an end to his business as a captain if the statement made by the minister should go abroad and be believed by people who wished to employ Captain Decoste in the only capacity in which he is capable of serving. It is a very serious matter to him, and I do not think the minister was justified in stating so positively that there would be no investigation into the case of Captain Decoste. The reason was that he had some papers, some statements in his possession——

Mr. MONK. He was found an unsatisfactory officer.

Mr. SINCLAIR——reflecting on the character, I suppose, of Captain Decoste. If there are documents of that kind in the department I would remind the minister that the House passed an order that all documents relating to the dismissal of Captain Decoste should be produced. We have the documents here that were produced and we do not find any complaint of that character. I do not think that this is a position that the minister should take. I think he should say that he will bring down these documents and that he will give Captain Decoste an opportunity of being heard. It is not a question of getting back his job, but it is a question of his character, and that is very important to him. If he has an opportunity of clearing up his reputation as a captain he might get employment somewhere else, but when the minister summarily discharges him and states in parliament that here will be no investigation in Captain Decoste's case, it will be a serious matter for Captain Decoste personally. I have a very high respect for him. He acted as captain of a dredge on work in my constituency, he gave thoroughly good service and there was no complaint against him by anybody. He did his work very well and I think there must be some mistake somewhere, because I do not think that Captain Decoste got fair play or that documents could be produced in the Public Works Department or anywhere else that would show that he was unfit to perform his duties. I would like the minister to reconsider the decision that he has come to this afternoon and to tell the House before this matter closes that he will give Captain Decoste an opportunity of being heard for the purpose of clearing his character.

Mr. MONK. I did not say there were charges or accusations against this man. I said that he was an unsatisfactory officer by general report and that we did not consider that he was a loss to the department.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There is another matter that I want to mention to the Minister of Public Works and particularly while the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) is in his seat. Some years ago a person in the town of Digby was appointed by the Department of Public Works to attend to the winding of the clock in the public building in the town for which he was to receive $25 a year. I understand that he is in no sense a partisan and not considered as such in the town of Digby. Recently some person, whether by authority or not I do not know, placed on the door entering to the clock in the tower a padlock which prevents the proper person gaining access to the place where the clock is in order to wind it. This may be a very serious matter to the town of Digby if some day they ascertain that the clock in the public building is stopped. I would like the Minister of Public Works to look into this and instruct the man who put the padlock on the door to take it off so that the person employed some few years ago to wind the clock may have an opportunity of getting at it.

Mr. MONK. I will look into it.

Mr. JAMESON. I think that I will possibly be able to explain the situation to my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean). This gentleman to whom he refers as having charge of the clock in the public building at Digby has been reported to me as having been unsatisfactory. It was said that he did not care for the clock sufficiently well to keep it going, that at times it was, owing to lack of attention, stopped, and that otherwise it was not attended to

in a satisfactory way. I brought the matter to the attention of the Department of Public Works and the department removed that gentleman from office and appointed another. The man who was appointed to office received a notification to that effect, but through some oversight, as I am given to understand, the person who had previously held the appointment, did not receive notification. The result was that when the new official went to discharge his duties, after attending to them, he put a padlock on the door. The padlock, however, was removed by the gentleman who had previously attended to the clock. I think the matter has been explained to the satisfaction of all concerned by a notification from the department which has reached the first official to the effect that his services are no longer required.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). He has been dismissed?

Mr. JAMESON. He has been dismissed.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). And notified to that effect?

Mr. JAMESON. And notified to that effect.

Mr. LAW. I was not able to be present when the item of $100,000 for dredging and improvements in Yarmouth harbour came up. I would like to ask the minister what he proposes to do with the $100,000 that was voted, whether it is to be expended upon dredging or other work.

Mr. MONK. That is under consideration. The matter has not yet been decided, but I think dredging probably.

Mr. LAW. It seems to me that before the estimate passes the House we should be entitled to know something about the work that is to be done. There is an obstruction in Yarmouth harbour at Sollow's Rock ledge which has been there for many years and for the removal of which $75,000 was placed in last year's estimates.

Owing to the dissolution of parliament that money was not expended, and I would like the minister to state definitely now what he purposes doing with that vote and whether there will be an additional vote in the supplementary estimates. The port of Yarmouth is one of the most important in the maritime provinces; there are more first-class passengers landed there in the course of a year than at any other port in the maritime provinces or probably in the Dominion. We have a line of steamers now between Yarmouth and Boston and we are looking forward to having another line from Yarmouth to New York. The Canadian Pacific railway have purchased the Dominion Atlantic railway, including their steamship line, and it is proposed in a short time to put larger boats on the route between Yarmouth and Boston, while of course the New York boats will also be larger than those plying at present to that port. I point out to the minister the urgency of the need of improvements at the port of Yarmouth. While the late government had been lavish in its expenditure there, and had greatly improved the harbour, yet there is a great handicap to shipping in the inadequate channel leading from the mouth of the harbour to the business part of the port. There is a ledge situated outside of the harbour on which there is at low water fourteen feet six inches, and that will require to be blasted out at a large expenditure. I submit to the minister that the necessity and importance of the port demand early action on the part of the government. There is considerable dredging also required in the harbour. We have in the channel a depth of twenty feet, but if the Canadian Pacific railway should put on larger boats as they intend to, a great deal of dredging will have to be done. The people of Yarmouth will appreciate the $100,000 which is now in the estimates, and I have nothing to say against it except that it is altogether too small. I trust that the minister, when he looks into the matter, will be able to place in the supplementary estimates an equal amount. When some gentlemen from Yarmouth attended the liquid banquet which was held in Halifax last fall, they said when they returned home, that they had seen the Minister of Public Works and the report was current that he intended to expend two or three million dollars on Yarmouth harbour, and although we appreciate the $100,000 in the estimates, the drop from two or three millions is great indeed. Has the minister any idea as to how he will expend the $100,000 in the main estimates?

Mr. MONK. I have a general idea, and that general idea which is very firmly imbedded in my mind is that when the late government spent so much money in that locality it is a pity it did not remove that ledge to which the hon. member has referred. That was the key of the situation in the harbour of Yarmouth, and instead of employing the dredges in the neighbourhood of private docks, probably with the object of advancing private interests, if they had removed the ledge at the entrance of the harbour it would have been a far more profitable service to the port. The port of Yarmouth will require our attention and there is a vote in the estimates for it.

The determination of the Canadian Pacific railway, having acquired the Dominion

Atlantic line, to place new boats on the route, is not yet an accomplished fact. Although Yarmouth is an important port it is not the only port in Nova Scotia. There are other important ports along the Bay of Fundy, and until we know exactly what the plans of the Canadian Pacific railway are, and how far our improvements may meet these plans, the matter remains to a certain extent in doubt. Justice will be done to the harbour and certainly the work will be more profitable to the general interests of the port than anything done in the past by the late government.

Mr. LAW. In denial of what the minister has said, I wish to state that if he goes to Yarmouth he will only find a very few partisans who will say that the dredging done in Yarmouth Harbour has been done for the benefit of private owners of wharfs. There has been no work done in the port of Yarmouth solely for the benefit of owners of wharfs; the work done there has been done in the interests of the general navigation of the port. I deny most emphatically the statement made by the minister. He has apparently been posted by some gentlemen from Yarmouth who have taken considerable interest in the matter, but I know that the statement he made to-day is absolutely wrong, I know that ninety per cent of the dredging done in Yarmouth Harbour has been done largely in the main channel, and while it certainly has improved private wharf property it undoubtedly has improved the harbour facilities as well. There was a channel dredged at the south end of the town which has opened up a large fishing industry and I doubt if the Minister of Public Works will find even a Conservative in Yarmouth who will object to that work. I know what I am speaking about and I say that the work done by the late government was done for the benefit of Yarmouth Harbour and was not done for the benefit of any private wharf owner. If the minister will spend this $100,000 to as good purpose as the late government spent the money, there will be no fault found. As to why the late government did not remove this ledge, I may say that there was only a certain amount of money voted and the dredging was done first, leaving it for the present government to take out the rock. Had the Liberal government remained in power, and I am sorry it did not—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Mr. LAW. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but if the rest of Canada had given as intelligent a vote as the County of Yarmouth did, we would have been on the other side of the House to-day. I feel satisfied that had the late government been in power to-day I would have got a vote of no less than $250,000 for the development of Yarmouth Harbour and if the present government puts that amount in the estimates they will be doing a lot of good in the public interest.

Mr. DAVIDSON. As a representative of one of the western Nova Scotia counties I wish to corroborate in a measure what has been said by my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Law). It is in the memory of this House that on a certain occasion when there was to be a banquet in the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Law) and when the officers of the great Canadian Navy were required there to furnish partners in the dance for the charming ladies of that locality, the 'Niobe' was ordered to that port.

And notwithstanding the large expenditures of the late government for dredging in that harbour, it was in such a condition that the 'Niobe' met with a very great misfortune.

Mr. LAW. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. She met with no misfortune in the port of Yarmouth. What the hon. gentleman is stating is absolutely false, and he knows it.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman to take back that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The statement should be withdrawn.

Mr. LAW. I say then that it is not in accordance with the fact.

Mr. DAVIDSON. The point I wish to make is this, that owing to the order given by my hon. friend, who wanted to make a day of it in Yarmouth, the warship 'Niobe' was despatched to that port. In carrying out that order she got into trouble and got the Dominion government into a great deal of trouble. Therefore I would like to see such expenditures made in that locality that not only would the people engaged in the dredging business be benefited, as I know they were by the expenditures previously made, but such improvements would be made in the port of Yarmouth and its vicinity that on the occasion of another visit to the port of Yarmouth, the Canadian navy, if it happened to be in existence at the time, would safely ride in and safely come out.

Mr. LAW. I do not want to allow the statement to go unchallenged that the 'Niobe,' before she left Yarmouth, met with a bad accident. The hon. gentleman will not hear that statement made in Yarmouth harbour or Yarmouth county. It has been made by the hon. member and circulated by every Tory newspaper in the Dominion of Canada, but I say that the 'Niobe' met with no accident in the port of Yarmouth.

Mr. FOSTER (Kings, N.S.) Will the hon. member for Annapolis tell us what business the 'Niobe' had at Yarmouth at that time?

Mr. McKENZIE. She was loaded with potatoes, apparently.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Before this item passes I would like to impress upon the hon. minister the necessity of doing some dredging at the Magdalen islands. Last year I obtained from my colleague the late Minister of Public Works the promise that a dredge belonging to the department would be sent to the islands, and one was sent. As my hon. friend knows, there are several harbours around these islands, but the sands are continually shifting, so that the harbours are very difficult of ingress and egress. No dredge had been sent to the Magdalen islands since 1875, and it has always been difficult to obtain from the department the services of a dredge for that district, because the dredges were all monopolized by the various harbours in the maritime provinces. But, last year the late Minister of Public Works sent a dredge to the islands. The great difficulty, I am bound to say, is to get the work started at a stated point. Every man on the islands—I do not except my own friends—wanted the dredge to start in his locality. This is a great mistake. There are certain harbours which should be attended to first, because the steamer stops at them.

Mr. MONK. What is the name of the dredge that is there?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know the name. The resident engineer should select the places where the dredge should work. I told him not to be dictated to by any of the residents, but to follow his own judgment. I may say that I lost heavily on the Magdalen islands because I followed the straight path and adhered to it from beginning to end. The dredge is still there, and I expect will be working next summer. The man who should be consulted in this matter is Captain McClure, the captain of the steamer which plies between Pictou and the various ports of the Magdalen islands. He has prepared a map of the islands, which shows the places where the work should be done. I believe there is a duplicate of that map in the Public Works Department, and I would urge my hon. friend to give instructions to the resident engineer to follow the advice of Captain McClure, who is more experienced in such matters than any one else in that region.

Mr. MONK. Strong representations similar to those I have just heard have been made to me by the sitting member for the county (Mr. Gauthier), and we will endeavour during the coming summer to carry on the dredging in the wisest way.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), says that about the bars and harbours of the Magdalen islands there are shifting sands. If that is the case, no benefit will be obtained by dredging in the ordinary way. All that can be done is by dragging or harrowing. If the minister will consult the officers of the department, I think he would find that they will agree with that statement.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was a dredge used by the department for ordinary dredging, but in view of the shifting sands of the Magdalen Islands the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), sent a special dredge for the work.

Mr. OLIVER. When the estimates of the Minister of Public Works were under consideration before, I asked the minister some questions, and, if I remember correctly, he promised to furnish me with answers by letter. I have not yet received any communication from the minister, but I hope he will keep the matter in mind, and let me have the desired information at his earliest convenience.

Mr. MONK. I got my officers to prepare answers to all the questions put during the discussion in committee that I was not able to answer at the time. I will put this information upon the table so that hon. gentlemen interested can have access to it.

Ottawa—Heating, including salaries of engineers firemen and watchmen, $150,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What explanation has my hon. friend to give about this?

Mr. MONK. It is the usual vote, but somewhat increased this year. It is a vote to make provision for a large number of items of expenditure which are incurred every year in connection with the heating of the public buildings here.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What system of heating is adopted by the Public Works Department?

Mr. MONK. I believe there are hot water furnaces in most of the departmental buildings, and in others the heating is by steam.

Mr. LEMIEUX. How many firemen are employed?

Mr. MONK. We have 57 firemen whose wages range from $330 to $660 a year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has the minister dismissed a fireman named Gariepy?

Mr. MONK. I do not remember the name. If any complaint had been made against him, his name would be handed to the Ottawa investigator.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Why have the services of Mr. Williams, door-keeper at the door of this chamber, been dispensed with. This man is a British navy veteran, and possessed a number of medals gained in active service?

Mr. MONK. I know nothing of the circumstances and doubt very much if this man was in my department. If so, and there was complaint against him, his case would have been referred to the investigator, Mr. Chauvin.

Ottawa—Removal of snow, including Rideau Hall, $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. How many men are employed in removing snow?

Mr. MONK. I could not tell exactly, but the number is a little larger than last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. By whom are the men employed in removing snow recommended?

Mr. MONK. The men are engaged on the recommendation of any reputable person. Part of the work of removing snow is done by contract.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the explanation of the increase in the cost this year?

Mr. MONK. I suppose there are more buildings to attend to. I do not know of any other reason.

Ottawa—Repairs, including ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c., $250,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What has the minister to say about this item? The item for furniture was very severely criticised during the last parliament.

Mr. MONK. This vote is asked for the purpose of carrying out works of improvement, and repairing and procuring furniture. We find this necessary from time to time in order to maintain the public buildings in the city of Ottawa in a proper state of efficiency, and to meet the requirements of the public service. There is an increase from last year. The men who mainly perform these works are mechanics and labourers, employed under the direct supervision of the officers of the department, in compliance with requisitions received from the various departments.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When furniture is required by the department for the various buildings is it furnished by the department itself, or is it purchased outside?

Mr. MONK. As a general rule it is purchased outside. I do not think we manufacture furniture.

Mr. LEMIEUX. From what firm?

Mr. MONK. I really could not tell my hon. friend. It depends upon the kind of furniture that is required. I think that where a large purchase is contemplated, the purchase would have to be by contract. I have not had myself any transactions of the kind carried through since I have been in office. The demands have been limited to desks and things of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend complied with the $5,000 limit in these cases?

Mr. MONK. In every instance.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

PATENTS OF THOMAS D. RAMBAUT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 84), respecting certain patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—Mr. Ames.

Mr. CARVELL. When the hour for private Bills expired on Wednesday last, I think we were discussing section 2 of this Bill. I have certainly an objection to this Bill, but as the promoter is not present, I do not wish to force on a discussion, although, if the committee think it proper to go on, I will do so.

Mr. REID. We will let it stand.

Mr. CARVELL. Would the minister be willing that it should not come up on Monday, as I shall not be able to be here until after dinner on that day?

Mr. REID (Grenville). We might let it stand for a few minutes, and if the member in charge of it does not come in, we will let it stand till another day.

Bill allowed to stand.

PATENTS OF THOMAS WADGE.

Bill (No 16) respecting patents of Thomas Wadge reported from Committee of the Whole without amendment.

Mr. CURRIE. Mr. Speaker, I hold that this Bill is still in the committee, and has not been discharged from the committee.

Mr. CARVELL. According to my recollection, this Bill was passed by the committee and we entered into the discussion of (Bill 84) and discussed it until nine o'clock, when Your Honour took the Chair without the Bill being reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. On the Bill is printed, 'as reported by the Committee of the Whole.' It was not reported to the House, as the hour for private Bills having expired while the committee was sitting, it could not be reported.

Mr. CURRIE I do not go by anything that was expected or understood at the last meeting of the committee. I go by the order of proceedings as laid down in the order paper, and item 41 says:

February 13—Further consideration in Committe of the Whole of the following two Bills——

And it names Bill (No. 16) and Bill (No. 84). I do not want to sultify the order paper, and I hold that the Bill is still in the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must rule that the Bill has passed the committee, because I was here waiting until the business of the Committee would be reported, but as the hour for private Bills expired before this Bill was reported, although to my personal knowledge it had passed the committee and was ordered to be reported therefore I must treat it as reported now. There will be an opportunity for any motion or discussion on the third reading.

Mr. STAPLES. I happened to be out of the House when this Bill was last in committee, but I certainly want to oppose it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I move that the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. STAPLES. This Bill is for the renewal of a patent on wind-stackers, which the patentees have enjoyed the benefit of for 18 or 20 years. The patent covers a piece of machinery that is used on threshing machines in the western country and also in other parts of Canada and in the whole world. I think in the interests of the consumer it is now time that such a patent should lapse. The effect of this would be a reduction in the cost of that piece of machinery of possibly a couple of hundred dollars.

Mr. CURRIE. I certainly think that the Bill should be allowed to stand, and be compelled to stand, especially as the hon. member who has charge of the Bill is not here. I called the attention of the House to these Bills when they first appeared. I said that they should be accompanied by an explanation of the specifications to prevent a fraud of any kind on the public. No explanation has been given of what these patents cover, and this Bill is so framed that you cannot extract from it any idea of what the patent is. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Armstrong) took occasion to inquire at the Patent Office what the specifications of this patent were, and he received a letter from the Commissioner of Patents that the specifications would be sent to him for $6.50 or $7. Now, I think that the hon. member who desires to have the Bill read the third time, might just as well, in the interest of peace, let it stand until we satisfy ourselves whether the patent deals with a stacking apparatus or not. I have never heard in the House an explanation of what the patent is. If the House does not adopt the rule that there should be such an explanation on every patent Bill, we shall have applications coming here for the renewal of the patent on the Bessemer process of making steel, and on a hundred other things, and the result will be that this country will be burdened down with patent rights which do not exist in other countries. We have stopped patent Bills before, and the people of Great Britain have been compelled to prevent the patenting of articles not patented in other countries. If a corporation has a patent such as this, it need not manufacture in Canada unless it likes. In view of these facts I think it would be well that the Bill should stand over; therefore, I object to the third reading at present.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) is in error as to the facts connected with the Bill, which I excuse him for, as he has not been intimately associated with farming for many years. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is, however, on a different footing; I think there is not such an excuse for him. Had he been in this House when this Bill was passed by the committee last Tuesday, he would have known that the very explanation which he asks for was then given. To correct first the hon. member for Macdonald, I may say that the patent does not cover anything with wind-stackers at all. The patent originally covered something connected with a fanning mill for cleaning grain. Just when the patent was taken out I cannot tell, but I know it was only a little over seven years ago. Mr. Wadge is the purchaser of the two patents. What the specifications cover I do not know, and it is not material to the Bill. Mr. Wadge purchased the patents in the ordinary way, on an 18 year basis; but owing to an error of his solicitors, who did not discover that the patent period paid for was only 6 years, he went on manufacturing, and has manufactured very largely in the city of Winnipeg, in the belief that he had the title for 18 years.

Mr. CURRIE. Is the patent in existence in any other country for this additional term or is it the fact that this six, or eight, or fourteen years required here does not hold good in the United States?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not think we are concerned with the United States?

Mr. CURRIE. Of course, the patent law of Canada states that when a patent

expires in the United States, it expires here automatically.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I could tell the House what I know about the patent law in a short time, I confess, to my hon. friend from North Simcoe. But, I know this, and it is sufficient for the present Bill, that Mr. Wadge, who purchased the patent, purchased the patent for Canada and that is all we are concerned with. The patent for Canada expired at the expiration of six years, although he had purchased it for 18 years. The reason that it expired was owing to an error of a firm of patent solicitors—a very competent firm—in the city of Winnipeg. In the spring of 1905 he began to manufacture this patent in Canada and he has manufactured it continuously since. Last year he made 1,800 and this year expects to make 2,400 of the articles covered by the patent. This is simply to correct an error which was no fault of Mr. Wadge's, but only his misfortune. What is the result if we do not? In the first place, no one is injured if we do. This was all explained to the committee before and the House will forgive me if I traverse it again. The rights of all who may have acquired rights since the expiration of the patent are reserved in the Bill. Any rights acquired since the expiration of the patent are protected but Mr. Wadge's patent is continued to the expiration of the time he purchased it for. Had he known, which he did not, that it would expire at the end of six years, that being the only term that was paid for, he would have paid the very small fee and secured this renewal. This is simply to correct the most obvious of errors. It may be obtuseness on my part, but I cannot see why United States rights have anything to do with the Bill that is before the House.

Mr. STAPLES. It is quite natural that a man who is off the farm for a period becomes a little rusty in his farming pursuits. According to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) the hon. member for Portage la Prairie has evidently become a little rusty in his law. However that may be, I frankly admit to the committee, according to the affidavit which I have now read and which was not brought to my attention before, the rights contained in this Bill do not extend as far as I thought they did. I thought the Bill renewed the patent for pneumatic stackers, and if such had been the fact I certainly would have opposed it. After hearing the explanation of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie I withdraw my protest against the Bill.

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

Mr. CURRIE.

PATENTS OF THOMAS D. RAMBAUT.

On the order for further consideration in Committee of the Whole of certain patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—Mr. Ames.

Mr. CARVELL. If this Bill is going over to the next sitting of the House, will it be understood that it will not be taken up on Monday before six o'clock?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. I want to offer some objection, and I cannot be here before six o'clock.

Mr. ROGERS. All right.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Gatineau and Ungava Railway Company, and to change its name to the Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company.—Mr. Chabot.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 93) respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia, Limited.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Pacific Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 56) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr White (Renfrew).

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Barnard.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Northern Territorial Railway Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

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

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the British Western Loan Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 102) for the relief of Edna Wells.—Mr. Beattie.

SUPPLY.

House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Rideau Hall (including grounds)—improvements, furniture and maintenance, &c., $35,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would the minister give an explanation of this item?

Mr. MONK. This vote is to be applied to carrying on the works of renewals, improvements and repairs, procuring furniture, &c., required for Rideau Hall, and maintaining the grounds in proper condition in accordance with the specifications of the chief architect. It is a smaller vote than last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand the vote is to complete the refurnishing of the interior of Rideau Hall. What will be the cost of that?

Mr. MONK. The cost was very considerable, amounting in respect of furniture and fittings to the sum of $5,000. The furniture was in a very poor state when the new government took office, and it was deemed absolutely necessary after an inspection to make this provision.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it the intention of the government to carry out the idea propounded by the late Governor General? Lord Grey was of opinion that the government should procure another site and build a new gubernatorial residence, in fact he had himself selected a piece of ground not far from Rideau Hall which was better suited for the purpose than the old estate. If I remember well, he had committed to his views gentlemen like the Prime Minister, and I believe also the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I remember being present last year at an afternoon tea when this question was discussed freely, and every one agreed that too much money had been spent on the old building and that there ought to be a new residence occupying another site.

Mr. MONK. I think the idea is a very good one and ought to have been carried out. However, we have already made considerable expenditure for repairs. The cloak rooms have been built up, and other repairs carried out, and I do not think there is any immediate prospect of carrying out the project which nas been so often mooted. The residence was a wretched building for the purpose in the first place, and if some years ago a more suitable residence had been erected on a better site it would have been preferable to what has been done. The expenditure of large sums, however, has made the dwelling, I am informed, tolerably comfortable. And it will be suitable enough for the present. We have such large expenditures to make in the immediate future for departmental buildings, that until greater necessity arises I think we can leave the matter as it stands.

Dominion buildings—furniture, $19,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is this vote for new furniture?

Mr. MONK. The vote is asked for the purchase of new furniture for the use of employees of the federal government in the Dominion buildings in the various provinces.

Power for running elevators, stamp cancelling machines, $35,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. From whom do you get the power?

Mr. MONK. From the Ottawa Electric Company.

Mr. MACDONALD. I take advantage of this opportunity to draw attention to a somewhat important matter. Not long ago a friend of mine who is interested in a Canadian Coal Company, while visiting these buildings suggested that there was no reason why heat, and power also, except such as that obtained by hydraulic means, for the public buildings of Canada might not be developed from the use of Canadian coal. The coal at present used in our buildings is brought in from the United States, and although there may be some difficulties in the way, I would like to see the opportunity taken to assist Canadian industry. I draw the minister's attention to this point as perhaps it is one which he has so far overlooked. We all glory in Canadian made articles, and why should not Canadian coal be used in connection with the heating and lighting of our buildings in preference to coal from the United States. I do not know whether the minister has considered this question?

Mr. MONK. I have not.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then I would like the minister to give the matter his attention, because when we have a coal production in Canada of something like 10,000,000 tons, the least we can do in the way of rendering patriotic assistance to the men who produce that coal is to burn Canadian coal in our public buildings.

Mr. MONK. I have not had occasion to give this question very much consideration but it is certainly worthy of attention. I hope the time will come when we will be able to get all the heat we require through the medium of the immense water-powers which surround this city.

Mr. MACDONALD. Pending the time when we shall see the development of

electricity on such a large scale in this district, and the long expected ventilation of these buildings in a modern way such as the members of this House have been talking about for the last 30 years, I hope the minister will not lose sight of this important question of the use of Canadian coal in our public buildings. I ask the minister's serious attention to the matter, and hope he will look into it.

Mr. MONK. Is the coal produced in the province from which my hon. friend comes suitable for heating purposes in buildings of this character?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes; people in the maritime provinces depend entirely upon the bituminous coal produced there for keeping their houses and buildings warm in winter.

Mr. MONK. Is it used in the government buildings in Halifax?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes, in the government buildings in the maritime provinces generally. The Minister of Public Works calls for tenders every year for the supply of coal for the public buildings in eastern Canada. There is no reason why he should not extend that so as to include the public buildings in central Canada as well. The coal from Alberta should be used, if it is not, as far east as Manitoba. Of course, the element of cost will enter into the question of supplying coal from the east and from the west for the central area; but, I submit, that every Canadian ought to be patriotic enough to prefer to have Canadian coal used in the public buildings, even if it costs a little more.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Did the late government do that?

Mr. MACDONALD. This 'late' government business is becoming a habit with my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). He is always looking to the past. We have a new government which came in with great professions of what they were going to do for Canada, particularly in such matters as this. We were told that if we ventured to buy or sell with the people of the United States, our loyalty would be endangered. I call the attention of the government which came in with these hopes and professions to an opportunity for action in line with those professions, and I hope they will not fail to act upon it at an early day.

Mr. MONK. All the same it must seem a little singular to people not familiar with political idiosyncrasies to find that the coal which is used this evening to heat this very building was bought outside of Canada to fulfil contracts made by the friends of the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) in violation of the principle which he is so energetically defending to-night.

Mr. MACDONALD. I decline to have a matter so serious as this dismissed by hon. gentlemen opposite with an excuse so hackneyed as the tu quoque argument. How long are they going to keep it up?

Mr. MONK. Very long.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then, I think the best thing they can do is to take up everything the late government did and imitate it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) seems to forget the virtuous professions made on behalf of the party now in power of what they would do if they were given control of public affairs. But when we ask them to fulfil their pledges, even in a small degree, their answer is: We are not going to do it because you did not do it. I say we have had about enough of that proposition, if these gentlemen are to make any pretence whatever at standing to the principles. I am surprised specially at the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). I have brought this question of the use of Canadian coal to his attention at the suggestion of a friend of his own. It is no answer to tell me that the late government did not do it. The hon. minister ought to look into the matter. If there is good reason why Canadian coal should not be used in the public buildings, let us know it.

Mr. MONK. I have given the hon. member the assurance that I will look into the suggestion. But when he becomes irritated and indignant on this question of Canadian coal, I think it fair to remind him that the coal we are burning at this moment, and which, I think, was supplied under contract to the late government—I do not recollect giving any order for coal—was bought in contravention of the principle which the hon. gentleman laid down. We have had absolutely no opportunity of putting in practice the principle he is defending so valiantly; and, in answer to his indignant protests, it seems fair to say that that which excites his indignation was the act not of this government but of his friends.

Mr. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman is worried because of any supposed indignation on my part, I beg to assure him that I am in the best of humour. I accept the minister's assurance that he proposes to look into this matter. If so, I hope that, if not this season then next session, we shall find that he has looked into the matter and has seen to it that Canadian coal is purchased.

Mr. SINCLAIR. There seems to have been a very clear and decided difference between the attitude of hon. members on the other side and that of the late govern-

ment in regard to these matters. It should be remembered that the late government was disposed toward freedom of trade with the United States, while our friends opposite were very much opposed to it. What we are asking them to do is simply to live up to their professions. The fishermen in my county thought it would be a good thing if they were enabled to sell their fish in the United States. But a trooper representing the conservative party came down with a poster 'Canada for the Canadians,' 'God save the King,' and so on, and the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite declared that it would be a bad thing to adopt the policy which the late government proposed. And now, when we ask the Minister of Public Works, in pursuance of the policy of his party, to burn Canadian coal in the public buildings, his answer is that the late government did not do it. That is no proper answer. These gentlemen ought to be ready to live up to their professions, and one would think that to ask them to burn Canadian coal to heat the public buildings would be to call upon them to fulfil only a very small part of those professions. I notice by the public returns that Canada imported last year something like $50,000,000 worth of coal from the United States. I believe the greater part of that coal was burnt by those who were so much opposed to our doing business with the United States—by the combines, the railway magnates and the big manufacturers. Of course, if Nova Scotia could get a larger market in Canada for her coal it would be a good thing, and I would like to see everything done in that direction that we can do. I would like to see Nova Scotia coal go further west than it does at present. It is not sold much further west than Montreal. Could we sell it in Toronto and other places in Ontario, we should have a much larger business than we have at present. Anything this government could do to promote the consumption of our own coal would be but an attempt to live up to the professions they made on September 21st.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton). I do not know whether the suggestions of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) are practical or not. But I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister of Public Works with reference to lighting the public buildings in Ontario. I would like him to take into consideration the fact that the Hydro-Electric Commission are doing a great public service for Ontario, and as far as possible we should make use of the power they supply to light and heat the public buildings.

Mr. MONK. I will make a note of it, and when we take up the question of lighting I will look into the matter further.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I notice in this item a vote for 'Power for running elevators, stamp-cancelling machines, &c.' What are the stamp-cancelling machines?

Mr. MONK. A number of post offices have stamp cancelling machines, and they require electrical power to operate them.

Dominion Buildings—rents, $340,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Has the minister rented any new buildings since taking office?

Mr. MONK. I have rented one building on Metcalfe street since taking office. Last year the amount of our rentals was $306,485.89. This year we will require $340,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Are rentals cheaper or dearer this year as compared with former years?

Mr. MONK. We are paying something like 98 cents or $1 a foot for the building on Metcalfe street, which is a somewhat high rental.

Mr. SINCLAIR. How much a foot was paid for the Woods building?

Mr. MONK. I think it is considerably more than that, but that was some years ago.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The minister means considerably less than $1 a foot, does he not?

Mr. MONK. No, I think it was more than $1 a foot in the case of the Woods building, but it would be difficult to establish any comparison because rents have gone up a great deal during the past few years.

Mr. SINCLAIR. My recollection is that the rent of the Woods building is less than 80 cents a foot.

Mr. MONK. That is one way of estimating rentals. We have found in the case of the last lease we made that we are paying 6 per cent upon the expenditure. I think in the case of the Woods building and other buildings rented at that time the percentage was far greater than that on the cost and that in some cases it went to 20 per cent.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What is the length of the lease of the Metcalfe street building?

Mr. MONK. Five years. I made that lease as short as possible, but I do not anticipate that we will be ready in five years, unless we use very great diligence, to install our departments at home.

Mr. McKENZIE. Has the minister made any comparison between the rentals

paid by the departments and other people who rent buildings or does he find that the rentals paid by the government are just about the same, or sometimes less, than the rentals paid by other people?

Mr. MONK. I took the trouble to get special reports on that and I find that our rent is the same as that paid by other lessees in the locality.

Mr. MACDONALD. What arrangement has the minister made in regard to lighting the building?

Mr. MONK. I am not in a position to give full information to the House in regard to lighting, but I have heard that there was a contract signed for a considerable space of time—four or five years—with the company that is at present lighting the building. I have not been able to verify that fact. The only thing that I have before me is the amount we ask to meet the requirements of lighting for the coming year. However, I intend to look into that as soon as I have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the contract require that the building is to be lighted by the government or by the owners?

Mr. MONK. We provide for the light if I am not mistaken.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it included in the $1 per foot?

Mr. MONK. I am under the impression. but I am not absolutely certain. The elevators are.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Have you a list of the new rentals?

Mr. MONK. The only new building rented by the government is this building on Metcalfe street. They asked us $19,000, and we brought it down to $16,000. I think that we are paying $13,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If it is true that we are paying at the rate of $1 per foot for floor space in this new building, and that we rented the Woods building at 80 cents a foot, I would like to draw the fact to the attention of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). I would have expected to hear some protest from him when the rental is increased to such an alarming extent.

Mr. MONK. I do not know exactly what the conditions of our occupation of the Woods' building are. I think we heat that building. We do not heat the building we have rented on Metcalfe street, but, in any event, a comparison cannot be established on that footing at all. The increase in rentals within the past two or three years in Ottawa is something quite abnormal.

The real test in regard to the point raised by my hon. friend would be, what percentage does the proprietor receive upon his investment? Clearly, I think, there is no doubt that, in the case of the Woods' building, the percentage received by the proprietor far exceeded the sum of 15 per cent. In the case of the building rented on Metcalfe street the revenue of the proprietor does not exceed six per cent upon his investment. That is the proper test of what is a fair rental, because, in a city like Ottawa, or Montreal, where rents vary a great deal and increase in such a large proportion, you cannot say that $1 per foot at one period of time is a heavy rental when compared with a period four or five years previously, when the rentals were very low.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I suppose that if we are to make that the basis of the value of a building we must take the value of the building during the present year. Suppose that the owners of the Woods' building erected that building at a small cost twenty years ago and property has increased so that it is very valuable to-day, I do not think we should place the valuation altogether on the original capital that was put into the building. The same would be true of the Metcalfe street building if it were of any age. It would increase from year to year, as the city got larger.

Mr. MONK. The Woods' building was built especially for the government.

Mr. SINCLAIR—If we are to adopt that principle we should take the value of the building as it stands in the market to-day, and find out what the proceeds of that value would be. That is what would be done in this case. If any one else were going to rent the building the proprietor would expect to get the value of his property as it stands in the market to-day, and not the value as represented by what he originally put into it.

Mr. MACDONALD—Are there any offers to rent buildings other than this one?

Mr. MONK. We are receiving offers every day. People imagine that we do not intend living in any other way. People come and offer buildings that they have on their hands, or offer to erect buildings suited exactly to our requirements provided we will pay the rent. I think that condition of affairs is regrettable, and that as soon as possible we should deal with the question.

Mr. MACDONALD. What policy does the minister adopt in dealing with these men who want to erect buildings for the government?

Mr. MONK. My policy at the present time is, in spite of the discomfort and want of accommodation that we are undergoing everywhere, to try and rent as little

as possible and push as quickly as possible the adoption of some comprehensive scheme for erecting buildings of our own and getting out of these rented buildings.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the minister contemplate renting any additional buildings at the present time?

Mr. MONK. I am afraid that before we are in a position to get into our own departmental building we will require further accommodation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. For what departments?

Mr. MONK. All the departments seem to be in want of further accommodation. Many departments are divided up in different parts of the city and they complain a great deal of the inconvenience that it causes them. Some departments are unduly congested and cannot accommodate their staff. They are prevented from securing the necessary help for the work of the departments not because they have not money to pay the employees but because they have no accommodation for them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I suppose the buildings for the departments are scarce?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Dominion buildings—salaries of caretakers, etc., $250,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would the minister permit this item to stand as there are some returns which are coming down and I would like him to hold it over until we get them?

Mr. MONK. There is no objection excepting that we will have further items in the supplementary estimates which will enable the question of caretakers to be discussed and I am very anxious, if possible, with the indulgence of the committee, to get rid of the main estimates to-night and allow the committee to take up the items on some other department.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). This will be the only item that we will ask to be held over.

Mr. McKENZIE. I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the salaries paid to the caretakers of public buildings in Nova Scotia, and while I do not know how they compare with the salaries paid to similar officials in the other provinces, I submit that the salaries in Nova Scotia are altogether too low for a living wage. It is not hard work, but it takes all the time of the caretaker from early morning till late at night. In eastern Nova Scotia the mails arrive sometimes at midnight and at four o'clock in the morning and the caretaker must be there to receive them if the post office happens to be in the public building. A salary of $400 such as is paid in these places is not sufficient to support a man and his family. I should think it ought to be $600 or $650 to the man whose whole time is taken up in any government service especially, as of late years, the cost of living has gone up to such an extent.

Mr. MONK. The salaries paid to caretakers in Nova Scotia appear to range from a minimum of $400 to $770, whereas in Quebec, except in Montreal where they are $500 and $600 the salaries range from $150 to $300. There is $150 paid in Laprairie, $300 at Longueuil, $300 at L'Assomption, $150 at Hull. There appears to be no disproportion between the salaries of caretakers of public buildings in Nova Scotia and in the other provinces, but I will make a note of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and inquire into the matter.

Water supply—$28,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Last year, Dr. Black, then member for Hants, called special attention on several occasions to the water supply furnished to the public buildings by the city of Ottawa, and as Dr. Black is not here this session the matter is not engaging the attention it deserves. The Minister of Public Works will remember the epidemic of typhoid we had in the city last year, and I think it was the present Speaker of the House who suggested that parliament should be prorogued or adjourned for a period rather than that the members of the House should take the tremendous risk of drinking the water we had to drink in this city last year. That epidemic has passed, and I fear there will be very little done to improve the water of the city until we are in the throes of another epidemic. The government pays large sums of money towards the upkeep of municipal work in Ottawa, and as the representatives of the people are bound to come here, they should feel that they are as safe in this city as anywhere in Canada, and that they are not forced to drink water which may bring disease and possibly death. I have remarked nothing in the proceedings of the city council which would conduce to bring about a better state of affairs in this respect than we had last year. I think the Minister of Public Works should refuse positively to contribute any money from the treasury of Canada to the upkeep or beautifying of the city of Ottawa until there is a pure water supply in the city. Nothing will bring people to their senses like stopping the money supply, and as long as the city of Ottawa is getting the money of the country without any protest it is not likely that anything will be done. It is quite within the power of the city of Ottawa to give us a supply of pure water. The minister should say to the city authorities that they will not get any more money from us until they put themselves

in a position to deserve that treatment from the government. I bring this matter most seriously to the notice of the minister.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid I cannot take the rigid position which my hon. friend has suggested, and refuse to pay for any water until I have an absolute certainty that the water is pure. The subject is a very interesting one, and so far as we can help to solve the water problem in Ottawa or anywhere else we will do the best we can as a government. I think I have in the department a full and interesting report on the water conditions in Ottawa, and if so I shall lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What truth is there in the report published in the press that the Minister of Public Works has signed a contract for the St. John harbour works?

Mr. MONK. The fact is not as alleged. There is no contract signed yet, but we intend carrying out the improvements contemplated at Courtenay Bay on the east side of the harbour of St. John, as soon as I have the necessary authority to enter into that contract.

Graving dock, $35,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are rumours afloat that the Levis graving dock will be enlarged or that a new dock may be built. If I remember well, there was formed a year ago, a company composed of Sir Montague Allan and other gentlemen of very high repute, and they asked the government for the usual subsidy, but owing to some difference between them and the government as to the amount to be guaranteed, the project fell through. I see by the papers in Quebec that a delegation from that city is to meet the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works shortly, and that one of the questions to be discussed is that of a new dock in Quebec. Will my hon. friend state whether the dock to be built in Quebec will be built by a company under the Dry Docks Subsidy Act, or built by the government? In Quebec the opinion generally expressed is that the government should build the dock and operate it. On the other hand, there are people who think that it should be in the hands of a company. I have no opinion to express myself, but I would like to know what is the policy of my hon. friend. It is stated in 'L'Evenement' that this meeting is to be strictly private, only a select few to be present; but this is a matter of vital concern to the whole country, and I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman will receive suggestions only from this Quebec delegation. Many people believe that a graving dock at Quebec is a national necessity; many believe that the harbour of Quebec is superior to all our other harbours. I regret to see that neither the hon. Postmaster General or any of the Quebec members are present, but I know that they are very optimistic with reference to the future of Quebec, and I would like to have an expression of their views on this question. I hope the hon. minister will give us a peep into his department, and let us see what his policy is in regard to it.

Mr. MONK. The question is a very large one to discuss at this point, but there is no doubt that there exists at Quebec a great necessity for a suitable graving dock. No port anywhere nowadays is complete without a graving dock. European ports, which have cost anywhere from fifty to a hundred million dollars invariably have graving docks, and the same is true of properly equipped ports according to modern notions in the United States and in South America. Quebec is one of the ports recommended by the Transportation Commission to be improved as a national port. There is a graving dock there which I visited some time ago, and while I was convinced that a graving dock there could be made a paying concern, the existing one is too small for modern requirements and it has never been administered in such a way as to pay, although it yields a fair revenue. Another, and large dock, is an absolute necessity if Quebec is to be equipped as a national port. Nothing has been done for that port during the last few years. No equipment of any serious and durable value has been carried out under a general scheme of improvement. Such a general scheme or plan is the first step to be taken. It is the first step we took in Montreal under somewhat different conditions, and even though we had there a plan which would take years to carry out fully, the equipment of the port of Montreal is at present very far from complete. The policy of the late government was to grant subsidies, under the legislation of 1908 and 1910, to companies for graving docks. I do not think it is a bad system, but the legislation requires to be improved in many respects. I am not prepared to say that the government should undertake, in all the 12 or 13 national ports of this country, the construction of graving docks; but the necessity of an improved graving dock at Quebec, in keeping with modern requirements, is apparent, and as soon as possible that matter will be taken up.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are all familiar with the legislation of 1910, and previous legislation to stimulate the construction of dry-docks. In connection with that legislation several projects were mentioned, at Collingwood, St. John and other points.

The provisions of the legislation were that if a dry-dock of a certain character were constructed, a subsidy, proportionate to the cost, would be given. The first legislation failed to bring about any results, and amendments were made increasing the subsidies. My purpose in calling attention to this is to make an inquiry of my hon. friend in respect to the St. John dry-dock. An appropriation was made recently by this House for improvements at Courtenay Bay at St. John, and since then I understand that tenders were invited for the construction with the terminals at Courtenay Bay, for a breakwater for the protection of that portion of the harbour of St. John which is exposed to south-easterly gales, and for dredging that portion of the harbour.

Tenders for all these works were invited en bloc, but any one who desired to bid for other portions of the work would necessarily have to include in their tenders an offer to construct a dry dock. Tenders were received and I understand the contract has been awarded, but it would not be opportune nor relevant for me at present to criticise in any way the course taken either by the present government or its predecessors. I do not desire at present to criticise any action that has been taken, however much I might be disposed under proper circumstances to do so. The firm which holds the contract for the construction of these several works, will, I assume construct a dry dock. Will they be entitled to receive any consideration as a firm under the subsidy Act, or is the work to be constructed and paid for by the government and owned and operated by it when completed, entirely apart from any consideration under the Act now in force?

Mr. MONK. I am glad that the hon. gentleman narrowed his question down to the one he has just put, because the general question of the improvement of St. John harbour would require extensive application. Therefore I will simply answer him by saying that the tenderer for the work obliges himself to build a dry dock at St. John and nothing more. It is as if he had applied for the subsidy under the terms of the Subsidy Act of 1910, and after the proper formalities have been complied with, the works will become entitled to the ordinary subsidy as defined by the Act. The government will not own the dock. It will be the property of the party who constructed it just as in ordinary cases and that party will be entitled to the subsidy. The reason of this is that it was not supposed that we could get anybody to undertake the risk of constructing a dry dock in St. John except under the conditions of that person having the contract for the construction of the other works referred to in the tender. My hon. friend understands, I hope, that it is absolutely a construction under the ordinary conditions of the Dry Docks Act.

Mr. EMMERSON. Would I be correct in understanding the minister to state that when the contract of the Messrs Griffiths is completed, they will naturally receive the compensation under that contract, and the government will naturally have paid for the construction of a dry dock as well as for the other works contemplated under the contract?

Mr. MONK. No, my hon. friend is mistaken as to that. It is not a block contract such as my hon. friend stated. There is no contract as yet. It is contemplated to make a contract with unit prices and details, but it does not enter into the sum we mentioned in the contract price of the dry dock. The condition was that they would execute the work, and furthermore oblige themselves to build a dock under the Dry Dock Act.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then my hon. friend having stated that it would be impossible to secure a dry dock under the subsidy Act at St. John, apart from the consideration of these other works, it is to be assumed that the contractor will perform these several works— that is the construction of a breakwater, the dredging of a harbour, and the construction of the docks—for a certain sum of money calculated of course upon the schedule prices? Is it not also to be inferred that the government will have paid them not only for these several works, but in addition have given them in the prices awarded, a contribution to the construction of a dry dock? That would be the inference—that apart from the amount of money which he had received for the construction of these other works, they would not be willing to construct a dry dock under the terms of the Dry Docks Subsidy Act. That seems to me quite apparent. It may be all right—I am not going to question it at this moment, it would not be proper for me to do so—but I simply want to understand the situation; and therefore while we know as to the cost of the several dry docks which may have been built in Canada, on the Pacific coast or on the great lakes, under the terms of the Subsidy Act, in the case of St. John we do not know, because a portion of the consideration for the construction of that dry dock is involved in the construction of the breakwater, the dredging of the harbour, and the construction of the loading docks known as the terminals. That would seem to be the clear reasoning to be gathered from the circumstances as detailed by my hon. friend. I do not quite so understand it.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has made a natural inference, but he is entirely mistaken. No doubt the House will desire to see the contract when it is prepared so as

to examine the unit prices in order to convince itself that the dry dock it not at all provided for by the consideration therein, and the inference of my hon. friend is very natural until one has occasion to look into the details of the contract. The situation is this: It was deemed impossible to induce anybody with a harbour such as St. John, unimproved, possessing no equipment of a modern kind whatever, to undertake the construction of the dry dock there; but when these works of importance will have been carried out, the shipping will undoubtedly greatly increase, and with a harbour properly equipped under the terms of this arrangement there will be a better prospect of a dry dock. Therefore it was deemed necessary, I think very wisely, to include in the contract with a large and powerful firm, the stipulation that when these works of improvement had been carried out, a dry dock would be constructed. But my hon. friend bears in mind, no doubt, that when the time comes for constructing that dry dock an estimate of the cost of it will have to be laid before the government and carefully gone into by its engineers in order to determine what subsidies will be paid to the company. When this estimate is fully gone into, and when the unit prices mentioned in detail in the contract is considered, it will be seen that the natural inference of my hon. friend is absolutely not founded.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend is correct and the works are not to be carried on contemporaneously, then I can see some reason for the action taken. Apart from that, it seems to me that no concern in Canada would compete for the several works in connection with the harbour terminals, if associated with that work there was required to be an undertaking to engage in the construction of a dry dock even at a later date. That is to say that practically, if not wholly, it prevents competition in the dredging, the breakwater, and in the terminal docks so far as Canadian contractors are concerned.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows that the form of tender was established before this government came into office. I have examined it very carefully. I find the tenders that are in greatly reduced the price, as the House will see when the matters come before it. But I cannot find fault with the form of the tenders; I think it was a good form in every respect.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that the part tendered for by Norton, Griffiths & Co., has been awarded.

Mr. MONK. No, there has been no award of any kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No partial award?

Mr. MONK. No, there will be no partial award. The whole work will be undertaken 'en bloc'.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Referring to the Quebec proposed dry-dock, has the minister received any offer from a syndicate or a company which would undertake the construction of the new grading dock at Lévis?

Mr. MONK. There is no proposition now for either Lévis or Quebec before the government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am told that a syndicate has been formed in Quebec and that it has already had some interviews with the minister, with a view to obtaining a subsidy or guarantee from the government in connection with the construction of a graving dock at Levis.

Mr. MONK. I have no knowledge of that. I saw some gentlemen to-day who are interested in some such construction and who made some representations to me in reference to the Subsidy Act of 1910, which requires amendment in several particulars, and they laid their observations before me. Whether these gentlemen constitute a syndicate or not, or what they intend, I have no knowledge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would the hon. gentleman have any objections to giving the names of the gentlemen who interviewed him?

Mr. MONK. I do not know if my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) is right in calling them a 'syndicate'. Mr. Webster, of the Quebec Harbour Board saw me in reference generally to the very urgent improvements required in the port of Quebec. With him was a gentleman whose name I do not remember, who seemed to be very much interested in dry-docks, and a couple of members of the district. Sir Rodolphe Forget was also of the number. They made representations merely with reference to the Quebec harbour improvements and the necessity of enlarging the scope of the Dry-dock Act. No mention was made of any particular scheme.

Mr. CARVELL. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the tenders put in were at lower prices. Does he mean to say that there has been an actual reduction in the prices, or has the change in the specifications meant that the total, as his engineers figure it out, will be a reduction in the cost of the work?

Mr. MONK. I meant a general reduction, calling at the same time for lower prices. The tenders are all very high. The department did not think it would be possible to recommend the adoption of even the lowest tender unless it was possible to bring the lowest tenderer within

a more measurable distance of the estimate. That was what I alluded to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As I understand it, the Department of Public Works has nothing to do with the dry-dock at Montreal.

Mr. MONK. We have everything to do with it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I thought it was under the supervision of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MONK. Under the Dry-Dock Subsidy Act, all dry-docks subsidized are constructed under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, but I understood that arrangements had been made between Vickers Maxim and the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. There have been various contracts and arrangements between the Harbour Commissioners and Vickers Maxim who are constructing a floating dock; but the determination of the subsidy and the class of floating dock came under the consideration of my department before my time. The documents are all in my department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that before the department pays over the subsidy the work will be inspected. I understood that the builders had made arrangements with the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. I cannot speak with absolute knowledge as to that. I believe so, and all these arrangements would come under the purview of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There may have been some sales or leases of land or contracts for the preparation of the cradle of the floating-dock. Where we come in is the determination of the subsidy, the inspection of the work and the approval of the plans.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are rumours about a sale of land. The hon. gentleman ought to know that no lands were sold to the company but that the arrangement made with the Harbour Board of Montreal is with relation to the lands which are being dredged by the company; but they have had no sales of land from the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. When I say 'Sale of land,' they must have come to an arrangement with the Harbour Commissioners as to where they would install the floating dock and must have concluded a lease or alienation of some kind in order to have a place within the limits of the harbour of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, the hon. gentleman is not right in that. I say that with all due respect. I would like to make that point very clear in order to dispel the rumours afloat.

Mr. MONK. What rumours?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The rumours which the hon. gentlemen probably knows.

Mr. MONK. I have not heard any.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal have made arrangements with Vickers Maxim that the material dredged out of the river St. Lawrence over a long distance will be used by the Vickers Maxim Company for their plant. But there has been no land on the main shore sold to the company.

Mr. MONK. I know nothing of that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am very glad the hon. gentleman states that. Has he any idea when the dock will be completed?

Mr. MONK. I have heard a rumour that it is nearly finished. It is being constructed in the old country and is to come out to us in the spring. It is a floating dock. The cradle, or place where it is to be put is at the foot of the harbour of Montreal, and I imagine the dock will be installed there about the month of June.

Public Works—chargeable to collection of revenue—telegraph lines—land and cable telegraph lines, lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable services, $140,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend looked into the case of the Magdalen Islands cable linking the islands with the mainland? For several months in the year these people are cut off, and I obtained several years ago the advantage of a cable line and a cheap rate. I would like to know if the rate is being maintained or if it has been changed?

Mr. MONK. I do not think there has been any change.

Mr. McKENZIE. Referring to the item including the working expenses of vessels required for cable service, have you more than one vessel, or is the 'Tyrian' the only vessel?

Mr. MONK. I think so.

Mr. McKENZIE. Some two years ago the headquarters of this vessel, the 'Tyrian,' was moved from Halifax to North Sydney. The most of the work performed by this boat is in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence, and it was considered that North Sydney was a central place for the homes of the crew, and also a place at which coal could be obtained more economically and conveniently than Halifax. I am told

lately, although not departmentally, that this vessel has been moved back to Halifax. Would the minister tell me anything about this?

Mr. MONK. As far as I know the 'Tyrian' was moved to Halifax before the 21st of September last. I think that at present the vessel is at Dartmouth or Halifax and there has been no change since the government came into power.

Telegraph lines—Yukon system (Ashcroft-Dawson), $213,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is that for maintenance?

Mr. MONK. No, this is for some very important extensions. We expect to have a revenue this year from our telegraph lines of $110,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend any idea what rate the people pay, or is it the rate of the ordinary telegraph lines?

Mr. MONK. I think it is the same rate as that of the ordinary telegraph lines.

Telegraph service generally, $7,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is that item for?

Mr. MONK. That item is to be applied to cover a number of unavoidable expenditures in connection with the Dominion telegraph service, including Point Pelee telegraph line service, superintendent, repairs, operators, use of instruments, travelling expenses, and stationery. The appropriation for 1911 was $7,000 and the expenditure from the 1st of April, 1910, to the 28th of February, 1911, was $5,548. A request has been made to keep in abeyance the item under Dominion buildings, salaries of caretakers. There is no special objection to that except that if my hon friends would allow that item to pass it would enable us to take away a large quantity of documents required in the department and questions which might be raised under the item can be brought up under several items of the supply estimates. It will be a convenience to the department if the committee will adopt that item completely, which would close the main estimates in so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned.

Mr. MACDONALD. Unfortunately, I was not in a few moments ago and perhaps the minister would let me know something in regard to the item for telegraph lines between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Has the minister received any request from the Maritime Telephone Company which has telephonic communication with the island in regard to assisting their project in substitution of the old agreement which was made with the Anglo-American Cable Co.? I understand that they are prepared to give a better service. I am surprised that our friends from Prince Edward Island are not here to refer to the matter. I understand that the Maritime Telephone Company are making some representations in regard to the matter. Does the minister recall anything in regard to it?

Mr. MONK. Application was made quite recently by the Telephone Company of the maritime provinces to us to lay a cable to the island. The matter was considered and we came to the conclusion, as far as I can recollect that we could not do it.

Mr. MACDONALD. Of course the matter is one in which the people of the island are primarily interested. There is a long standing complaint in regard to the lack of accommodation furnished by the Anglo-American Cable Company, which has some old contract, and I assume that that may be the difficulty that the minister anticipates in connection with this matter.

Mr. MONK. Is there any telephone communication at the present time?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes there is. The reason I speak of the matter is because there is an island midway between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, which is in my county, which this present telephone service touches, which is inhabited by quite a number of people, and which is a very fertile place. I understand that the company were making some application to the government—I do not know exactly what the nature of it is—but I should hope that the minister would be able to find some method of dealing with it which would give a better service than that which is obtained under the vote which, I think, is one which is given to the Anglo-American Cable Company. It formerly was impossible to have a telegram delivered in Prince Edward Island after eight o'clock at night, owing to some regulation of the cable company. If that financial assistance were diverted to the telephone people, the whole of the maritime provinces would be benefited. I hope the minister has not fully closed the door against considering the proposal that these maritime province people have submitted and if the minister could see his way clear—having regard to existing contracts to make any arrangement with them, it would be much to the public advantage.

Mr. MONK. There is quite a recent application—I do not remember the circumstances very well, but I would be very glad to show the file and correspondence to anybody who is interested in the subject. I was impressed with the idea that they were asking the government to lay a telephone cable largely for the benefit of the telephone company in question. It may be that there is some public interest operating in favour of our laying the cable between the mainland and the island, but at the time it seemed

to me that we were invited to render this service to a private corporation. If I am mistaken in that I shall be very glad to look into it again.

Mr. MACDONALD. Of course, at the present time the service is performed not by the government but by a private corporation, which is not locally interested, and does not attempt to serve local interests.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). They have a monopoly.

Mr. MACDONALD. They have a monopoly, as my right hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) states. There is this consideration, that the government do grant assistance to private companies and if this company of local people were to undertake the service the minister might be assured that it would be very much improved.

Mr. MONK. Calculations were made in my presence that it was a considerable expenditure from which we did not appear to stand to derive any revenue.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There have been telephone companies formed of late in the peninsula of Gaspé, and when they came to provide for putting up their lines they found that the distances were so great and the patrons so few that it was very difficult for them to find money sufficient to erect the poles. I understand they intend to ask the Minister of Public Works for permission to use these telegraph poles to string their wires on. The settlements are very scattered around that peninsula, and the telephone has become such a modern necessity that I hope the Minister of Public Works will be generous when applications of this kind are made to him. I trust he will allow the telephone companies in such a remote region as that to string their wires on the government telegraph poles.

Mr. MONK. In these sparsely settled regions I think it is a good policy for the government as far as possible to grant the right to telephone companies, under certain circumstances, to string their wires along our poles. We have had no applications so far, but I would be inclined to favour the idea, provided the public interests be safeguarded. Of course, unless there are very special circumstances it is a bad principle to follow.

Immigration—salaries, agencies, in Canada, Great Britain and Foreign countries, $400,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Has the government settled upon any immigration policy for the maritime provinces? The subject was discussed here some few weeks ago in the House, and I would like to know if the minister or the government has arrived at any matured plan.

Mr. ROGERS. I have had a deputation wait on me from New Brunswick, in the person of the Premier and Mr. Grimmer, and one other of their colleagues, and we discussed a proposition suitable to that province, and which appeared satisfactory to them. With regard to Nova Scotia, I had the pleasure of being waited upon by a large deputation, the spokesman of which was Mr. Cummings, a government official of that province, and we discussed a plan which was apparently satisfactory to them, and which included the appointment of one or two agents in London to work together with our own staff in European countries, and the appointment also of one or two agents in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Was Mr. Cummings delegated by the government of Nova Scotia to interview the minister?

Mr. ROGERS. I think he so represented himself.

Mr. STANFIELD. I think Mr. Messenger was appointed by a farmers' meeting in the province to meet the minister, and Mr. Cummings happened to be here and went along.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). About what date did the department engage the services of Mr. Hawkes, and was he promised the position prior to the last election in the event of the defeat of the Liberal government?

Mr. ROGERS. I may tell my hon. friend that the matter of Mr. Hawkes' appointment was never discussed previous to the election, so far as I know. In fact it was my own suggestion to Mr. Hawkes, probably a month or more after the election, that he should undertake this work.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the minister give us a statement in regard to the officers in Great Britain and the Uunited States?

Mr. ROGERS. In May, 1911, A. F. Jury was transferred from Liverpool to Exeter, succeeding Mr. Alex. McOwan, who resigned on the 1st March, 1911, John McLennan was transferred from Aberdeen to Liverpool, and G. H. Mitchell was transferred from Birmingham to the High Commissioner's office in London; J. K. Millar, formerly of Saltcoats, Sask., was appointed Agent at Birmingham. W. B. Cumming, formerly of Saskatoon, Sask., was appointed Agent at Aberdeen, Scotland.

In the United States, J. S. Crawford was transferred from Kansas city, Mo., to Syracuse, N. Y. in January, 1911; W. H. Rogers from Indianapolis, Ind., to Kansas city, Mo., March, 1911; George Aird appointed agent at Indianapolis,

March, 1911, and in January, 1912, Mr. R. A. Garrett, of Manitou, Man., was appointed acting agent in charge of the office in St. Paul, Minn., relieving Mr. E. T. Holmes, who is seriously ill. No new offices have been established in Great Britain. No office is closed in the United States except the one in Boston for reasons which my hon. friend can appreciate. We have established offices in the United States at Crookston and Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. OLIVER. Who are in charge of these two offices?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Askett at Crookston and Mr. Black at Des Moines.

Mr. MACDONALD. In regard to the appointment of Mr. Hawkes, who has been touring England at the expense of Canada and writing flamboyant articles about himself and sending cables to Canada about his activities over there, I do not know whether the minister promised this gentleman his position during the last election campaign or not. I had the honour of a visit from Mr. Hawkes in my constituency, where he undertook to instruct the men who had come from old England and Scotland as to their duty in regard to political matters in this country. I am glad to say my constituents had the good sense to resent the attempts of this gentleman, who had hardly reached the standard that he could call himself a dignified Canadian, to direct them how to vote in the somewhat aggressive manner in which he did. I am sorry my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) is not here so that he might tell the minister of the performance which his appointee indulged in in his county when the hon. member had to apologize for his utterances and his conduct in discussing public questions.

I do not know whether the minister saw the very keen review and discussion of Mr. Hawkes made by the Victoria 'Sunset.' It does seem to me on general principles that a man who goes forth to represent this country, in immigration matters or anything else, should stop talking about having been born in Scotland or England or anywhere else—that he should be a Canadian first, last and always, and should go forth in that capacity. But that does not seem to be the method of this electioneering agent of my hon. friend or of some of his friends. The performances of Mr. Hawkes are not such as to bring very much pride to the average Canadian who is proud of his country. From what I saw and heard of him in the maritime provinces in the last election, I am surprised at the minister, who is usually given the credit of being a man of sound judgment, selecting a man like Mr. Hawkes, who seems to be running papers for his own glorification. I saw in Montreal the other day the British 'News,' which is his newspaper, and which contains quotations from his own speeches delivered in the old country, and writings as to his various performances. You would think that he was the centre of interest for the whole of Canada from the very hour he arrived in Great Britain, and that nobody else who had ever gone there before knew anything about Canada. It seems to me that the minister should send for that gentleman and give him a lecture as to his performances instead of attempting to foist him on the Canadian people.

Mr. ROGERS. I have not had the privilege of reading any of the articles to which my hon. friend refers, but I am informed, and I believe correctly informed, that Mr. Hawkes has now no interest whatever in the British 'News,' or whatever the name of the paper is. I regret that Mr. Hawkes met with such misfortune in the maritime provinces on the occasion to which my hon. friend refers; but I am glad to say that he had not the same misfortune in other provinces which he visited about that time. However, that had nothing to do with the appointment which he at present holds, further than this, that I recognized in Mr. Hawkes a suitable man for the work of immigration, in bringing to the notice of the people of England, Scotland and Ireland the great advantages of Canada for immigrants. I think still that Mr. Hawkes is a desirable man for that work, and from the statements of my hon. friend, he is evidently a man capable of securing a good deal of advertising——

Mr. MACDONALD. He advertised himself.

Mr. ROGERS——and that is the right sort of man as an immigrant agent. I may say, with regard to bringing Mr. Hawkes back from the old country, that I believe he is on the ocean now, and he will be here in a few days.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will his mission be completed then?

Mr. ROGERS. He is not engaged for any definite period. That will be determined when we get his report.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is his work for the department?

Mr. ROGERS. His work was first of all going to the different provinces of Canada with the view of enlisting the co-operation of the local governments with the Dominion in the matter of a general immigration policy. He visited all the local governments with a good deal of

success. Then he went to London for the purpose of visiting our different agencies and offices there, in order to make a report as to whether or not it would be advisable to make any change. I hope we shall have his report in a few days after he arrives, and I shall be glad to submit it to my hon. friends for their consideration.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Could not that work have been done by somebody else in the department?

Mr. ROGERS. I regarded Mr. Hawkes as a very suitable man for this work, and he has certainly done it very well up to date.

Mr. McKENZIE. Were any definite arrangements of a lasting character made between the department of the hon. minister and the government of Nova Scotia, for instance, with regard to immigration? What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that this gentleman met with considerable success?

Mr. ROGERS. He met with success in interviewing the government of British Columbia, and I believe he met with the same success with the government of Alberta. I have had a letter, I think, from a member of every local government in the Dominion of Canada, after Mr. Hawkes' visit, expressing satisfaction with the idea of their co-operating with us in immigration work.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That was not a new idea in this country.

Mr. MACDONALD. It was not Mr. Hawkes' idea.

Mr. ROGERS. No, it is our own idea.

Mr. MACDONALD. What credit is he to get for it?

Mr. ROGERS. He was selected as the man to have the interviews and to arrange the plan of co-operation with each province as far as we possibly could. Take the province of Ontario: We are combining our forces and saving a considerable amount of money instead of duplicating our work. The same applies to New Brunswick, and it was only a few days ago that I had a report from a member of the government of Nova Scotia, shortly after Mr. Hawkes had visited that province, and we had the deputation the other day with regard to co-operation in an immigration policy suitable to that particular province.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is a tribute to my hon. friend's judgment, if the idea had not existed before, that it would be a good thing to co-operate with the provinces. My hon. friend is altogether too modest. He need not fancy that Mr. Hawkes is of some consequence because the minister conceived the idea and Mr. Hawkes was sent to carry it out. I am satisfied that the minister had in the department men of experience, whose knowledge of this whole immigration business would have enabled them to carry out the minister's idea better than Mr. Hawkes. The minister is adroitly confusing the fact that he conceived this idea with the notion that that is a defence of Mr. Hawkes. A man who had hardly any root in this Canadian soil, was hardly the man to send forth with all the panoply of the greatness attributed to him in his own newspapers, for this work. The cablegrams about his movements in the old country are sent by himself, and of course the government pays for them. I am quite sure that the hon. minister has gentleman in his department who could have done more effective work. From what we have seen of Mr. Hawkes in this country, he is not a man who should be sent abroad bearing any credentials from this government as a sample Canadian agent. The minister is putting forward his idea of co-operation as if it were some defence of Mr. Hawkes.

Mr. ROGERS. I am afraid that my hon. friend is not acquainted with Mr. Hawkes, or he would not have made such a statement. Mr. Hawkes has spent years in western Canada, and he knows our conditions as few men do, so that I felt that he was a suitable man for the work. While we have first-class men in the Immigration Department, every man there has a special work of his own, and it was necessary to have some one else, and I selected Mr. Hawkes as a suitable man to stir up interest in immigration.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Hawkes was given the work of interviewing the various provincial governments and formulating with them a policy of co-operation in immigration. My hon. friend has told us that. I think that he should give us some idea of what the proposition is in regard to each of the provinces. While there has been some co-operation in the past, I understand from what the hon. minister says that it is intended to adopt the principle of co-operation as an important part of our immigration policy from this time forward. That policy having been decided on, Mr. Hawkes the special agent of the government, having interviewed the governments of the different provinces, and amicable arrangements, we are informed, having been arrived at, I think the minister should give us an idea of what those arrangements are, so that the House may judge of the merits of the scheme.

Mr. ROGERS. With certain of the provinces who have agents as we have had in the past, and as we have in London, we are uniting the offices, in so far as we pos-

sibly can, and are working from the same office, instead of having dual work. As between the Dominion and a particular province, we are working and co-operating together to that extent. Now, Mr. Hawkes will be here in a few days. He left rather hurriedly for London about Christmas time without presenting his report on his tour of inspection through the different provinces of Canada. However, the report will be prepared by the time he returns here, and I will be pleased to present it to the House in order that the full details may be gleaned as to his work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am very much interested in this work which Mr. Hawkes is carrying on. I do not know whether the government has had a report from that gentleman of an interview which he apparently has had with the representatives of the province of Quebec, which province within the past few months has established in London a new agency. It was a new departure and one which has been much commented on by the people of Quebec. I should be very pleased to learn that Quebec's agent in London is working in co-operation with the officers of the Department of the Interior. Speaking with regard to the province of Quebec, and the immigration policy as it affects that province—and not only Quebec, but the Dominion as a whole—I know that necessarily the immigration from Europe must above all come from the British Isles. I favour that policy, and I believe it to be a wise and good one. Of course we get good citizens from the continent of Europe, and we make good Canadians of them. That has been seen in the mixed population of the west where the foreign element has been quietly absorbed and to-day forms some of our best citizens. The minister himself, born and bred as he was in the province of Quebec, and being one of its bright sons, is aware that his native province has sent thousands of her sons into the maritime provinces, over hundreds of thousands into the province of Ontario, and many thousands into the far west; and he will admit that the province of Quebec deserves to be helped somewhat by a slight sprinkling of French emigration from Belgium and from France. I have given this question some consideration for years past. At the request of myself and some of my colleagues in the late government we obtained from his predecessors the appointment of agents in Belgium, and in France. An announcement recently appeared in the press that the salaries of the agents in France had been cut off. I do not believe that statement was true, and I am glad to see my hon. friend take exception to it. It would be a very unjust proceeding if that were done because the men who represent the departments in Paris, Mr. Wiallard and his assistants, are very able and active, and they have become experts in the matter of French immigration. The minister knows that it is very difficult for a Canadian agent, or indeed for any agent, to make any headway in France, as regards emigration to this country. The French government is opposed to emigration and they have very many good reason for that attitude. They have a standing army and compulsory military service, they have their own colonies, and more than that, lacking the virtues of their descendents in New France they lose in natural growth of population thousands of citizens. Naturally the government of France is not favourably disposed towards emigration, in fact it adopts many precautions to prevent it. Yet there are a certain number of people in France who are prepared, of their own volition to emigrate to this continent, and among that class our agents are quite able to get their proper share for this country. Many of these French immigrants go to Argentina and the United States. During the last fifteen years we have received our fair quota but we could find room for more. We must always remember that it is very difficult for our agents to make any active propaganda in the various provinces of France, in fact some years ago the then Prime Minister, Mr. Clemenceau, issued an edict or circular, prohibiting agents from conducting any active propaganda in the interests of emigration to this country. I read that circular myself, being in France at the time of the death of the late Mr. Prefontaine, and I saw Mr. Clemenceau who was then the Minister of the Interior. He explained to me the reasons which I gave a moment ago, that they could not see their way to facilitate the activities of our agents. However, he said, out of the people who did go abroad they were quite satisfied that the Canadians should get their fair share. As regards the Belgians that country is small in extent but numerously populated, and we can get from there an excellent class of immigrants. We all know the qualities of the Belgians: they are very thrifty, very industrious, and very excellent gardeners. Around our large cities such as Toronto, Montreal, and Winnipeg there would undoubtedly be a large sphere of operations for them. Some are located around Montreal and they are probably the best gardeners on the island. I would ask the minister to enable our agents in Belgium to send, not only in Quebec, but elsewhere our fair share of this very interesting population. The province of Quebec deserves that consideration. The results of every decennial census show that in that province we are doing our duty towards the Dominion, and we are spreading

throughout the whole country. In order to maintain Canada as loyal and as proud as it should be, we should get some recognition from the Minister of the Interior.

In that way, we get from abroad a sprinkling of French blood. It is good blood. Look at the Anglo-Saxon race, the finest race in the world, after the French-Canadian. It is a mixture of French, Saxon, Dane and many other races. But the Norman predominates in the Anglo-Saxon and is the best part of him. I hope that Mr. Hawkes, who has been employed by the Department of the Interior, to promote co-operation in immigration with the provincial governments, will not lose sight of the fact that, while it is a good policy to have the British-born in Canada, to have the bulk of our immigration from the British Islands—which I approve, sincerely approve—yet we can make excellent British subjects of those of pure French and Belgian stock. For these people find natural affiliations in this country, not only in Quebec, but in parts of Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, and in the maritime provinces as well. I was pleased to read the other day the interview given to the papers by Hon. Richard McBride, the Premier of British Columbia, commending to attention the words of Rudyard Kipling of some years ago, 'pump in the whites,' referring to the need of this policy in order to keep British Columbia as a white man's country. And Mr. McBride made a special appeal to the French-Canadian race, declaring that it was the best race for British Columbia. Send more French-Canadians, was his conclusion, and British Columbia will be ultimately saved. When I think of six Tories from British Columbia in this House, I cannot but think that the province needs salvation. If we had more French-Canadian inhabitants in the Rocky mountains, British Columbia would soon give a good account of herself. But, speaking seriously, I hope my hon. friend, who knows the French, having been brought up in the good old county of Argenteuil, will not forget that they have some claims on his department.

Mr. ROGERS. I am sure I have but little fault to find with what my hon. friend has so well said. First, with respect to the matter of co-operation with the province of Quebec, we shall undoubtedly be as well pleased to co-operate in regard to immigration with the province of Quebec as with any other province in Canada. My hon. friend has just stated what I already knew, that the province of Quebec has opened offices of its own in London and elsewhere. I believe we gain advantage by working together, especially in respect to literature. The Dominion is preparing literature suitable for the different provinces at all times, and literature suitable for the local governments and under their direction will be distributed by our agent, as well as in the localities in which they may have their agent's offices. So far as immigration from France and Belgium are concerned, and especially with regard to our office in France, I may say that no change has been made in the officers or their salaries. The only change made since I took charge of the department is to provide better and more suitable offices for the officers in that place. My hon. friend correctly states the position which we occupy in sending our agents to France. The government there has adopted a view which the hon. gentleman describes, and we are prevented from pursuing a general policy of immigration such as we pursue elsewhere. We are obliged to do what little work we do under the head of an information bureau. If we can expand, even in that way, I can assure my hon. friend we are ready to increase our staff or do anything more we possibly can to secure additional immigrants from France. We only secured something like 10,000 during the past ten years. And, while as the hon. gentleman says, conditions are a little different in Belgium—we have more freedom there—I think we have only secured 8,000 from that country in twelve years. In the meantime, we shall be glad, if possible, to introduce assistance there and adopt a more vigorous policy with a view to inducing people in France and in Belgium to take advantage of the many opportunities which offer, not in the province of Quebec only, but in the other provinces as well, for people to better their positions and live under conditions where they can carve out a place for their children and do much better, I am sure, than they could do by remaining at home.

Mr. EMMERSON. There may be some misapprehension as to the course pursued in the past with regard to co-operation. If it should be thought that there has not been co-operation hitherto, certainly the person so thinking labours under a misapprehension. I know that when I was connected with the provincial government of New Brunswick, the agent-general of that government in London, who had charge of immigration for the province, co-operated with the federal officials and an active propaganda was carried on. It was particularly active between the years 1897 and 1900 inclusive, as I personally know of. And since then the province of New Brunswick has had an agent-general in London whose chief duties were to give attention to immigration matters in co-operation with the federal Department of Immigration. The late Charles Duff-Miller represented New Brunswick as agent-general for many years. Probably no man has

been in London more active in immigration to the province of New Brunswick. He saw to it that literature was circulated, and acted with the officials of the Dominion in that regard; and I know that the federal officials were very much disposed to assist him in the work. So we should not run away with the idea that there has been no co-operation in the past between the provincial and the federal governments in this matter. I think it is due to the committee that my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers), should state exactly what new arrangements have been made in this respect, and how far co-operation has been elaborated as between the several provinces and whether they have reached the point where they will probably co-operate more fully than in the past. I presume that that information is in the department. As we understand that an official has recently been appointed to confer with the provincial governments with a view to closer co-operation than in the past, I think it would be an advantage to the country to know what the arrangements are. I suppose there must have been correspondence and other writings with regard to these plans. Several meetings have been held. I would like to know the nature of the understanding, and, if there are any financial features, what they are—whether there is any arrangement for the division of the expenses that are assumed, and have been assumed by the provincial governments in the past.

Mr. ROGERS. I appreciate what the hon. gentleman has said with respect to New Brunswick in particular. I want to endorse everything he has said with respect to the agent-general, Mr. Duff-Miller, whom I had the pleasure of meeting on more than one occasion in London. He certainly was a most worthy representative of the people of New Brunswick, and a credit not only to that province, but to the Dominion of Canada as a whole. He did much to make pleasant the visit of any Canadian that he met upon the other side while he occupied that position. I can understand that any government will co-operate with and lend assistance to such an individual as was Mr. Duff-Miller, occupying the position which he did in England as the representative of New Brunswick. I had a visit from the Premier and some of the ministers of the province of New Brunswick and we took up this matter. They have a plan of their own in respect to how they propose to divide their work up, and I presume they will announce it in their own legislature in due course. But, I may say to my hon. friend that I gave them the assurance that we were prepared to supply an agent named by the province to represent them at London, England, and to do the work as representing that province, but paid by the Dominion. I also told him that we were prepared to give them one or two agents for special work in the province of New Brunswick. This plan is being prepared, and I shall be glad to furnish any information in connection with its progress to my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I would like to ask the minister if he has sent farm delegates to the British Isles this winter?

Mr. ROGERS. We have followed the general practice and a number have gone. I do not know that we have been able to send as many as went last year, but the number is pretty nearly the same.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). So far as I understand the policy of the minister it is to pursue unremittingly the policy of Canadian immigration propagandism that has been pursued by his predecessor. In regard to these farm delegates, my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) will bear me out in what I say, that there were at least two members in what was then the opposition, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), who showed tremendous hostility to these farm delegates being employed. I do not call attention to that subject to express any sympathy with their action then, nor to follow the example of their action myself now. But, there are circumstances in the present condition of western Canada that I think should be in the minister's mind in connection with his immigration policy. We had what to me was a very pregnant admission from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) in this House in another debate the other day. He said that it had to be admitted that for the moment production has outrun transportation in western Canada; that is to say, that production had outrun our present ability to dispose of what we produce. The only object of production is to dispose of what we produce, and, clearly, if we do not dispose of it, it would be better not to be produced. If we are to pursue unremittingly this immigration propagandism the difficulty occurs in my mind that in a few years production must invariably, by the process of logic, still further outrun our transportation and marketing facilities. I do not want to saddle my hon. friend or the government with the responsibility of providing markets, but he is far too clear-headed a man not to see the connection between that part of his departmental work that is now under survey, and the admission of his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Mr. Arthur Hawkes, in the recent election, I understand, made an appeal to the British-born to forego the advantages of a great and freer market.

Mr. Hawkes is now making another appeal to the British-born to come to the same country where he previously pursuaded their fellow countrymen to forego the advantages of this market.

Mr. CURRIE. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he will pardon me—?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). No, I will not pardon the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CURRIE. I understand he is making a statement in reference to Mr. Hawkes. When did Mr. Hawkes state—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CURRIE. I am going to ask on what occasion did Mr. Hawkes state that he did not want us to have wider markets. Do not put statements in his mouth that he did not make.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). One has a great deal of trouble with budding ministers in this House. I prefer to deal with actual ones. I do not think the Minister of the Interior resents a single word I am saying.

Mr. CURRIE. The trouble with the hon. gentleman is that he was only in the bud as a minister.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I was pointing out a difficulty which I see in connection with the policy of the Minister of the Interior and of the government. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I was within the rules of order and pointing the difficulty out and drawing the attention of the government and the minister at present before us to the difficulty in parliamentary terms and in courteous language. My point is that it is due to this side of the House to know what the government means to do in the presence of a difficulty which exists out of the mouth of one of the members of that government. Now, as I have said already, I do not want to saddle the minister or the government with the responsibility of providing the markets, but it is very clear that unless this deadlock—because it is that in western Canada to-day—is removed there may be more wisdom than we saw at the time in the contention of the hon. member for Halton and of the present hon. Minister of Public Works that we should hold our hand for a little in this immigration propagandism. I believe that my contention is strictly logical and to the point, and I am sure the minister will bear me no grudge for pointing out this matter to him.

Mr. ROGERS. I can understand and appreciate the difficulties that have occurred this year by reason of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clark, Red Deer) is pleased to term the overproduction of grain in western Canada. It is true, it is a fact, and I am sure that as western members, at all events, we are all proud to notice and declare the fact that we have grown in the three prairie provinces something over 450,000,000 bushels of grain of different sorts. Naturally, in view of that great development, we have had very considerable difficulty in securing railway transportation for that amount of produce. However, I see a brighter outlook for the future perhaps than my hon. friend in this regard. We have now under construction two additional transcontinental railways which will be finished in the very near future, I hope, and in addition to these we have the Hudson Bay railway well under way. I am one of those that have confidence enough in the construction of the Hudson Bay railway to believe that we are going to get an outlet there, not alone for three or four months in the year, but I think that is the only outlet shown on the map of Canada where the people of western Canada will ever be able to get their products transported to the markets of the world for twelve months in the year. In my judgment, if this government undertake and carry on the construction of the Hudson Bay railway to Fort Nelson or Churchill and undertake the construction of a line of railway from the other side of the bay to the Labrador coast, we will be able to have open navigation for twelve months in the year. It is true, as everyone knows, that it would be impossible to secure that by going through the straits, but I think that by avoiding the straits and undertaking the construction of a line of railway such as I have described, we will be able to have, not alone for three or four months in the year but for twelve months in the year, an outlet for the grain that we produce.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). How would you get across Hudson Bay in the winter months?

Mr. ROGERS. It does not freeze over during the winter months.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Surely there is ice there.

Mr. ROGERS. There is ice, but we have ice at Port Arthur and elsewhere. There are ice-breakers that are very convenient for keeping the harbours open in the winter time and I think this is one of the things, at all events, to be considered in the future. Nevertheless, we will get our markets and I hope that we will be able to get our transportation in such shape as will lead to greater development and prosperity in western Canada in the future than we have had in the past.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am rather surprised at the statement made by the hon. gentleman about the Hudson Bay railway. As far as we know navigation through the

straits is possible only for two and a half or three months in the year. I know that Hudson Bay itself is navigable at nearly all times of the year. But my hon. friend says that if we build the Hudson Bay railway from the Pas to Nelson or Churchill and that if we build from the other side of the bay to a port on Labrador we will have solved the question of transportation.

That brings up the question of the construction of what is generally called the James Bay railway. When my hon. friend mentions the Labrador railway, does he mean that this section of the Hudson Bay railway would have its terminus on the Labrador coast? The most popular and feasible route would be one from the head of James Bay following the Nottaway river, tapping the Transcontinental railway at some point and coming in a direct line to Montreal or Quebec. That would solve the question of the transportation from the west at all times of the year. I was speaking to Captain Bernier the other day and he told me there are reports in the Department of Marine which mentioin the fact that Fort Nelson is the most available port taking it all the year around, and that very little work would have to be done at it. In order to solve the question of transportation when the Hudson straits are not open it was pointed out the other day by the Minister of Railways and by Sir Lomer Gouin, Prime Minister of Quebec, that the construction of the James Bay railway from the head of that bay to Montreal or Quebec is the proper course to pursue. It is only five hundred miles long and it traverses a splendid territory, rich in minerals and in lumber, and has fine agricultural land being a continuation of the famous clay belt of Ontario.

Mr. ROGERS. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) but in the development of our country, as he knows, we have to take it step by step. I quite believe that before the suggestion which I threw out a moment ago will be realized we will have in operation the James Bay railway to which the hon. member has referred. In my judgment such an outlet will give a longer period of transportation than would navigation through the Hudson straits.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am told there are about nine months navigation that way.

Mr. ROGERS. In addition to that, this parliament has already voted a large subsidy for the greater portion of the James Bay railway and I hope it will be carried on and that by the time we get our railway built to Port Nelson or Fort Churchill the James Bay railway will be constructed so that we can make a connection and secure all the advantages that the construction of such a line would give to the people of western Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX

Mr. OLIVER. What provinces have agents in England now?

Mr. ROGERS. I am not sure but I think British Columbia, Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and I think Quebec is starting now.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Nova Scotia has an agent general who is the representative of the province at large.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is also an agent from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. OLIVER. Will these agents be withdrawn as the result of the scheme of co-operation that is being entered upon?

Mr. ROGERS. That will be a matter entirely for the provinces. I think the provinces now feel important and strong enough to believe that they should be represented by their own agents general who will probably not devote so much of their time to the matter of immigration as formerly, but who will do other work in connection with the provinces which they represent. At least that has been suggested, and I do not know to what extent the practice will be adopted.

Mr. OLIVER. In what way will this duplication of work be avoided, and in what way is the expense to be decreased by the co-operation system proposed?

Mr. ROGERS. We can employ the same offices in many ways and we can have a uniform arrangement in regard to our literature, and in many other ways we can work to advantage by co-operating. I know that all the provinces we have spoken to seem to agree with the idea and see an advantage in it. I certainly do so far as the literature and the using of the same offices are concerned. Take an agent going from Ontario or the west, and generally speaking he knows very little about the conditions in the maritime provinces. Our hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) told us the other day that our present representative in London did not appear to know that there was such a place as New Brunswick, and we want to avoid any suspicion of that kind of thing. We want representatives there that will know the special conditions prevailing in each province of Canada and be able to meet intending immigrants who would be suitable for these particular provinces. For instance, the class of immigrants wanted in New Brunswick would be good market gardeners and the like, and in my opinion we can get immigrants from Belgium who would be suitable for that province. Probably, I might say the same thing in regard to Nova Scotia. In that way it would be an advantage to co-operate and it would pay the duplicating of offices and literature.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Will the minister appoint the men designated by the several provincial governments and will the Federal government pay the salaries?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Will the Federal government pay the greater portion of the maintenance and literature?

Mr. ROGERS. That has to be arranged yet.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It is only fair I think that the federal government should bear, if not the whole, the greater portion of the cost, because it is not a fair expenditure to force upon the various provinces. I think the minister will agree with me that the several provincial governments in this country have all they can do with their limited financial strength to perform the various public services which fall under their jurisdiction, and these are becoming more burdensome on them all the time. I think in the matter of immigration the federal government might well pay all the expenses of the printing of immigration literature for the provinces.

Mr. OLIVER. I must say that I fail to see the economy of the arrangement so far as the Dominion is concerned, although, of course, there may be economy in respect of the provinces.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not wish to be understood as saying that we will have any increased economy so far as the Dominion is concerned, but we will have increased economy to the extent that between the Dominion and the provinces we will not be duplicating the work, and having two men doing what one man could well do. For instance, the other day the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario arranged with me to join forces in the office in Toronto which is a considerable saving for our department, and he would pay the rental if we would supply him with a certain amount of literature. We save duplicating the work in that way. In a general sense it is not as a policy of economy that we are doing this, but in order that we may work in unity towards the same end.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite understand the situation now, and I think it is desirable that the House should understand that the economy is an economy of effort rather than an economy in money. If I might criticise, I would think that in all human probability the Dominion will have the privilege of bearing a very large share of the cost under the arrangement that is made. It is to be hoped that it will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in efficiency. Does the minister intend to reopen the office at Boston?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, on the 1st of March.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Was the office entirely closed at Boston?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Then why re-open it?

Mr. ROGERS. We found the necessity of it to a certain extent and the closing gave rise to the false impression that we were closing offices in the United States and not going to be as vigorous in our immigration policy towards our neighbours as we had been in the past. We have had a considerable number of applications for information and we found it necessary to re-open the office.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I suppose all the officials employed in that office were dismissed, and I would be very suspicious that the closing of the office was a modus operandi for getting clear of some officials.

Mr. ROGERS. The hon. member is mistaken.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What is the explanation?

Mr. ROGERS. I think the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) will bear me out when I say that the officials who happened to be in charge of that office were not desirable for the carrying out of the work, and in any case whether the office had remained open or otherwise it would have been necessary to dismiss them. They were not suitable for the work. Accidents will happen in all cases and this was simply an accident.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Were Mr. Hetherington and Mr. Copp the only officers employed there?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, there were one or two stenographers besides.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Whom does the minister intend to appoint?

Mr. ROGERS. We have not selected any one yet.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid I can hardly accept the co-operative principle my hon. friend accords me with regard to the Boston office. If I had held the same opinion of the officials there as he holds it would have been my business to have dispensed with them.

While I admit that the officials had their limitations, they had their good parts. Mr. Hetherington, who was the first agent appointed there, was a New Brunswicker, a man of very good standing in his province, and well known both in New Brunswick and in New England by the New Bruns-

wickers living there, and for that reason it seemed to me that he was a valuable man. I admit that he had attained a considerable age, and was not as active as he might have been, but certainly he had the qualifications for the work. Mr. Copp, who assisted him was a Nova Scotian, and had formerly been a member of this House. He was a younger man than Mr. Hetherington and certainly was an active man, and I would suppose was a suitable agent. I find no fault with my hon. friend. He is responsible to the country for the efficient operation of his department, and has a right to decide on the efficiency of those in the service. But I do not want to leave myself under the imputation of having retained in office persons who were unsuitable. I would be sorry to see the office permanently closed, because I think there is a good field there, on the lines on which we established it, for securing a population for our western country from the maritime province people, who have settled in many thousands in the New England states.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). When Mr. Copp and Mr. Hetherington were dismissed, what reason was assigned in the notification to them?

Mr. ROGERS. No special reason was given further than that the office was to be closed. It was a recommendation of a departmental officer which brought it about, nothing else.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What salary did Mr. Hetherington get?

Mr. ROGERS. $1,800 a year.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What did Mr. Copp get?

Mr. ROGERS. $1,500.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It was not a very expensive staff. All I have to say is that I do not like the look of the whole transaction. It does not look as if there was departmental candour at least in getting rid of these officials. They were not highly paid officials. In the case of Mr. Copp it has proved to be a great hardship. While not very old, he is well up in years; he is an ex-member of parliament, and has a good knowledge of Nova Scotia, and I think he could have rendered service to the country up to the extent of the small salary he received. It looks as if these gentlemen were dismissed by a policy of fraud and deception. While the reason given was that the office was to be closed, we are told that the office is to be opened again. Unless the minister will take the ground that they were dismissed for incompetency, I think his action was most unfair. He could not dismiss them for political partisanship. I think the chairman (Mr. Jameson) will bear me out in saying that Mr. Copp, since his appointment to that office, has not taken any part in politics in Nova Scotia.

Mr. ROGERS. I may say that there was no politics whatever in the closing of this office or in the dismissal of those connected with it. The action was taken entirely on the recommendation of the officials of the department, for the reason that they did not consider either Mr. Hetherington or Mr. Copp capable of fulfilling the duties they were expected to perform. I did not know them myself; I simply acted on the recommendation of officials of the department. There was no outside interference or request of any description with reference to the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In connection with the immigration from the United States, might I remind the hon. minister that some years ago, under his predecessor in office, and under Mr. Sifton, some French-Canadian agents were appointed specially to look after the repatriation of French-Canadians from the New England States? Amongst the agents appointed were some well-known priests who were well acquainted with the various French-Canadian settlements in the New England States, and I must say that they have been quite successful in repatriating several thousand French-Canadians, many of whom have settled in Saskatchewan and elsewhere, I think, in Alberta. As these agents have proved to be very satisfactory in the past, I hope my hon. friend will continue their services. There is a large population of French-Canadians in the New England States. According to the census returns published by the United States government, the population of French origin from Canada in the United States is nearer one million than a half million. This started many years ago—first at the time of the establishment of the cotton factories in the eastern states, and again during the hard times before 1896. And there was quite an influx of French immigration to the United States. Now the tide has turned, thanks to the efforts of the clergy and to the immigration agents who have been appointed in various cities of the neighbouring republic, and quite a number of these people have come back to Canada. I hope the minister will maintain these agents and see that they continue to do their work well. In this way we can recover many of our people who have not foresworn their Canadian citizenship although they are living on the other side of the boundary line.

Mr. ROGERS. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) I may say that we are retaining all the officers to whom he has alluded, and that we are favourably considering recommendations for extending this kind of work.

Mr. McKENZIE. We in the province of Nova Scotia are particularly interested in the details of the proposed co-operation because we are very desirous of attracting more people to that province for agricultural purposes. I was glad to hear the minister say they hoped to settle in New Brunswick people who would take an interest in market gardening, and presumably agricultural pursuits generally. In Nova Scotia, more particularly the eastern part of the province, we are confronted with a condition of things that is highly detrimental to agriculture. Prior to 1875 and 1876, farming was almost wholly the occupation carried on in that part of Canada. Almost everybody engaged in agriculture and the cost of living was consequently low. Of recent years large industrial centres such as coal mines, and the steel and iron works, have operated and have had the effect of drawing the rural population from the country. The result is that large tracts of land which previously were thickly settled by farmers, are now practically vacant while there are large centres of population entirely unproductive, requiring tremendous quantities of food stuffs. Hence the cost of living in these busy centres of population and industry is becoming alarmingly high. Our only hope and salvation is that we can secure a class of people who will settle on those vacant lands and make them productive. I have talked to the Premier of Nova Scotia upon the subject, and the question is where are we going to locate immigrants if they come or what inducements can they hold out to them. There is abundance of land but it is not owned by the government, and I would therefore suggest to the minister that in order to effect any substantial progress with his policy in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia he should acquire some of this land. It can be got very cheaply and if it were divided into small farms of fifty acres the necessary inducement to immigrants to come and settle on them would be found. Around Sydney and North Sydney there is much good land available out of which splendid farms can be created. The creation of colonies of fifty or sixty farms in my opinion would be highly successful, and in a short time this scheme would practically make its own way. I am very hopeful that the policy announced will be successful. I wish the minister every success and I trust that his plan will promote the settlement of vacant lands in the maritime provinces.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would suggest to the minister that in making appointments to the Boston office, it would be desirable to select persons from the maritime provinces who will appreciate the conditions there much better than persons who have lived in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Such a course might also have the effect of influencing immigration from the United States back to the maritime provinces.

Mr. JAMESON. As I was in the chair when the question of closing the Boston office was being discussed I wish now to say a word with regard to that matter. My first intimation that that office was about to be closed, or that any change had been made in connection with it, was the receipt of a newspaper clipping forwarded to me from Digby to the effect that Mr. Copp who was in charge of the Boston office had returned home again. Mr. Copp was my opponent in the election of 1908, and he and I have always been on most friendly terms, and I am glad to say the same friendly feeling exists to-day. Immediately upon receiving the newspaper intimation I went to the department and made inquiries, and after a time was informed that the change had been brought about as a result of a report by an officer of the department to the effect, I believe, that it was necessary in the interests of the department, and of that branch of the department's work. I also heard at the same time from Digby that Mr. Copp was very unwell. The information given to me at the department was that while the Boston office would be closed on the 31st of December, Mr. Copp had been retired on the 21st of October. I then saw the Minister of the Interior and represented to him that Mr. Copp was unwell, and urged that he be reinstated for the remainder of the period that the office would remain open, that if necessary, Mr. Copp, though too unwell to resume his duties, should be allowed leave of absence and his salary paid as though he were still in the service of the department at the Boston office. The minister acceded to that, and Mr. Copp has been paid his salary up to the 31st of December. Only yesterday I received from Mrs. Copp a letter expressing appreciation of what had been done in that regard, and stating that her husband's health was such that she regretted his inability to write me himself. I do not want any member of the House to think for one moment that I had ever done or said anything that would militate against the interests of Mr. Copp as an officer of the department, because, as I have already said, we have always been on the best possible terms, and it would be the last thing I should have thought of under the circumstances.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). No one has ever suggested such a thing.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to ask whether under this proposed co-operative arrangement as applied to the province of Nova Scotia, that province is to nominate an immigra-

tion agent with a permanent residence in England, at the expense of the Dominion with two or more subordinate agents. All the provinces are represented in the government, excepting Alberta, Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, and I have no doubt that the ministers representing the other provinces will take care of the interests of those three provinces in this arrangement. I would ask the minister if the arrangement he has sketched is equally open to Alberta, Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island as to the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. ROGERS. The same conditions will obtain in all the provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to clearly understand the new policy of the minister as regards this co-operative work between the provinces and the Dominion. If I understand rightly the officers thus working together will be paid the one by the province, and the other by the Dominion. And then the Department of the Interior will see to the literature to be issued to the public. Will the literature tend to move immigration towards the west especially?

Mr. ROGERS. No, the idea is to have special literature for each province prepared by the representatives there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Dominion government will do just as much to help immigration towards the several provinces as towards the public lands of the west.

Mr. ROGERS. Just the same.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When we are next in committee on these estimates I should be glad if the minister will give some details about the mission intrusted to Mr. Oliver Asselin. I understand that he has a commission from the department to look after agencies in Europe.

Mr. ROGERS. I will answer that at once. The mission was simply in connection with the French and Belgian agencies, with a view to widening our scope, the subject we discussed a few moments ago. Mr. Asselin was represented to me as being a suitable man for this work, and he was going anyway. He receives the same salary as a farm delegate. He undertook the work, and will make a report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has the minister received the report?

Mr. ROGERS. Not yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I should be glad if the minister would inform me when it is received. Mr. Asselin is a very able man, a splendid writer; I shall be much interested in reading his report.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). When we are again in Supply, I desire to ask some questions concerning the application made by some of the East Indian population of British Columbia with regard to the admission of their wives into that province.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the hon. gentleman want the information to-night?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). No.

Mr. OLIVER. As to the agents of the provinces appointed in England, will they occupy a part of the offices provided by the Dominion or will they have separate offices? and if so who will provide these offices?

Mr. ROGERS. That has not yet been definitely decided. Some of the provinces are ambitious enough to have their own offices and buildings and wish to remain in them, while others have not. I think we have reached the time when probably this government should do something about securing large and suitable buildings in London for the purposes of the Immigration Department and other departments of government that are represented over there. If that scheme is carried out in the near future, I hope we shall provide, in that building under whatever arrangement we might make, suitable and acceptable accommodation for each province.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly that is an excellent idea. It is the idea propounded the other day by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). One goes to London, and passing along the Strand sees on one side the Ontario building, on the other side the Quebec building; and a little further, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and all using the magic word 'Canada.' Why not have one big central building for the Dominion with all the provinces located in that building? When my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was Minister of the Interior, a proposition was made by Lord Strathcona to provide for a splendid building in the heart of London. I believe a site could then have been obtained on favourable terms on Trafalgar Square which would have been very suitable. The Department of Immigration has offices on Charing Cross, a small place and occupying a very valuable site, but the display made there, I am sure, has brought thousands of immigrants to this country. Passing there morning, afternoon or evening—for the place is kept bright at night with electric lights, one can always see a crowd looking at the exhibits in the window. And, as

I say, this is a small corner of Charing Cross. If we had the old hotel in front of the Nelson Statue—I think it is called Morley's hotel, one of the old landmarks—

Mr. ROGERS. I am told that is a very expensive site.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It may be so; but you cannot have a central site in London suitable for Canada without paying the piper. But look at the Grand Trunk railway, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Allans, and all the big concerns that have erected splendid buildings and that are doing the advertising for Canada. Canada is big enough and rich enough to do advertising for herself. And certainly I would commend the action of the government if they were to erect in the heart of London, which is the heart of the empire, a big building which would be architecturally beautiful, and would in itself be an advertisement for the country; make it the headquarters of our High Commissioner, and rally all the provinces under that roof. I think it would be the beginning of a very sane imperialism.

Mr. OLIVER. I see that there is an increase of $50,000 in the first item on the list.

Mr. ROGERS. While it appears as an increase it is not such in reality. It is due to the fact that in former years a number of salaries were charged to the vote of contingencies. These were added to the salary list for the year 1912-13. According to a statement prepared early in November, it will require $387,812.26, to pay the salaries of the immigration employees in the outside service, leaving little over $12,000 to provide for new appointments and increases during the ensuing year. While you provided $350,000 you spent $387,817.26 up to November 15. So that it is practically the same thing.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. ROGERS moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. ROGERS. Government Bills, and, if we get through with those, Supply.

Mr. OLIVER. What Bills?

Mr. ROGERS. The Bills on the order paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And when we go into Supply we will take up my hon. friend's (Mr. Roger's) estimates?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.23 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 19, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT OF PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. CURRIE moved that the first report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER. As this report relates to the Printing of Parliament, which involves an expenditure of money, I am afraid I shall have to ask that it be allowed to stand.

Mr. CURRIE. The Printing Committee recommend in this report that in future all reports presented in either the Senate or the House of Commons, by the other committees which contain requests for the printing of reports, pamphlets, &c., be first submitted to the Committee on Printing. That recommendation should be really unnecessary because, under Rule 64 of the House, a motion for the printing of any paper must be first submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing for report before any action is taken on it. However, an abuse has arisen in the House, and other committees present to the House resolutions accompanying their reports with motions that a certain number of copies of testimony or papers placed before them should be printed and the House has granted such requests. For instance, the Committee on Agriculture recommended that 150,000 copies of Dr. James Robertson's address before them on the matter of conservation should be printed. That would involve an expenditure of something over $15,000. It is a violation of the rules, there was a slight clash over the matter, and as a result this report is now presented to the House. Whether this motion is necessary I do not know, but it is well to pass it, and so remind the chairman and secretaries of committees that this abuse cannot be continued. In 1908 the amount of money required for sessional printing for the House was $85,000, but last session it was

over $250,000. We do not wish to be considered parsimonious, but we feel that orders for any printing of such magnitude as this should at least be referred to the committee appointed by parliament to pass upon such things.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I would suggest that this motion might stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. I requested that the report referred to by the hon. gentleman should stand as it recommended printing, which involves an expenditure, without that question having been referred to the Committee on Printing charged with the duty of looking into such questions and making recommendations with respect to them.

Motion allowed to stand.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. BENNETT (SIMCOE).

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to refer to an item in the 'Free Press' personal to myself. It says:

> One of the chief causes of Conservative attack upon Hon. Dr. Pugsley's administration of the Public Works Department was his use of the tug 'Whelan' to break the ice in the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William. Indeed the investigation into this 'scandal' is still in progress before the Public Accounts Committee. Yet the same tug 'Whelan' is doing the self same work under the administration of Hon. F. D. Monk. What will W. H. Bennett say now?

In reference to the item, all I have to say is this: There is no investigation, to my knowledge, now before the Public Accounts Committee in reference to ice breaking at Fort William or Port Arthur. Last year there was a contract there for $30,000 for that work, but under the withering influence of honest competition and tender, that has shrivelled down to $19,250; and at Midland, with reference to which there is an investigation pending as to the breaking of ice, that contract has been reduced from $5,500 to nothing. That is all I have to say.

MR. JUSTICE RITCHIE OF NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. MACDONALD. I saw an announcement in the 'Free Press' on Saturday to the effect that Mr. J. J. Ritchie, K.C., has been appointed a justice of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia in succession to the late Mr. Justice Laurence. I trust the rumor is true. I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether it is true or not.

Mr. CURRIE.

I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman is aware of the fact that it is desirable that the appointment should be made at an early date on account of the illness of one of the other judges.

Mr. BORDEN. The order in council was approved on Saturday.

Mr. MACDONALD. For Mr. Ritchie's appointment?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes.

MARRIAGE LAWS—REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice if the rumour published in the Montreal 'Gazette' is true, that the reference on the marriage question will be submitted to the Supreme Court this week at the opening of the court.

Mr. BORDEN. It will be submitted at the earliest practicable opportunity; I hope this week.

FARMERS' BANK INVESTIGATION.

Mr. MACDONALD. With reference to the statement that Sir William Meredith has been appointed commissioner to investigate matters in connection with the Farmers' Bank, will the Prime Minister bring down a copy of the order in council appointing him?

Mr. BORDEN. It was laid on the table the very day on which it was approved.

PATENTS OF THOMAS B. RAMBAUT.

On the order being called for further consideration in the Committee of the Whole, of Bill (No. 84) respecting certain patents of Thomas B. Rambaut.—Mr. Ames.

Mr. OLIVER. When this Bill came up on Friday one of the members who was very much interested in it asked to have it stand over until to-day when he could be present, and that was agreed to. I would ask that the Bill be allowed to stand for the present.

Mr. BORDEN. I understand that arrangement was made, and the Bill will stand accordingly.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FARMERS' BANK—Hon. T. W. CROTHERS.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is the government aware as to whether the Honourable T. W. Crothers, now Minister

of Labour, declared himself when a candidate for parliament, at Kerwood, Ontario, on or about the first day of September last, as being in favour of indemnifying every man who lost a dollar by the operations of the management of the Farmers' Bank?

2. Is the government aware as to whether or not such a statement was reported by the London 'Free Press' on September 2, 1911, as emanating from the honourable gentleman above named, at that time a candidate for election to the House of Commons?

3. Is the government aware as to whether the same honourable gentleman declared himself to the same effect at Fingal, Ontario, on September 4, 1911?

4. Is the government aware that the St. Thomas 'Times' of September 5, 1911, alleged that the honourable gentleman so declared himself at Fingal, Ontario, on the 4th September, 1911?

5. Is the government aware as to whether the Honourable Minister of Labour has at any time since the said dates repudiated the statements attributed to him by the said journals?

6. Is it the intention of the government to indemnify or recoup every man who lost a dollar by the operations of the Farmers' Bank?

Mr. BORDEN:

Respecting the matters alluded to, Mr. Crothers, on the occasion referred to, expressed his personal views only, and did not undertake to speak for the Conservative party, or for its leader, or for the present administration which had not then been formed.

A Royal Commission has been issued to Sir William Ralph Meredith, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas Division of the High Court of Ontario, empowering him to inquire into the circumstances connected with the organization and operation of the Farmers' Bank. A copy of this order in council has already been laid upon the table of the House.

NURSERY STOCK.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has any nursery stock been purchased for the Experimental Farm at Kentville, N.S.?

2. If so, from whom were the same purchased?

3. What is the quantity ordered and the price to be paid therefor?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Arthur Harris, Riverside Nursery, Annapolis Royal, N.S., 1,025 apple trees for $256.25, including packing; Geo. Bunyard & Company, Maidstone, Kent, England, 80 apple trees for £4 0s. 0d.; The Helderleigh Nurseries, Winona, Ontario, 225 apple trees for $67.50, including packing.

SOUTH RENFREW—APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. PROULX:

1. How many persons from the riding of South Renfrew have been appointed to positions in the public service of this country by the various departments of this government since the 21st day of September last?

2. What are their names and the salaries or the emoluments they receive?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Post Office Department, 1 postmaster; Department of Railways and Canals, 1.

2. Post Office Department, Mr. Alex. McLeod was appointed to the postmastership of Matawatchan at a salary of $49 per annum. Department of Railways and Canals, Mr. Thomas Lloyd, of Arnprior, county of South Renfrew, is appointed as messenger by the Department of Railways and Canals, at a salary of $50 per month.

FENIAN RAID VETERANS.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Has the government considered the advisability of making grants of land or money to the Fenian Raid veterans?

2. If the matter has been decided, will the grants be of land or money?

3. Will a Bill be introduced by the government before the end of the present session for the above-mentioned purpose?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1, 2 and 3. Under consideration.

CENSUS COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Have the census commissioners in Shefford, Brome and Missisquoi been paid for their services?

2. If not, when may they expect to receive the balance due them by the government?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. The census commissioners of Shefford and Brome have been paid in full. A small balance of about $5 is still due to the commissioners for Missisquoi.

2. Just as soon as the accounts are finally revised and audited, which will be very shortly.

CIVIL SERVICE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Has the government or any official thereof, or any person connected therewith, received any recent representations from the Civil Service Association?

2. If so, to what did such representations refer?

3. What reply was given by the government in connection with the different mat-

ters touched upon in the representations made?

4. Is the question of superannuation to civil servants to be taken up this present session?

5. Is it the intention of the government to pass an order in council to amend the present regulations of the Civil Service Commission so as to permit persons who were in the inside civil service as third division clerks at the coming into effect of the Civil Service Amendment Act of September, 1908, to be promoted to the second division, on passing the promotion examination in vogue prior to the coming into force of the said amendment Act of September, 1908, without passing the present second division promotion examination?

6. Is the government aware that the present representatives of the city of Ottawa during the late campaign promised on behalf of the present government, that if elected this alleged injustice would be remedied without any avoidable delay?

7. Has the government or any member thereof received any representations from the present representatives of Ottawa in this parliament in regard to this matter? If so, of what did such consist?

8. Does the government contemplate legislative action on any other matters respecting civil servants during the present session? If so, what?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. Various matters connected with the administration of the Civil Service.

3. That the representations will receive consideration.

4, 5 and 8. These matters have not yet been considered by the government.

6. Now I purpose placing on the table of the House a copy of the representations made to the government on that occasion.

CENSUS EMPLOYEES.

Mr. DEMERS:

Have the census employees in the county of St. Jean and Iberville been paid in full for their work? If not, when will they be?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. No. Small balances are still due, and will be paid as soon as the schedules are finally revised, which will be very shortly.

STE. THERESE POST OFFICE.

Mr. SEGUIN:

What were the respective revenues of the Post Offices at Ste. Thérèse and the town of Laurentides for the last five years?

Mr. CARROLL.

Mr. PELLETIER:

STE. THERESE, QUEBEC.
REVENUE.

1907	1,263,02
1908	1,522.27
1909	1,545.70
1910	1,800.88
1911	1,958.83

LAURENTIDES, QUEBEC.
REVENUE.

1907	1,029.83
1908	1,169.57
1909	1,148.64
1910	1,113.56
1911	1,274.65

POPULATION OF CANADA.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Is the Minister of Agriculture in a position to tell if the figures of the population of Canada, and of the several Canadian cities and towns, given in reply to an inquiry on the 4th December last, are decisive—

2. If not, can the minister inform the House of an absoluteness on this subject and give the exact figures?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. The figures of population of Canada and of certain cities and towns given in reply to an inquiry of the 4th December last, were not final.

2. The figures of population, as finally revised, for Canada, Quebec province, and the cities and towns asked for in the former inquiry are as follows:

Canada	7,203,837
Quebec Province	2,002,712
Montreal	470,480
Quebec	78,190
Three Rivers	13,691
St. Hyacinthe	9,797
Sorel	8,420
Hull	18,222
Fraserville	6,774
Montmagny	2,617
Rimouski	3,097
Nicolet	2,593
Joliette	6,346
St. Jérôme	3,473
Sherbrooke	16,405
Lévis	7,452
Maisonneuve	18,684
Chicoutimi	5,880
St. Jean	5,903
Victoriaville	3,028
Outremont	4,820
Roberval	1,737
Valleyfield	9,449
Terrebonne	1,990
Marieville	1,587
Ville Marie	850
Drummondville	1,725
Grand Mère	4,783
Verdun	11,629
Laprairie	2,388

TRAVELLING PASSENGER AGENT, INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

* Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Has the position of travelling passenger agent for the Intercolonial railway in Nova Scotia and other eastern provinces, heretofore held by D. Murray Condon, been abolished and Mr. Condon transferred to the general passenger agent's office in Moncton?
2. If so, does this leave the Intercolonial railway without any travelling passenger agent in the maritime provinces?
3. Is the Minister of Railways aware that the Canadian Pacific railway has one or more travelling passenger agents in the provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick?
4. Is it the policy of the government to vacate the maritime provinces as a field for canvassing for the westbound passenger traffic for the government system of railways, to its competing line of railway for such traffic, namely, the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No; Mr. Condon transferred to General Passenger agent's office temporarily, in meantime, because of resignation of one of the staff.
2. The work will be performed by assistant general passenger agent, Halifax, in the meantime.
3. Yes.
4. No. This work will be performed in the meantime by the assistant general passenger agent, assisted by the local agents of the railway.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. When was J. A. Beauchemin, of Granby, Quebec, appointed caretaker of the public building at that place?
2. When was he removed from office?
3. What was the date of the letter sent to him by the department ordering him to vacate the premises?
4. What time was given to him to vacate the said premises?
5. Who asked for his dismissal?
6. What was the reason for his dismissal?
7. Was any investigation held before his dismissal from office, and was the said Beauchemin present at said investigation?
8. Was the said Beauchemin advised why he was being dismissed?
9. Who recommended the appointment of his successor?
10. Is the government aware that the position was promised to the present incumbent by certain local politicians during the course of the last campaign?

Mr. MONK:

1. May 12, 1903.
2. December 31, 1911.
3. December 22, 1911.
4. From December 22nd to December 31.
5. Mr. J. Davidson.
6. Extremely offensive political partisan.
7. No.
8. No.
9. Mr. J. Davidson.
10. No.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has Mr. Henri Locas, excise officer in the town of Laurentides, been dismissed? If so, at whose request and for what reason?
2. Has an inquiry been made?
3. Who has been appointed to succeed him and who recommended his successor?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes. At request of Mr. Morin and on account of political partisanship, during last election.
2. No inquiry was made as charge was clearly established and Mr. Locas, when called upon, offered no explanation relative thereto.
3. Ovide Brien. Recommended by Mr. Morin.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has Robert Bull, of Woodstock, N.B., been dismissed from the position of preventive customs officer? If so, for what cause, and what was his salary?
2. Was a Mr. Purrington appointed in his place? If so, has he assumed the duties of the office, and at what salary?
3. Was Herbert Lindsay also appointed in his place, and has he assumed the duties of the office, and at what salary?
4. Is it the intention of the department to retain the services of both officers or only one? If so, which one?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Robert W. Bull, preventive officer of customs, Richmond road, has been dismissed for active political partisanship during the recent general elections. His salary was $550 a year.
2. Daniel H. Purrington was employed temporarily in Mr. Bull's place, at the same salary, $550 a year, but his employment was discontinued.
3. Herbert Lindsay has been employed to perform the duties formerly attended to by Mr. Bull, at a salary of $550 a year.
4. The services of Mr. Lindsay only have been retained.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has James White, of Centreville, N.B., been dismissed from the office of Indian agent?
2. If so, for what reasons, and on whose advice?
3. Has N. J. Smith, of Fredericton, N.B., been appointed in his place? If so, on whose recommendation?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. Mr. White's place of residence, Centreville, is inconveniently situated, being some distance from the reserves.
3. Yes.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has Leandre Jacques, postmaster of St. Didace, county of Maskinonge, been dismissed? If so, at whose request, and who recommended his successor?
2. Has the Postmaster General received a petition from the ratepayers of the parish interested requesting that Mr. Jacques be retained in his office?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes, on recommendation of Mr. A. Bellemare, M.P., who also recommended his successor.
2. No, but a petition was received from the residents, making serious complaint in regard to the management of the post office, and recommending a change in the postmastership.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it within the knowledge of the Minister of Railways that Theophile Thibault, sectionman on the east of St. Simon station, county of Rimouski, has been dismissed?
2. If so, has there been an inquiry and at whose request has Mr. Thibault been dismissed?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. No inquiry has been held. Mr. Theophile Thibault has asked for an investigation which will be accorded him. He was dismissed at the request of Mr. Boulay, M.P.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Mr. Calixte Lavoie, postmaster at St. Cyrille de Wendover, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason, and who requested his dismissal?
3. Who recommended his successor?
4. Has an inquiry been held?
5. Has the Postmaster General received petitions from the parishioners of St. Cyrille, asking that an inquiry be granted to Mr. Lavoie? If so, how many signatures?
6. Does the minister intend to accede to this request?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. (a) For political partisanship.
   (b) Mr. Napoleon Garceau.
3. Mr. Napoleon Garceau.
4. The facts were well known. An inquiry was not necessary.
5. (a) Yes.
   (b) 314.
6. See answer to No. 4.

FISHERIES JURISDICTION.

Mr. CLARK (Bruce):

Is it the intention of the government to open negotiations with the different provinces with the view to ending dual jurisdiction over fisheries?

Mr. BORDEN:

The matter has not engaged the attention of the government.

Mr. ROGERS.

QUEBEC INLAND REVENUE INSPECTOR.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex):

1. Has Joseph Alphonse Dumontier, been appointed inspector of Inland Revenue for the district of Quebec? If so, when?
2. Did he at the time of his appointment possess the qualification prescribed by section of the regulations relating to the government of the excise branch of the Inland Revenue Department?
3. If so, when did he acquire such qualifications?
4. If not, what were the reasons for departure from the regulations?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Joseph Alphonse Dumontier has been appointed Inspector of Inland Revenue for the district of Quebec.

Mr. Dumontier was appointed by an order in council dated the 23rd December, 1911.

2, 3, and 4. He was appointed under the provisions of section 40 of the Civil Service Act, which provides that graduates of any university in Canada shall be exempt from the Qualifying examination. As this was his first appointment he could not have qualified under section 41 of the Regulations for the governance of the Excise Branch of the Inland Revenue Department but he was appointed under the provisions of section 44 of the same regulations on the grounds of his personal fitness for said position.

KELLEY'S COVE BREAKWATER.

Mr. LAW:

1. Were tenders called for an addition to the breakwater at Kelley's Cove, Yarmouth county, NS.?
2. If so, what were the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender?
3. Is it the intention of the government to award the contract to the lowest tenderer? If so, when will work be commenced?

Mr. MONK:

1. Yes.
2. Thurston and Durkee, $7,450; D. W. B. Reid, $8,976.
3. It is not the intention to take any action on the tenders received as no vote for this work has been provided in the estimates for 1912-13. If an amount is placed in the supplementaries, a new call will be made for tenders.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PAY DAY.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

Does the government intend to pay the employees of the Intercolonial railway every fortnight instead of every three months?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The government pays the Intercolonial railway employees monthly. No other plan has been decided on.

St. PAUL L'ERMITE—REPENTIGNY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has the Postmaster General at any time publicly declared that the public interest would be served by having cancelled the contracts for carrying the mail between the station of the Canadian Northern railway and the post office at St. Paul L'Ermite and also between the post office at St. Paul L'Ermite and that of Repentigny? If so, in what respect would the public interest be served by such cancellation?

2. Is Mr. Albert Juneau the present contractor for both such contracts?

3. Were Messrs. Larose and Seguin the former contractors for these services?

4. If so, in what respect is Mr. Albert Juneau, as a contractor, superior to Messrs. Larose and Seguin, and in what way are his services more to the public interest than those of Messrs. Larose and Seguin?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. The public declarations of the Postmaster General are on record. It is for the Postmaster General to judge if the cancellation of a contract is or is not in the public interest.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. Answered by No. 1.

MOOSEJAW POST OFFICE.

Mr. KNOWLES:

1. What are the proposed post offices and the sites of same authorized to be established in the Moosejaw electoral district, to which no postmasters have yet been appointed?

2. Has Mr. R. K. Rathwell been asked to make recommendations to the Postmaster General of such postmasters, and at what date was he first so requested in each case?

Mr. PELLETIER:

Proposed name of Office.	Proposed site.				Date on which Mr. Rathwell was first consulted.
	Section.	Township.	Range.	M.	
Floyd	1	2	15	W. 3rd.	December 20, 1911.
Jonesboro	17	23	15	" "	December 20, 1911.
Maeshowe	15	12	17	" "	November 18, 1911.
Mayne	2	3	6	" "	February 1, 1912.
Niederstadt	..	11	9	" "	December 20, 1911.
Sunshine	13	3	27	" "	December 20, 1911.
Valjean	25	17	5	" "	February 1, 1912.
Bestville	14	17	21	" "	December 20, 1911.
Connaught	3	16	29	" "	November 18, 1911.
Rinde	36	15	10	" "	January 15, 1912.
Spring Lake	21	23	10	" "	December 20, 1911.
Valentine	20	19	16	" "	January 15, 1912.
Dixie	22	18	9	" "	December 20, 1911.
Mackid	27	11	27	" "	February 1, 1912.
Pinto Valley	16	7	10	" "	December 20, 1911.
The Flats	6	15	6	" "	February 1, 1912.
Ritchie	2	26	21	" "	December 20, 1911.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all letters, petitions, memorials or other documents received by the Prime Minister or any other member of the government, relating to the passage of a federal marriage law or legislation in regard to the so-called effect of the Ne Temere decree.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, complaints, charges, or other documents in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to the dismissal of Edward Kelly from the position of engineer at the Reduction Works at Canso, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, complaints or other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department, relating to the dismissal of Captain Alex. Roberts, postmaster at Canso, N.S., and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, complaints, charges or other documents in the possession of the Marine and Fisheries Department, relating to the dismissal of David S. Hendsbee from the position of weigher at the Reduction Works at Canso, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, requests, complaints, or other documents in the possession of the government, or any department thereof, relating to the dismissal of George Cavanagh from the customs service at New Glasgow, N.S.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, petitions, recommendations, complaints, charges, orders in council, or other documents in the possession or under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to the dismissal of Patrick J. Conway, lightkeeper at White Head island, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all papers, letters, documents, &c., relating to the dismissal of Hector Hamel, assistant appraiser at the Montreal custom house, and also relating to his subsequent appointment as preventive officer.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all documents, letters, telegrams, requests, reports, recommendations and correspondence, regarding the removal or dismissal of Alexander R. McAdam, fishery officer for Antigonish county, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a return showing the number and capacity of cold storage establishments in each of the principal cities of Canada; the kind and quantity, approximate value of food stuffs and produce contained in each of these establishments, during the months of November and December, 1911, and January, 1912.—Mr. Verville.

ADJOURNMENT OVER ASH WEDNESDAY.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That when this House adjourns on Tuesday next, the 20th instant it stand adjourned till Thursday 22nd.

Motion agreed to.

COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK.

Mr MONK moved that the House do tomorrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to ratify and confirm an agreement between the Collingwood Ship Building Company, Limited, and His Majesty, dated the 27th July, 1910, respecting the construction of a dry dock at the town of Collingwood, and to authorize the Governor in Council to pay an annual subsidy of three per cent per annum for twenty years upon the sum of $306,965.18, being the cost of construction of the said dry dock.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is this subsidy paid according to the Dry Dock Subsidies Act?

Mr MONK. It is paid according to the Dry Dock Subsidies Act of 1910, and it is necessary to have the concurrence of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE BILL.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 60), an Act to amend the Civil Service Act.

On section 39.—Salaries of Private Secretaries,

Mr. BORDEN. When this clause was under consideration before, I moved that subsections 2, 3 and 4 be struck out for the reasons which I then stated. It was then suggested that I had better give the matter a little further consideration. I have given the subject further consideration, but have not changed my conclusion with regard to it. I therefore beg to move that subsections, 2, 3 and 4 be struck out.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). On what ground?

Mr. BORDEN. The ground is this: The granting of an allowance, or an increase of salary, up to $600 to a person who has been appointed private secretary while in one sense perhaps not undesirable, inasmuch as it would merely restore the secretary to the emolument which he might have at the time when he retires from the service of his minister as private secretary, nevertheless might entail some difficulty and some possible injustice by putting such an official over the heads of a great many persons who had been in the Civil Service a long time, and who would feel that they were not receiving quite the consideration to which they were entitled if that were done. It may be that some other arrangement may be devised for dealing with the matter in a way that would do no possible injustice. I have not, within the limited time at my disposal for consideration of the matter, been able to arrive at any conclusion which I regard as quite satisfactory. For that reason I move that these subsections be struck out.

Mr. OLIVER. I was not present when the Bill was first discussed, and if the Premier would not object I would be very glad if he would give in a few words the effect of that part of the section which remains.

Mr. BORDEN. Perhaps I had better explain what the present law is. Section 39 of the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1908 provided that any person chosen by a minister to be his private secretary might, without examination and irrespective of age be appointed a clerk for a period not exceeding one year in subdivision B of the second division, and that after one year's service as such secretary he should be permanently appointed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What was the salary attached?

Mr. BORDEN. He would have to be appointed under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and the salary, not under the new provision that I have referred to, but the old one, would be $800 and he would have an additional allowance of $600 as secretary. It was not found possible in some cases to obtain the services of a competent man to fill the position of of private secretary at that figure.

Mr. OLIVER. At $1400?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, and therefore we are asking for authority to appoint to subdivision B of the second division, or subdivision A of the same division, or to subdivision B of the first division.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But the secretaries will still get the allowance.

Mr. BORDEN. They will.

Mr. OLIVER. They are to go into a division higher than the present Civil Service Act permits.

Mr. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. And they get the same extra consideration as secretaries ?

Mr. BORDEN. Quite so.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the private secretaries who have served under the last administration be affected by this ? Section 2 provides for the Act coming into force on the 10th of October, 1912. What is the effect of that clause ?

Mr. BORDEN. The effect is that men who are selected as private secretaries to ministers may as of that date be appointed to the positions provided for in this Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Were the secretaries who served under the old government to be affected by this? Is there not precedent for giving those who remain in the Civil Service compensation for the $600 a year that they lose?

Mr. BORDEN. No, there is no provision under this statute different in that respect from that which was originally provided.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was it not the intention of the right hon. gentleman to do that?

Mr. BORDEN. No, that had not occurred to me; for I had understood that the secretaries of ministers of the late administration had been provided for, except in one case which was brought to my attention, and as to which I undertook to make some provision. I was not aware there was really any difficulty. Of course, the whole subject is, perhaps, not a very easy one to deal with, because of the effect of the legislation which was passed in 1908. I do not know that I have any suggestion to offer other than that embodied in this legislation, but it is clear that it does bring about an inconvenient result. This legislation may have to be changed at another session. The inconvenience is this: A gentleman is appointed as private secretary to a minister. In some cases at least he does not discharge any duties except those incident to his private secretaryship, and the administration of the department is provided for altogether outside of his services. His minister goes out of office and the private secretary remains in the Civil Service. Under the provisions of the Act of 1908, and under the provisions of this amending Act, he is left for the time being without any special duties to perform. And so matters remain until the department can so organize as to make his services available to the country. That is the difficulty which was pointed out to me, and it undoubtedly exists. But it exists no more under this amending Act than under the Act of 1908.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is hardly fair to deal with the private secretary by ignoring the fact that he has a special case. If a member of the civil service has acted as private secretary to a minister, of course he has received extra consideration. If the minister goes out the private secretary reverts to the salary which he had before he became private secretary. I think that the man who has acted as private secretary to a minister and has been able to fulfil the duties—the somewhat onerous duties—of that position, has thereby acquired an experience and a knowledge that is valuable. Also he has proven himself a man of such capacity as to entitle him to at any rate more consideration than to merely put him back where he was at the beginning of his term of office as private secretary, perhaps four or five years before. While I am aware that that is the position under the law, I understood that the purpose of this Bill was to recognize in some measure the idea I have taken the liberty of placing before the committee. As I said, I shall be very sorry if the Bill is not put in such a form as to give the private secretary some consideration. I do not ask that when he drops the very onerous duties of private secretary he should receive absolutely the same salary as he had while he was discharging those duties, but I think it is entirely unfair, and not in the reasonable interest of the public service, that the man who has occupied that position and who has acquired an experience which should be of value should, on a change of government, revert to the position he occupied before he was chosen for the position of private secretary. I would ask the Prime Minister to give some further consideration to that side of the case, unless he has already considered it and has absolutely made up his mind.

Mr. BORDEN. I have considered that. Those gentlemen who leave their positions as private secretary, in some cases at least at the present time, are left almost entirely without any duties to perform. We have no disposition whatever to deal otherwise than fairly with them, but we have to take into consideration the circumstance that it is very difficult, if not impossible, in

some of the departments at least, to make any effective utilization of their services. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) says that they revert to the position which they held at first. That, perhaps, is not an absolutely correct way of stating it, because they have received each year a certain increment in their annual salaries under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. True, they do lose at the moment, the sum of $600 a year, to which they were entitled, by virtue of being private secretaries. But we cannot very well deal with that without taking into our regard other considerations which I mentioned a moment ago, and which were brought to my attention by some members of the civil service. I am placing all private secretaries exactly on the same basis, so far as that is concerned. The provisions embodied in this Bill particularly under subsections 2, 3 and 4, had regard to the men who are being appointed now, and I am striking them out. But I am prepared at some later date—for I have not had sufficient time to consider the subject thoroughly—to take up the question of dealing not only with these but also with the men who went out of office as private secretaries, when the government resigned, but who are still members of the civil service. But I do not think it would be possible for me, purely for lack of time, to deal with that matter this session. So far as the secretaries of ministers of the late administration are concerned, the case of only one of them has been brought to my attention, and he is to be provided for in a way that I hope, will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does the right hon. gentleman allude to the secretary of the right hon. the leader of the opposition?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes. I have taken the matter up with the leader of the opposition, and I think it can be settled in a way that will be satisfactory to him and to the gentleman who is concerned.

On the Preamble.

Mr. BORDEN. With respect to one department of the government, a point was brought to our attention within a day or two, and it may be provided for in an amendment to the Bill. For the present, I will let the Bill stand in committee for that purpose, if you, Mr. Chairman, have no objection.

Progress reported.

THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. BORDEN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 104) to amend the Civil Service Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill is expressed on its face. At the present time there are two Civil Service Commissioners. Inconvenience has been found to arise in more than one instance by reason of the members of the commission being equally divided, in which case no action can be taken. For that reason it has been thought desirable to introduce this Bill to enable the government to appoint another commissioner. There is another reason which I mentioned on the introduction of the Bill. It is hoped that the provision of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, will be extended in the early future to some portions, at least, of the outside service. The leader of the opposition, who was present when I introduced the Bill, alluded to some positions in the outside service, such as postmasters in cities, to which he thought the Act might be extended almost at once. Inasmuch, however, as we do not know how soon this can be accomplished, or how soon the services of another commissioner may be required for that purpose, it has been thought best to introduce a provision in section 2 of the Bill that it shall not come into force until proclamation by the Governor General in Council.

Mr. KYTE. Is it the intention of the Bill to make appointments to the outside service subject to competitive examination?

Mr. BORDEN. I have said that it is the desire and intention of the government to extend as rapidly as possible, to some parts of the outside service at least, the provisions of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908. How rapidly that can be done, what progress can be made in putting it into effect, I cannot say, for the reason that we have not been able, owing to the very numerous matters pressing upon our attention during this session, to give much consideration to it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It can be done by order in council.

Mr. BORDEN. It can be done by order in council; but we must have regard to some other considerations. I imagine that there would have to be some departmental inquiry necessary in every case to enable the government to form a just conclusion as to how far the provisions of the Civil Service Amendment Act could be brought into operation in any particular department.

Mr. OLIVER. What position will the new appointee take? Is he to be chairman?

Mr. BORDEN. We have not given any consideration to that at all. We merely provide that there shall be three commissioners instead of two, and that one of them shall be chairman.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the salary?

Mr. BORDEN. The same as before, no change.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does the chairman receive a larger salary than the other members?

Mr. BORDEN. It is not so provided in this Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. At present the salaries of the two commissioners are the same?

Mr. BORDEN. Exactly the same. They have the rank and salary of a deputy minister.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the chairman be designated by order in council?

Mr. BORDEN. The Governor in Council may appoint one of the members of the commission to be its chairman.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is there not some general statute which provides that deputy ministers are only removable by joint address of the Senate and House of Commons?

Mr. BORDEN. I am not quite sure. If I remember correctly, that is provided either in the statute creating the department or by some general provision, such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

On section 2,

Mr. LEMIEUX. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman will not object to reporting progress. I understood the other day that the leader of the opposition had something to say. I suppose he may say it on the third reading?

Mr. BORDEN. Just as my hon. friend prefers.

Progress reported.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.—RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. PELLETIER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 105) to amend the Post Office Act. He said: This Bill is to provide for an improvement in the railway mail clerk service, which is not at present in a satisfactory position. The railway mail clerks now receive a salary of $500 a year on appointment. We have to get them from the outside, and we have a good deal of difficulty in getting good men for the reason that they are not paid as they ought to be. This Bill provides for several cases, which I will briefly explain to the House.

The first clause provides that any person may be employed temporarily as a railway mail clerk for a period of not more than one year at a salary of $500 a year and mileage allowance. The present law provides for the temporary employment of clerks for a period of only six months. We extend that period to one year. This gives the clerks two chances instead of one of passing their examination. When we find some of these men to be good employees, understanding their work, we do not want them to go and take other places. We are allowing them mileage allowance and I am sure that the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), will agree with me that this is a wise provision. We cannot expect railway mail clerks to do good work at $500 a year at the present cost of living. Permanent clerks receive a certain mileage, and these men who are in the service of the department are doing the same work, but they are not now given any mileage allowance. It is hoped that the granting of the mileage allowance will help to retain these men in the service. The experience of the department is that if we do not take better care of our employees we are simply training boys who, when they know something about the service, leave the department to take other situations and we thereby lose some of our most promising employees. We intend to try to keep these men in our employ by paying them decent salaries.

The second clause is one which will appeal to the House. A great number of temporary mail clerks have not passed the examination. The law says that they must pass the examination in order to be appointed permanently. I do not want to reflect on the Civil Service Commissioners, but I will frankly say that I could not pass their examinations nor could many gentlemen in this House. For this very inferior position, and this small salary, men are expected to answer questions which a young man fresh from college might be able to answer, but which a grown up man would be unable to answer. The ex-Postmaster General and myself have been obliged to take men who have not passed the examination, but who are just as good as if they had; they know their business, they do it well, but under the present law we are obliged to send them away. I ask the authority of the House to appoint these men permanently if their services have been satisfactory, and if they are recommended by the superintendent and the controller of the Railway Mail Service. They will have to pass only the preliminary examination, and I have no hesitation in saying that the passing of that examination is a sufficient qualification for the position of railway mail clerk. If they pass that examination they will go up, step by step, to $1,000. They will stop there if they do not pass the full examination. I felt disposed to be even more lenient, but I suppose progress has to be

made little by little, and I think this will appeal to the House as being a just and fair measure, both to these railway mail clerks, who have a great deal of heavy work to do, and to the public service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I quite agree with the general lines of this Bill and I concur in the remarks just made. The cost of living is increasing immensely. I remember, although I am not very old myself, that some years ago, a man could bring up a family on a salary of $1,000 a year, but now-a-days it is practically impossible to do so, living in a modest way. The railway mail clerks are most excellent officers of His Majesty's service, and as I have told the House on many occasions, they have to incur risks in the discharge of their duties, which other civil servants do not incur. They are obliged to travel at all times of the year, during the heat of the summer and the cold of the winter. They have to take out insurance policies for the protection of their families, and they have to contend with difficulties not experienced by other members of the civil service. Will the clause providing for the raising of the salaries of railway mail clerks up to $1,000 if they pass the preliminary examination apply to any railway mail clerk who is in the service at present regardless of the number of years of his service?

Mr. PELLETIER. I will treat them well.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Having said so much about what is being done in favour of the railway mail clerks, I wish to emphasize once more before this House, the urgent necessity of extending the provisions of the Civil Service Act to the outside service. It would save my hon. friend or any minister of the Crown much time and worry, if there was one general law applied to civil servants, whether they are in the inside or in the outside service.

When I was in the government, I advocated it, speaking for myself only, but there were some who did not believe that this reform should be accomplished then. However, a bold step must be taken some time, and it is time to take it now. The life of a minister is not worth living if, whenever he moves from Ottawa to Montreal or Quebec, he is to be constantly surrounded by a crowd of office seekers, as I understand my hon. friend the Postmaster General is and as I was when I was Postmaster General. Would it not be better to have the same principle of competitive examination for the outside service as we have now for the inside service? My hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) was not here before the days of the new Civil Service Act, and I can assure him that he is living in Paradise now, because he will never have so many visitors looking for employment as we had before that Act was passed.

Mr. PELLETIER. Did my hon. friend receive more visitors than we do now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, yes, we were stormed with visitors and letters. That legislation introduced by Mr. Fisher with respect to the inside service afforded a cure for many evils and gave the ministers of the Crown some little time to devote their energies to the business of the country. Under the present Civil Service Law we get a good class of civil servants; the law is known to the people, the minister is bound by it, and his answer to applicants is that he must obey the law. Why not extend this principle of competitive examination to the outside service? What difference is there between an official of the Post Office Department and an official in the post office at Ottawa, or at Montreal, or in the other cities? They both deal with the same matters, they have to perform practically the same duties; in fact I would say that the postmasters in Montreal and Ottawa must have perhaps more ability than some departmental officials. I can assure my hon. friend that when he proposes to put the outside officials under the Civil Service Act—and judging by the remarks of the Prime Minister to-day the government is contemplating that—it will meet with favour from this side of the House. Let there be one law for the inside and outside service alike, and thus the ministers will have more time to work for the country, and they will have to give less time to working for the office seeker.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). How many temporary clerks will come under this, and how much mileage per day would be represented?

Mr. PELLETIER. The mileage will amount to $250 or $300 a year each. I will get the information later as to the number of miles.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (North York). I wish to say a word or two with regard to the railway mail service of this Dominion, and, by way of explanation, I may be frank enough to tell the House that I spent four or five years of my life in that service. I am pleased to know that the Postmaster General realizes the importance of that branch of the department under his charge; I am pleased to know that he realizes that he has good and efficient servants in that branch, and I am pleased to know that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has been able to testify from past experience that the railway mail clerks were faithful and efficient officers during the time he was in charge of the department. I would like to refer now to a Bill affecting the railway mail clerks in-

troduced when the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) was Postmaster General, and I do so for the purpose of making a plea for the railway mail clerks and for that reason alone. In my humble judgment the railway mail service has been sadly neglected in the past and the following quotation from the Bill I refer to will, I think show that:

3. Paragraph (a) of section 32 of the said Act is repealed, and in lieu thereof it is enacted that a railway mail clerk shall be appointed on probation for a period of at least one year, at a salary at the rate of five hundred dollars a year, with an additional allowance or mileage, and on the confirmation of his appointment he may be paid at the rate of six hundred dollars a year, and mileage, with annual increases of one hundred dollars up to eight hundred dollars, and an increase of fifty dollars a year thereafter until the maximum of one thousand four hundred dollars is reached.

Now, I want to point out the injustice of that Bill. Whom does it affect? It affected primarily only the men who had been appointed by the late administration, because it will be noticed that the men who had just been a short time in the service received one hundred dollars a year increase instead of fifty dollars a year, and in the second place it affected that class of men who had been in the service practically for a lifetime and who had already reached the maximum salary of twelve hundred. Thus the great backbone of the service the men not included in those two classes received no immediate benefit whatever from that legislation. The men receiving over eight hundred dollars a year and under twelve hundred received no benefit, because their increase went along at the rate of fifty dollars a year as formerly. I cannot conceive by what process of reasoning any man could decree that a clerk shall receive one hundred dollars a year increase the first year he is in the service when he knows nothing about it whatever, and that after he had been three years in the service and learned the business from start to finish, that that increase should be dropped to fifty dollars a year. That is one phase of the question I cannot understand. I would appeal to the Postmaster General to, if he possibly can see his way clear, right the wrong that was done by this legislation, and a great wrong it is. There is another phase of the question to which I would direct attention. There has been a tendency in past years to place the railway mail service in a lower grade than other post office officials in the outside service. I want to tell the House that the railway mail clerk takes second place to no class of post office employees. There is not a branch of the department in which the men have to work harder or in which more experience is required. Further, it was the first branch of the post office service in which the employees were forced to go through a very strict examination on the duties of office in order to get their annual increase. Until a few years ago the railway mail service was the only service in which the employees had to undergo a yearly examination and take ninety per cent before they were pronounced entitled to their fifty dollars a year increase. I mention these facts in the hope that the Postmaster General will, when the case is fairly and squarely presented, take steps to right the injustice that has been done the railway mail clerks who are, I would say, possibly the most faithful officials in his department. It has been claimed that a railway mail clerk received a salary of fourteen hundred dollars a year and mileage, but when you come to consider the question of salary the mileage should not be taken into account because the mileage is paid only by way of compensation for the extra risk, and the unnatural conditions under which he has to discharge his duties.

I would like to remind the hon. the Postmaster General that only three or four days ago three of his men went down in a wreck in the Toronto division; and I could mention many such cases in that branch of the service. Men go out three or four times a week taking their lives in their hands. Surely these men are entitled to more consideration than men who work in offices. I hope the case of the railway mail clerks of this Dominion will be looked into thoroughly, and that they will receive the justice they deserve; and I am satisfied that they will receive it at the hands of one of the most just and reasonable Postmaster Generals that I think this country ever had.

Mr. NESBITT. I see that a clerk, no matter how long he has served, cannot get over $1,000 without passing a qualifying examination. Is that a special examination for railway mail clerks?

Mr. PELLETIER. No. The railway mail clerk is practically a stamper and sorter. He has to pass what is called a case examination and the annual office examination required by the Civil Service Commission. The limit of $1,000 is for the men who have passed the preliminary examination, to distinguish them from those who have passed both examinations, and whose salary does not stop at $1,000.

Mr. NESBITT. Is the qualifying examination an examination within the department?

Mr. PELLETIER. No, by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. NESBITT. Especially for the railway mail clerks?

Mr. PELLETIER. Of course.

Mr. NESBITT. The reason I ask is that a man who has had experience might not be able to pass the civil service examination, and still be a very well qualified railway mail clerk. If it is an examination into his special qualifications for his work, it is all right; otherwise, I do not think it is.

Mr. PELLETIER. I may say to my hon. friend that I fully expect before long to go further than this Bill is going. While it is very satisfactory to find that this Bill is so well received by both sides of the House, it does not go as far as I would have liked it to go. But we have to make progress little by little. Railway mail clerks are very good men, and I am happy to see that one who started his career as a railway mail clerk, is now a member of the House of Commons, and one of the best. With regard to the qualifying examination, if it is kept on the lines on which it exists now, and we extend the Civil Service Act to the outside service, it will be very difficult for the Postmaster General to find employees. The preliminary examination is all right, but I think the qualifying examination is too severe. It should be such as a certain number of people will be able to pass. Now we are obliged to go outside of the Civil Service Commission to get employees, because they have none to give us.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You mean for the outside service?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes.

Mr LEMIEUX. You are obliged to violate the law.

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes, we overstep the law all the time.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1, salaries of clerks,

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). As I understand the law at present, the railway mail clerks are required to pass the civil service examination, but the department has been in the habit of employing temporarily, persons who have not passed the examinations, upon the understanding that they might suffer dismissal if the examination were not passed within a year, and now the minister proposes to take statutory authority for appointing temporarily those who have not passed the examination.

Mr. PELLETIER. It is now done by overstepping the law, and I want the authority of the law to do it.

Mr. MACDONALD. The explanation of the minister clears up a point about which I had some doubt, as a matter of departmental practice. I had assumed that there was some statutory authority under which mail clerks were employed temporarily. I understand the minister to say that is not so, and this Bill will, for the first time, create such an authority. It is therefore, only confirming a practice which has been in existence in the past.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are now employed as labourers.

Mr. MACDONALD. I quite agree as to the desirability of the legislation in that regard. It has always seemed to me to be a hardship that where you have perfectly competent young men who have passed the preliminary Civil Service examination and who perform their duties—onerous and responsible as they are—very efficiently that they should be prevented from becoming permanent officers because of having to pass a qualifying examination. That examination, as the Minister says, has undoubtedly been too severe and in my view the Civil Service commissioners or those who prepare these examination papers, with all due deference to them, do not apprehend what ought to be the qualifications of those who offer themselves as candidates. That erudition, or knowledge of technical subjects, such as one acquires at school is not going to make a man who passes the preliminary examination for railway mail clerk any more qualified to perform his duties; and the fact that he is not in a position to pass this purely technical qualifying examination ought not to debar him from permanency of employment. In that connection I am aware of a great many cases of hardship which have occurred within the past few years, and I think that the Minister should have some discretionary power. The evil will not be removed if the position of these men, who were admitted to the service temporarily, is confirmed and the hindrances to them getting increases under the Act, which I have mentioned as being a difficulty in the way, is not also removed. I quite agree with the ex-Postmaster General in the proposition that there should be an extension of the civil service reform generally to the outside service. In a great many branches of the outside service, if there were proper examinations, greater efficiency would be secured, and the evils of patronage would be removed to a very great degree. We are all I assume—although there has been a lot of talk about the matter, and we are making but very slight progress towards attaining the desired end—in favour of causing the civil service to so improve as in some degree to approach the high status the civil service occupies in the mother country. I suppose patronage is an alluring thing to hon. gentlemen opposite, who have been without that privilege for so long, but they will find it becomes a very great burden after a while; and I think we ought to reach the stage in this country

when both parties can unite in a reasonable and sensible proposition of civil service reform for the outside service. That is a general proposition which is not rightly before us perhaps at this time, but it is a deduction from what I was anxious to see done with regard to the aptness and the sensible character of the qualifying examination, because some of the papers submitted to men who occupied temporary positions in the railway mail service and who desired to be made permanent, on presenting themselves for examination, have been shown to me, and as a means calculated to test their fitness or capacity for their duties were in my opinion absolutely ridiculous. It would appear impossible that educated people responsible for the civil service of this country would set papers of the kind, and there certainly requires to be a remedy in that respect both as regards the inside and outside service, if civil service reform is going to apply. Men who have been temporarily employed and are reasonably efficient in the discharge of their duties should not be debarred from promotion by failure to pass a technical examination. Provided you get integrity and general capacity on the part of the candidate the examination should take regard of a knowledge of the details of the particular service and the responsibility of the party affected. The possession of the necessary degree of intelligence can be very readily ascertained without exceptional educational test. At the first blush the Bill would seem to propose that one should be a graduate of the Military College, or of some university of Canada, but that is of course only an alternative qualifying position and would really dispense with the necessity of a graduate of either of these institutions having to go up for examination again. I hope that the minister, acting in conjunction with his colleagues, will see that a qualifying examination of a practical character is established, and the present examinations done away with, so that we may have a practical and sensible test of the qualifications of those who seek to enter the service.

Mr. PELLETIER. As I stated a moment ago, I would not have allowed the provision for a qualifying examination to remain at all, if I did not expect that this question will be dealt with before long, and that provision will be made for an examination calculated to demonstrate the fitness of candidates for positions they seek to fill and the work they are expected to perform. It seems to me that is the whole question in a nutshell.

Mr. NESBITT. That is the idea.

Mr. PELLETIER. Why put questions about irrelevant matters to a man who is going to sort letters or to become a railway mail clerk? I am strongly of opinion that the preliminary examination is all that is necessary to test the capacity of a man seeking to become a railway mail clerk. We must not advance too rapidly along the path of progress; this is the first instalment. I shall come with other instalments if the present law affecting all the departments is not amended. I shall take care of my own railway mail clerks and my own employees in such a way that they will be able to perform their duties efficiently, and that ridiculous questions shall not be put to them. As far as railway mail clerks are concerned if, having had the opportunity of taking two examinations in one year, they are not able to pass one such examination, they are not qualified to be railway mail clerks, because that examination is not a difficult one, but it proves whether they have the requisite knowledge to fill the office.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I hope the minister does not contemplate the abolishing all tests of educational accomplishments. I do not think you could fairly restrict the examination to what are the routine and practical duties of the railway mail clerk. There must be some educational standard that a man must reach before he can be appointed.

Mr. PELLETIER. There is no question about that.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I agree with the minister that in the past the papers set for candidates entering this particular branch of the service have been unduly severe. At the same time I trust he will maintain an educational standard of some kind.

Mr. PELLETIER. Certainly. What I meant was that the examination to be undergone should bear some relation to the work which the candidate has to perform. Of course the educational attainments must bear some relation to the work. However, it is not necessary for a sorter or stamper in the post office to possess the same degree of education as a man whose duties would require him to engage in correspondence and write letters in proper language. There should be some sort of a sliding scale by which the examinations will be based on the importance of the work the man is going to do. That will be one of the difficulties in extending the control of the Civil Service Commission to the outside service. A proper sense of proportion must be maintained in order to make the idea practicable, but I hope that we will be able to realize the object which the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and I think everybody in this House, has in view.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no question but that some years ago people were quite

satisfied with small salaries in these positions. But to-day, at least so far as this department is concerned, employees are required to pass an examination before promotion.

I quite agree with the Postmaster General that the standard of educational test should be reduced. What is the use of asking a young man who seeks to enter the railway mail service, questions on the history of Greece or Rome, questions involving knowledge of Greek or Latin? I see it stated here, for instance, that those who pass the examinations of the Royal Military College or of any university in Canada are accepted without examination. But such men are of too high a standard to seek entrance to the railway mail service. It is not that I wish to minimize the status of the railway mail clerk, but we must recognize facts. The man who acts as railway mail clerk between Montreal and Quebec, for instance, needs to be a good stamper and sorter, he needs to know the geography and topography of this section of the country, and of the country generally; it would be an advantage if he knows both languages, and he must read and write well. But the test of the university examination is too high for this position. If the Postmaster General wishes to find enough of the right men for this service he will have to lower the standard of the examination. At present he is obliged to violate the law—to overstep it, as he says—because men who can qualify under the present standard of examinations will not accept a position of $500 a year. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Armstrong), raises objection to the legislation I introduced last year providing for an increase of $100 a year for mail clerks until they reach $800, and $50 a year after that until they reach $1,200. Well, Mr. Chairman, any employer of labour will find that it is when the young employee is on the lower rungs of the ladder that he needs help. Men enter this service usually at the age of twenty or twenty one, or it may be twenty-five or even thirty. Most of them are not married. Well, at twenty-five, it is about time a man should think of being married. And so it is in these earlier years of his service that he needs help, and I think this increase of $100 until $800 is reached is quite reasonable. I do not object, in view of the high cost of living, to an increase of $100 until he reaches $1,200? What I say is that it is at the beginning of his career that he must be helped. It is to be noted also that he does not receive the $100 increase unless he passes certain examinations every year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). What kind of examinations?

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are called case examinations. Every year an inspector goes through the various offices and cars and subjects the railway mail clerks to examination in order to see that they are well trained, and that they maintain their efficiency. But I quite agree with the Postmaster General, and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr .Macdonald) that the educational test for the railway mail clerk is too high. Why, with all due respect to the railway mail clerks, who are good officials and good men—we have heard in this House to-day the maiden speech of a gentleman who tells us that he began life as a railway mail clerk, an excellent speech, indicating that the hon. gentleman will be quite an addition to this House, but I am sure that he will also admit what I say—it is lowering the standard of university and Royal Military College examinations to say that one who has passed those examinations may be admitted to the service.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Are the examinations which these men must pass the qualifying or the preliminary?

Mr. PELLETIER. Both. That is what I would call the absurdity of the present law. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) knows that we cannot keep up our staff of railway mail clerks strictly under the law. We have to take them on here and there under any name, 'labourers' for instance. Once we have engaged them, we take them into the service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In my time railway mail clerks west of Lake Superior were entitled to an additional fifteen per cent on their salaries as a special allowance, because of the greater cost of living in the west. I suppose that is being maintained under this legislation?

Mr. PELLETIER. All through this legislation, we have to take care of the extra cost of living in the west, which is admitted on all hands.

Mr. SHEPHERD. Is a knowledge of French necessary to qualify a railway mail clerk in the west?

Mr. PELLETIER. If we exacted that in all cases, we could not find employees. We have to strain a point; we have to be liberal. In principle it is all right, but in practice, we have to do the best we can. In the west we have great difficulty in finding people to enter the service. In the east, on the contrary, men are anxious to enter. We must constantly send people from the east to the west to maintain our staff there. The cost of living in the west, as is well known, is very high; also the people there seem to make more money than they do here—in spite of the many

complaints we hear in the House about losses suffered, everybody seems to be prosperous in the west. I hope that this Bill will enable us to find in the west men who are to work in the west.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is quite right when he says that the Postmaster General is not obliged to demand of a candidate that he shall be qualified in both languages. Of course, it is of great advantage to a man to have both languages. But the examinations, by law and the constitution of the country, may be passed in either language. If a candidate goes before the Civil Service Commission for the inside service, he may pass the examination in either French or English. But in this country no man has the same chance of succeeding, unless he speaks, writes and understands both languages. I cannot repeat too often to my English-speaking friends—and I say it with all candour—that the young French Canadian who speaks, writes and understands English as well as French, has two or three chances to one as against his young English-speaking competitor who has command of only one language. Besides in travelling all over the world my hon. friend will find that it is very important to know French.

Mr. NESBITT. I was going to object to that clause making an exception of the Royal Military College and universities, only that the Postmaster General says he is going to look into the question. The people in Ontario think that anybody who has passed through the military college and the universities is good enough for any place in the gift of this government, and surely their certificates are quite good enough to qualify a student for almost any business position in this country.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). I think the minister should, at an early date, revise this whole system of examination. So much has been said as to what are the real duties of railway mail clerks, that one need not go over it again. At present the Civil Service Commission, under the head of 'History,' puts such questions as these to applicants:

What do we owe to the following:—Magna Charta, Habeas Corpus, Wilberforce, and Florence Nightingale—

Who was Jeanne Darc (Joan of Arc)?

What was the Reign of Terror in France? What brought it about? Name the leading men who figured in it.

Sketch the career of William Lyon Mackenzie in the rebellion of 1837.

Fancy asking a young man going into the railway mail service such questions as these. If they were asked something about the career of William Lyon Mackenzie King, it might have been reasonable. Then here is another lot:

Give the plural of poet-laureate, crisis, madam, sheep and buffalo.

What I think should be required of a mail clerk is that he should be a fairly good writer, be able to do easy sums in arithmetic, and particularly be conversant with the geography of this country, of all the provinces in the Dominion; and to have more than a superficial knowledge of the geography of the United States. So far as European countries are concerned, the mail matter as a rule will go over direct to London, and there be sorted out. I hope the minister will cut out these examinations.

On subsection 6,

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the meaning of that word 'university'? Will that cover our classical colleges?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think in Quebec there are 17 or 18 classical colleges affiliated to Laval University, and students who have completed their full course receive degrees, some the degree of Master of Arts, and others the degree of Bachelor of Arts. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if the word 'university' will include such colleges?

Mr. PELLETIER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the minister what is the regulation by which the mileage apportioned to railway mail clerks is governed, that is, is there any uniformity in the mileage? There are perhaps five or six hundred clerks, and there must be great difference in the length of the routes. Is there any attempt at uniformity in the length of the routes, and the number of miles which each clerk has to travel? Otherwise, I can see that there might be some injustice in the payment of mileage. For instance, a man starting from Halifax and running to Montreal, would have a very long mileage; and I understand it is the same clerk or the same set of clerks who run up to Montreal, and turn to come back the next day. They would have a very long mileage, and consequently a very large pay; whereas a clerk running out of Halifax to Yarmouth, for instance, would have a short run, and short pay. Then again, the run from Halifax to Sydney is comparatively short, as compared with that from Halifax to Montreal. Is there some way by which the clerks are shifted about so that they may be treated with equality in the length of their runs and in the consequent amount of their payment? There are complaints in the service on this ground, possibly they have not reached the ears of the minister—complaints against superintendents, because—I would not like to say it—they put their

favourites on good routes, and men who are not their favourites, on poor routes. I would like to see this work put on some basis, put under some independent supervision, so that all mail clerks should be treated on a par, so far as mileage and payment is concerned.

Mr. PELLETIER. I think the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) is quite right. I may say that I have not, during the short time I have been at the head of the department, heard of any complaints in that respect. The hon. gentleman says there are complaints; if so, they have not reached the head of the department. If any complaints come to my knowledge, they shall be dealt with in such a manner that all shall be treated fairly and justly. Of course the department has to trust the railway mail superintendents, they are supposed to give each man a fair share of the mileage. I may say—so that it may go down on 'Hansard'—that it will be the aim of the department to treat all the railway mail clerks justly and fairly, so that each member of the staff shall receive a fair proportion of the mileage, and of the payment therefor. If any complaints are made to the head of the department they shall be heard. As a rule, I understand that the railway mail superintendents are doing this business in a fair manner. Of course there may be some difficulty in respect to long distances as compared with shorter runs. For instance, between Montreal and Ottawa, a railway mail clerk may travel as far as Vankleek Hill, and then double back to Montreal, and be with his family the same evening. Such arrangements exist in a certain number of cases. Others would prefer to go all the way from Montreal to Ottawa or vice versa. I understand that as far as is consistent with the interests of the service, the wishes of the clerks are taken into consideration by the superintendent. If complaints of the kind referred to reach me, I shall see that justice is done.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). The inside service at Ottawa stands on a different basis from the railway mail clerks. Railway mail clerks are, of necessity, all males, while in the inside service in Ottawa a lot of young women are employed. It is all very well to go wild on civil service examinations, but there must be limits. Whoever heard of a large steamship company with a line of ocean steamers asking for a competitive examination before appointing a captain? They select men according to their fitness. I know of no reason why a young man passing the ordinary preliminary examination, and in accord with the government of the day should not have preference in appointment. It is all very well for the hon. members for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), those twin darlings of buncombe on all occasions, who stand up and claim entrance to the service for Grit and Tory alike. They have been singularly quiet on that subject for the last 15 years. It may be that they are now fatigued by their efforts, and worn out by the work they have done for their friends, they now want them to be admitted to office by competitive examination. I want to place myself on record as being opposed to the appointment by the commission of railway mail clerks.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have not only advocated equality in the appointment of civil servants, but we introduced legislation to provide for it and in the inside service all parties have an equal chance, irrespective of politics. I ask my hon. friend if he does not think that in this way you secure a better service than by making selections from one party only. Is he of opinion that, after all, the appointment of a man in the outside service, a customs officer, or an excise man, or a letter carrier is of great political assistance to a member? There is an old adage in our province that when you appoint a man he becomes ungrateful, and you make 99 other people dissatisfied. Let it be under one commission, and let applications come from all parts and all sections of the community. Let the civil service be a national institution, not an institution in the hands of one party; let it be for the whole country.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do I understand that this amendment gives a minister power to make permanent those temporary clerks now in the service no matter what their age may be?

Mr. PELLETIER. Irrespective of age, the age limit is struck out, I think it is ridiculous.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is the rumour true which I heard in Montreal, that the old railway mail clerks who have attained the maximum of their salary, and are entitled to their superannuation, will get a superannuation equal to their salary?

Mr. PELLETIER. I have never considered this question at all, it has never been presented to me.

Bill reported, read a third time and passed.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 76) to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act—Mr. Cochrane.

Mr. KYTE. When this Bill was under consideration on Thursday there was some

criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to the cost of the railway, and they insinuated that it was owing to improper wastefulness and want of capacity on the part of the commissioners that it was costing so large an amount. The statement presented by the Minister of Railways shows that the total amount chargeable to capital account is $187,781,128. That is the total amount which will be chargeable when the road is completed. Of that amount the total liability of the government is the interest on the actual expenditure of $187,781,128 for 7 years, which comes to $39,434,031. Then there is an estimate for betterments to the road during the 7 years it is operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific without interest of $7,884,840, and the interest on this is estimated at $900,000, making a total of $48,218,871. I am not quite sure how the Minister of Railways and Canals comes to place the amount to be thus spent for betterments, but I presume that he has some reason for doing so. I should think that amount of betterments, $7,884,840, ought to be charged to capital account as is the case with other railways, or, if it is intended as the loss on the operation for seven years it should be charged to the government.

Mr. COCHRANE. Under the agreement the betterment must be made by the government for fifty years.

Mr. KYTE. With that explanation I repeat that the total amount of liability imposed upon the government in respect to the construction of the present Transcontinental railway will be $48,218,871. That is of course assuming that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will continue to operate the road after the period of seven years and pay the interest they are obliged to pay under the agreement. The statement made by the Minister of Railways included a charge for interest for the first three years after the road is taken over by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and assuming that there is not sufficient earned by the road during these three years to pay this interest, it would be chargeable to capital account, it, therefore, cannot fairly be stated that that would increase the liability of the government in respect to the expenses of building the railway. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) stated that figuring on the statement submitted to the committee by the Minister of Railways, $60,000,000 interest is going to be paid out by the country in connection with the road, instead of the $13,000,000 which we were told would be the cost by the then Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his Finance Minister, Mr. Fielding. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) then estimates that the total liability for interest of the country in respect to the construction of this railway will be $60,000,000, and I venture to say that there is no hon. gentleman who will be disposed to believe that the hon. member (Mr. Ames) is in any way disposed to reduce the amount of liability which the country will be under in this respect. Now, $60,000,000 is not a very considerable amount of money when we take into consideration the immensity of the project, when nine years ago the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier undertook the construction of this railway. It is true that the cost of this road to the country will exceed the estimate.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Is the hon. gentleman sure that the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) mentioned $60,000,000 as the cost of the construction of this road?

Mr. KYTE. No. He stated that that amount would have to be paid by the government for interest in respect of this undertaking. The government is not paying for the cost of the road as I understand. The Grand Trunk Pacific are ultimately to pay the cost of the road, either by actually purchasing it or by paying a rental which is estimated to amount to three per cent. on the actual cost.

Mr. REID (Grenville). At what page of 'Hansard' will I find the statement made by Mr. Ames?

Mr. KYTE. At pages 3197-98. It has been asserted time and again that when the Bill was first before parliament, Mr. Fielding, then Finance Minister, stated that in his judgment the total amount for interest chargeable to the government would be $13,000,000. I have heard that alleged statement denied by Mr. Fielding on the floor of the House, and I know that on a subsequent occasion the statement was made that $51,000,000 would cover the liability for interest incurred by the government in respect of the construction of this railway. Therefore, the amount of interest estimated by the late Minister of Finance and the amount which the hon. member (Mr. Ames) says the government will be liable for, do not disagree very much, there being a difference of $9,000,000 in the estimates of the two hon. gentlemen. Now, in the construction of every great undertaking it is not an uncommon thing that the actual expenditure should exceed the estimates. During the last forty years nearly every public work constructed by the government of this country has cost more money than it was estimated it would cost. In the construction of these very parliament buildings which was undertaken by the provinces of Ontario and Quebec in 1869, it was estimated that they would cost $2,000,000, but

when the buildings were completed it was found that they had cost $9,000,000, a difference of $7,000,000 above the estimate. In the case of the construction of the Panama canal, which was undertaken by the United States government, the actual experience of the work has proven that the estimate of the cost will be exceeded by an immense sum. I think the first estimate of the cost of the Panama canal by the officials who were charged to prepare that estimate, was $100,000,000 but, as an actual fact, the canal will cost $325,000,000 before the work is completed. There are reasons why the expenditure on the Transcontinental railway has largely exceeded the estimate, quite apart from any suggestion that there was want of capacity on the part of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. Take, for instance, that section of the railway betwen Moncton and Chipman; I understand that in the original specifications drawn by the engineers in charge of the work it was stated that for the first fifty miles west of Moncton there was no rock, and that common earth excavation would be the material met with, but, when they came to build the road it was found that this first fifty miles west of Moncton was almost exclusively solid rock. That mistake would seem to reflect to some extent upon the capacity of the engineers who were entrusted with the preparation of the specification in respect to that section. I suppose they could have made a more correct estimate of the cost of construction if they had gone to the expense of sinking test pits, from Moncton to Winnipeg. They would then be in a position to state with greater accuracy what was the nature of the excavations which would have to be done. But, after having sunk these test pits, which would have cost millions of dollars, how much better off would the country be in respect of the knowledge thereby gained? If those who are disposed to criticise the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners are able to prove that they have been guilty of any incapacity or want of integrity in relation to the work which had been entrusted to them, then, of course, it would be a most serious reflection upon them.

But the reason why the cost of the eastern section exceeded the estimate, was because, instead of common excavation, there was solid rock. If test pits had been made in order to enable the engineers to make an absolutely correct report upon the conditions, the country would not have benefited to the extent of a dollar, but rather would have lost the cost of making these test pits. Whatever the nature of the excavation was, it had to be done once the construction of the Transcontinental railway was entered upon, by virtue of legislation, empowering the government to carry on that work. I am going to cite another case—the construction of the railway in the neighbourhood of La Tuque. I understand that when the specifications for that section were being prepared, the engineers thought that owing to the greatly increased cost of constructing the road with a grade of 4-10ths of one per cent., a grade of 1 per cent. might be reasonably satisfactory in that locality. The Grand Trunk Pacific company, however, insisted upon the 4-10ths grade being adhered to, and the consequence was, that a change from 1 per cent. to 4-10ths of 1 per cent. in the neighbourhod of La Tuque, for the distance of a mile, added to the cost of the Transcontinental railway to the extent of $1,250,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does the hon. gentleman state that there is a 4-10ths grade between Moncton and Quebec?

Mr. KYTE. With the exception of a couple of pusher grades, I believe it is a 4-10ths grade. Now, the National Transcontinental railway is not the first great railway undertaken in this country. Some 30 years ago, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company undertook to build a railway across the continent. This is a company which was organized for the purpose of building the railway as a private undertaking; and, except for the grants of money and land and other concessions made to the company by the then Conservative government, the obligation to finance the scheme, was entirely in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself. That company received from the late Conservative government: in cash, $25,000,000; in railways completed and uncompleted, $65,000,000; and 25,000,000 acres of land, estimated to be worth $144,216,624; a total of $234,216,624 to assist them in carrying out their undertaking. Now, that is an enormous sum of money for the government of this country 30 years ago to bestow upon a company which only undertook to do in respect of a transcontinental railway system that which was undertaken by the government led by the right hon. the leader of the opposition, a few years ago. Of that sum, which the late Conservative government contributed to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, not one dollar came back to the people of this country, and the government does not to-day receive one dollar of interest from that expenditure. Hon. gentlemen opposite, who criticise with such unmeasured language, the extravagance of the late Liberal government in carrying on the construction of the Transcontinental railway, have strongly commended the wisdom and the statesmanship of the government led by the late Sir John A. Macdonald in making that contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Therefore, if the sum of $234,216,624 was only a reasonable assistance to give to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at a

time when labour was cheap, when supplies were cheap, when the cost of living was very much less than it is to-day, I fail to see why these hon. gentlemen should criticise and condemn the late Liberal government for contributing $60,000,000 towards the construction of another transcontinental railway, which, in the judgment of all the people in Canada is absolutely necessary to keep up with the present development of this country. In the statement which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals presented to the House the other night, he said that the Transcontinental railway had cost up to the present $113,853,300, and that it is estimated that to complete the road it will be necessary to spend $57,872,700 more. Now, according to the statements which have been submitted to the House from time to time, it is estimated that two-thirds of the whole undertaking is completed at the present time. Therefore, only one-third of the work remains to be done; and, if the figures submitted by the minister are correct, it would appear that it is going to cost the country nearly $1,000,000 more proportionately to complete the one-third of the road than it cost to complete the two-thirds that is now finished.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman does not mean that to be a fair statement, because he knows that the most expensive part of any road is the terminals and the right of way, which in this case are not yet paid for.

Mr. KYTE. The cost of the land for terminals is largely included in the amount thus far expended, as stated by the Minister of Railways the other evening.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman cannot prove that statement. He made the statement, as I understood him, that the right of way has been paid for. Now, let him prove that.

Mr. KYTE. I am stating that two-thirds of the road has been completed up to the present time, that one-third of it remains to be completed, and that this one-third, according to the figures submitted by the hon. minister, will cost proportionately $1,000,000 more than the two-thirds of the road now completed. Therefore, notwithstanding the excuse given by hon. gentlemen opposite for terminating the services of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners that owing to their incapacity and want of experience they allowed the road to cost too much, the future work to be done under the management of Mr. Leonard, the present chairman of the board, notwithstanding the contention that this change is made on the ground of economy, the one-third of the road still to be done will cost $1,000,000 more in proportion than what has been thus far completed.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the argument that this change is to be made in the interest of economy and in order to keep down the cost of the Transcontinental railway, in so far as it is not completed at the present time is scarcely borne out by the facts. Another criticism directed against the board is that they are not railway builders. Hon. gentlemen supporting the present government have questioned the wisdom of the late Premier because, in selecting the members of the Transcontinental Commission he failed to choose men with proper qualifications. It was suggested that instead of merchants, lawyers and business men generally, the right hon. gentleman should have chosen engineers to carry on this undertaking. I have before me the list of the first directors of the Canadian Pacific railway who were entrusted with carrying out the construction of that undertaking some thirty years ago, and in that list I fail to find the name of a single engineer whose judgment and experience seemed to be necessary in order to assist the directors in executing their task in the most business-like and most economical manner. The following are the gentlemen to whom I allude:

George Stephen, Montreal, merchant; Duncan McIntyre, Montreal, merchant; John S. Kennedy, New York, banker; R. B. Angus, St. Paul, Esquire; James J. Hill, St. Paul, Esquire; Henry Stafford Northcote, London, Esquire; Pascal Dr. P. Grenfell, London, merchant; Charles Day Rose, London, merchant; Baron J. de Reinach, Paris, banker.

Now there is not a single engineer in the whole of that list of the original directors of the Canadian Pacific railway. They were business men, they were merchants and bankers, they were men who were accustomed to do business according to the methods in which business was understood in those days but they had had no experience in railway building. When they required technical knowledge or technical assistance, they went to engineers whose services they engaged for that particular purpose. Therefore, the wisdom of the late government is not to be questioned because they did not appoint engineers on the board of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. The Act which constituted that board gave them power to employ the services of engineers for the purposes of the undertaking and that is what was done. Now Mr. Leonard the present chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Board, attended a banquet in the city of Brantford on the 3rd of January last and in responding to a toast there took occasion to refer to the character of the work of the Transcontinental railway that was done by the present commission. Sir, when I

hear hon. gentlemen criticising the manner in which this railway has been built, the manner in which the work was carried on, I am inclined to think that Mr. Leonard's speech at the banquet in question is a very excellent reply. Mr. Leonard says:

What the cost will be to complete the road to Moncton is hard to say, but it is now nearly all under construction, all but 400 to 500 miles between Cochrane and Winnipeg. The Quebec bridge which, when finished, will be the largest bridge in the world, will take 48,000 tons of steel, and will take five or six years to build. Going east our line runs at about 4-10 grade, and an engine will haul 1,600 tons, whereas on other roads where a 1 per cent grade exists, 800 is all that can be hauled.

'The Transcontinental,' he declared, 'is being built in the best and most durable manner known. It is also of great military advantage, giving Canada an unlimited width, in spite of the millions that will be spent in its construction.

The National Transcontinental is a national asset, not a burden to the people of Canada. Our enormous grain and mineral wealth goes to show what a truly wonderful country we have, and we should all do our best to make it a strong link in the empire's chain.

Mr. Chairman, that is a certificate of which both the Transcontinental Railway Commission and the late government might very justly be proud. Mr. Leonard has referred to the character of the work that was carried on, and the excellent character of the railway in respect to its carrying capacity as compared with other railways. I need not remind you, Mr. Chairman, that an enormous proportion of the cost incurred in the construction of this railway was due to the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the government of Canada as well, came to the conclusion that they should have a better railway than any transcontinental line existing at the present time. They desire a railway whose carrying capacity will exceed that of any railway at present engaged in transporting the products of western Canada to the maritime provinces and vice versa. In order to do that it was necessary to build a very much more expensive road, but they were amply justified in expending the additional amount of money when we take into account the enormous saving in operating expenses pointed out by Mr. Leonard as compared with similar expenses on the other transcontinental railways. I think that in discussing the liability of the late government and the responsibility of the present commission for the large amount of money which this railway has cost, we must not fail to take into account the circumstance that the whole liability imposed upon the government in regard to the construction of this road, not including the Quebec bridge, is $60,000,000 if we take the statement of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). Compared with that there is the sum of $234,216,224 incurred by the government of Canada and the people of this country for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway. When the transcontinental line is completed it will yield a revenue to the government of Canada equal to three per cent on every dollar that it cost in its construction, and in default of the payment of that rental by the Grand Trunk Pacific it will become the property of the people, whereas the Canadian Pacific railway upon which this large amount of public money was spent in the form of subsidies and subventions which I have referred to, yields not one dollar of interest to the people of Canada, but the whole advantage of this enormous expense has accrued to a private corporation. I have no reflection to make upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but if it was wisdom on the part of the late Conservative government to assist the Canadian Pacific railway to the extent they did from the public funds, surely it does not indicate a lack of statesmanship for the late Liberal government to build another transcontinental railway at a cost of little more than one fourth of the amount which the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway entailed on the people of Canada.

Mr. EMMERSON. It seems to me that this matter has not so far received the consideration which should be given to an important question of this kind.

This matter is not to be regarded from a sectional standpoint but from the standpoint of the whole Dominion. I believe that the people of this Dominion approve of the form of organization under which this great national work was undertaken and under which it has been so efficiently carried on, and that sufficient reasons have not been given for the change that is proposed.

Mr. NESBITT. The other day, when we were discussing the reduction of the number of these commissioners, my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) spoke of the cost of building the Transcontinental railway, and gave that as the reason why these commissioners should be removed from office. I was a little surprised to hear him take up the case in the way he did. It seemed to me a partisan discussion, and I am always surprised to hear a business man discuss a business question from a partisan standpoint.

Mr. COCHRANE. I was asked for a statement, and I gave it. That's all.

Mr. NESBITT. I was not speaking of the minister (Mr. Cochrane), but of the

hon. member for St. Antoine. I have no fault to find with the statement of the minister. We asked him for facts, and he gave them. At least, I assume that——

Mr. COCHRANE. They were on the authority of your own engineer.

Mr. NESBITT. Quite so. I have no fault to find with the statement of the hon. minister, but I was surprised, as I have said, at the hon. member for St. Antoine discussing this from a partisan standpoint. Now, I do not pretend to know much about the building of railways, but I have asked many people who do know about the building of railways, as to the quality of this railway which is now approaching completion, and I have been told by one and all who have seen the road that it is finished in a first class manner. We all know that it is quite the custom for railways in this country and in the United States to be built at first in a temporary manner—first get the rails down in any old way, and then go on and finish up the road. Those of us who have read the evidence before the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States on the question of freight rates, know that the capital expenditure on the transcontental railways in the United States has been enormous—I believe quite as much as stated by my hon. friend from St. Antoine when he said that this road would cost $130,000 a mile. I believe there is not a road through a similar country in the United States which has been built and put in reasonably permanent condition at a less cost than $130,000 a mile. I believe also that if the road is finished in the way capable men say that it is being finished at a cost of $130,000 a mile it is a reasonable figure, considering the portion of country through which it runs and the vast necessary expense, in getting in supplies. The right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was attacked the other day on the ground that this railway went through the section of country that it does. I believe that in a very short time it will be proven that this was one of the wisest steps that could possibly have been taken in the interest of the country at large. This is one of the sections of the country of which we knew little. It will open up a new region and will practically extend the boundaries of this country very largely. I believe that when the road is running you will find that it will pay from the first day so far as traffic is concerned. Local traffic will probably develop in that country never dreamed of, possibly, by the people of Ontario, before this road went through. I repeat but with all due deference to my hon. friend that I believe the road will pay from the time it is built. Also I think most emphatically that considering, as I said, the country through which it is built, it will be found on investigation, and a commission has been appointed to investigate—that the road has cost no more than it should have cost in view of the difficulties that had to be overcome in construction. And I, for one would not vote to-day to have it built in any other way so far as thoroughness is concerned, nor would I vote to have it built through a different section of country. It has been argued here that it should have been built to North Bay, and then via the old Northern to Toronto and by a connection to Montreal. Nobody would think of carrying heavy freight that way.

However, it may be said that this has nothing to do with the question before us. As to the commissioners, I believe in the old adage 'two heads are better than one, even if one is a cabbage head.' I believe that the probabilities are that for the remainder of this undertaking it would be better to leave the commission as it is. But the minister has seen fit to do otherwise. If he can save the expense of the extra commissioners and do the work as well, that will be all right. I do not know the head of the commission. They say he is a capable man. He would need to be a capable man to be as good as four other men. For my part, I am a great believer in a number of counsellors where great undertakings are to be considered.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NESBITT. When the committee rose at six o'clock I was saying that so far as I was personally concerned, I would rather trust the construction of this road to three commissioners than to one. But if the minister continues that work with one commissioner and does it as well, he will be entitled to credit for the amount saved. I would like to point out with reference to the expense that the Grand Trunk engineer had to be consulted on each of these contracts before they were let. I recognize that there was a dispute between the government engineer and the Grand Trunk engineer as to some of the classifications, but the amount was infinitesimal in proportion to the total amount expended. I would like to point out also that I think it is unfair for any hon. member to attack the expenditure without taking into consideration the quality of the work done. We all know that a man could build a warehouse 60 feet x 100 feet by using galvanized sheets of iron and rough lumber for between $2,500 and $3,000; by improving the

quality of the material, he could put up a building worth $5,000 or $6,000; and by using first class material all through he could put up a building worth from $15,000 to $20,000. I think any business man would agree that the latter one would be the cheapest in the end.

There is another thing I would like to point out, and that is the marvellous prosperity of the country which enabled the government to make this expenditure, as shown the other day by the Minister of Railways of Canada, with so little increase of the public debt. I am sure that the late government could not be accused of egotism if they took credit to themselves for at least some portion of that prosperity which enabled the country to bear that expenditure, without increasing the debt any more than it was increased. But the greatest fault I have to find with the attack made by hon. gentlemen opposite on the expenditure for this road is that they do not take into consideration the quality of the work. For my part, I do not know whether the road has been built in the way that has been stated by men who are competent to judge, but if it has been so built, I think it is time to withhold criticism until we know what the road is capable of doing after it is completed.

Mr. BLAIN. I think my hon. friend has missed the point. The point as I understood it, that was that the late government promised a first class road for the amount that they placed before parliament as the expense for the construction of that road, and now that amount has been exceeded. That is the criticism.

Mr. NESBITT. That is not the criticism as I understood it However, if my hon. friend so understood it, that is his privilege. I understood that the attack was made on the enormous expenditure that had taken place. I have no fault to find with the estimate made the other day by the Minister of Railways and Canals; but we must remember that the road is going to be one of the very highest quality. It is also to be remembered that the portion remaining to be constructed will not necessarily be as costly as that part already constructed, because it will not cost so much to get supplies into the part of the road to be constructed. Wages also are not likely to increase in the same proportion as they have done since this road was commenced. So I say on the whole that it is absolutely unfair to judge of the expenditure on that work unless we take into account the quality of the work done.

Mr. KEMP. Our present opposition, it appears to me, are in somewhat of an apologetic mood about something. What is that something if it is not the tremendous cost in excess of the estimates that were placed before this House in 1903 in regard to this National Transcontinental railway. Those of us who were in the House in 1903 remember clearly what was said about it at that time. I have before me a document which hon. members opposite will likely recognize: it is a speech of the right hon. the leader of the opposition who was then Prime Minister, and I wish to read one or two extracts from that speech to show what he said about it at that time, and he said it so well, in the opinion of his followers, that they thought it wise to make a campaign sheet of it, and it was spread broadcast throughout the country in the election campaign subsequent to the session of 1904. Let me read a few words which fell from the lips of the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition to-day, in respect to the cost of the National Transcontinental railway.

> So that here again the whole of the liability which is incurred by the government for the building of that section from Moncton to Winnipeg is simply seven years of interest. The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific Ocean will be in the neighborhood of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, and not a cent more.

I have never heard the right hon. gentleman explain clearly what he meant by those words, and I have never heard any one of his followers since explain to us what he meant when he made that statement.

We know that he could not have meant that the road would cost $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, that it was an interest charge to which he referred. But we have an estimate from the Minister of Finance of that day, Mr. Fielding, in respect to the cost of this National Transcontinental railway, and I shall take the figures which Mr. Fielding gave us at that time as being the figures which the late government authorized. The figures which Mr. Fielding gave us in the year 1903, in debate in this House were these: The railway from Moncton to Winnipeg would cost $54,609,000, made up in this way, from Winnipeg to Quebec at $28,000 a mile, $41,300,000; from Quebec to Moncton at $25,000 per mile, $10,000,000, a total of $51,300,000. He added to that a certain amount of interest which brought his estimate up to $54,609,000. In the following year, 1904, when the government came before parliament with a revised contract Mr. Fielding brought his estimate up to an average of something over $31,000 per mile, for this section of the National Transcontinental railway, and raised his total estimate to somewhere in the vicinity of $58,000,000. The government of that day went to the people of this country on these figures, and on

the figures cited by Sir Wilfrid Laurier of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, and they received the endorsation of the people.

Now we have placed before us the figures which this road has cost up to date, and which it is likely to cost and I have no doubt these figures are correct. According to the figures given us by the hon. the Minister of Railways this part of the road will cost not $25,000 or $28,000, or $31,250, as Mr. Fielding estimated in 1904, but $130,800 per mile; not a total of $54,609,000 as Mr. Fielding estimated in this House, but of $236,000,000. These things should be considered by hon. gentlemen opposite when they are discussing this subject, and I am not surprised to find them in an apologetic mood in regard to this expenditure. I look upon the construction of the National Transcontinental railway as one of the worst bungles of the late government, and it seems to me that the present government were amply justified in adopting another system of management of that great undertaking and changing the commission under whose direction this tremendous expenditure has been made.

What was the object in building this road? In 1900, 1901 and 1902, there was an agitation in this country in respect to getting the crops transported from the west to the seaboard, and to the markets of the world, and there was a desire on the part of the government of that day, as there is on the part of the government of this day, to facilitate in every way the transportation of the crops of the northwest to the markets of the world. In 1902 the Grand Trunk people made an application to the late government in writing, and that document was laid on the table of this House in due course. It was an application for permission to build a road connecting with the Grand Trunk system at North Bay, Ontario, into the wheatfields of the northwest. They asked certain concessions from the government of the day, concessions which would, in my estimation, be very unimportant as compared with the tremendous cost of this railroad as we have it before us to-day. The right hon. gentleman who led the government of that day made some statements with regard to the necessity of doing something in order to alleviate the conditions existing in the northwest. On July 30, 1903, he said in this House:

> We consider that it is the duty of all those who sit within these walls by the will of the people, to provide immediate means whereby the products of those new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost, and whereby, likewise, a market may be found in this new region for those who toil in the forests, in the fields, in the mines, in the shops of the older provinces. Such is our duty; it is immediate and imperative. . .
>
> To those who urge upon us the policy of to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow; to those who tell us, Wait, wait, wait; to those who advise us to pause, to consider, to reflect, to calculate and to inquire, our answer is: No, this is not a time for deliberation, this is a time for action. The flood tide is upon us that leads on to fortune; if we let it pass it may never recur again. If we let it pass, the voyage of our national life, bright as it is to-day, will be bound in shallows. We cannot wait, because time does not wait.

Here was the situation in 1903, and I must say that the situation is not improved to-day. What has happened? The Laurier government, instead of pursuing a business-like policy in regard to the building of this railway, delayed its construction in every possible way so that in 1912, nine years later, the people of the west have no better facilities for getting out their crops than they had in 1903. But what is more serious to my mind is that instead of the late government proceeding to complete that railroad from Winnipeg to Cochrane Junction where it connects with the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway which connects with the Grand Trunk system at North Bay, in order that these crops might be transported from the west and the people of the west might have relief as was forecasted by the statement of the Prime Minister of that day, what has happened? The government have completed the railway from Quebec to Moncton but it may be three years before they are able to make connection between Winnipeg and Cochrane Junction, to connect with the Grand Trunk system in order that the crops may be brought out.

Thus there are two main grounds of complaint against the late government in connection with the building of this railway, first, the great extravagance which has been permitted in its construction and, second, the unreasonable delay in the construction of that part of the road which would afford much needed relief to the people of the northwest.

Mr. MACDONALD. It is quite evident that the hon. member (Mr. Kemp), who is a sort of fo'castle member of the administration is somewhat behind the times owing to the fact that he was not here in the last parliament. The hon. gentleman does not seem, judging from his utterances, to realize the responsibility that rests upon him as a member of the government. He is worried over the fact that the government did not commence work at Lake Abitibi and branch off east and west, and he seems to have no idea about the conveniences required for getting in supplies and starting terminals and getting in the material necessary to carry on construction. He is such a great railway builder

that he would not do anything that expert railway builders thought it wise to do. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp), does not seem to be aware of the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific railway is in existence from Fort William to the city of Winnipeg, and that even to-day it brings the traffic of the west in touch with the other railway systems of the Dominion. The hon. member (Mr. Kemp), has followed the lead of the hon. member (Mr. Ames), in misrepresenting the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier as saying, when he introduced the Bill, that $13,000,000 would be the amount of money the railway would cost this country. I am more surprised at the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp), indulging in such misrepresentations than I am at the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), because we all remember that that latter gentleman a few years ago travelled all over the country with lantern slides and talking of the restitution that was to take place the moment the Conservative party came into power. Well, the lantern slide has been put in the garret and the hon. member (Mr. Ames), is not bothering himself about restitution. The chief occupation of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) now seems to be to act as a bellwether to the Nationalist portion of the gentlemen with whom he is sitting on the government benches, endeavouring to lead them into camp, and to keep them there until they get through the Manitoba school question and other such things, and then of course he won't care much about the Nationalists. The hon. member from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), has given up the lantern slide show, and he comes here to start an extraneous discussion on this Bill and to resurrect old stories which were shown to be baseless time and again in former parliaments, as to the supposed cost of the Transcontinental railway. Now, Sir Wilfrid Laurier never meant to say that the Transcontinental railway was only going to cost the country thirteen millions, and as a matter of fact he never did say so, but these gentlemen want to put such a false interpretation upon the words of the late Prime Minister.

Mr. BURNHAM. What interpretation did you put on these words?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), is another gentleman who is sitting at the feet of the wrong Gamaliel. I set against their interpretation of the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the opinion of the hon. member from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), who has studied the matter long and laboriously and who, with all respect, knows more about the matter than most gentlemen sitting on the government benches. Here is what the hon. member for South Simcoe said in the last parliament:

> We, the members of the House understood that the Prime Minister did not mean that the total expenditure on the construction of the road would be $13,000,000; he intended to convey the proposition that the money that would be paid out and not received back was $13,000,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is not what your campaign literature said.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the hon. member from Manitoba (Mr. Bradbury) go back upon the statement of the man who was his leader in the past parliament in all matters connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway? The hon. member for South Simcoe has spent toilsome days and sleepless nights endeavouring to extract some campaign material for the benefit of his party out of the words of the former Prime Minister, and he was able to tell the House what the meaning of the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was and the hon. member from Manitoba (Mr. Bradbury) was not here in that parliament and he knows nothing about it. It is not common sense to suppose that the right hon. gentleman meant that the Transcontinental railway would be built for $13,000,000 because that would represent only $7,200 a mile, and everybody who knows anything, knows that it is impossible to build a single mile of railway anywhere in Canada for $7,200. Contemporaneously with the statement made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier was the estimate made not by Mr. Fielding, but by Mr. Schreiber, a gentleman of long experience, a gentleman who advised the Conservative government in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, and he estimated that the railway would cost $62,000,000. But the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) was not deceived as to the cost of the railway, because he, with his great engineering knowledge, made an estimate all his own, and he said that the railway would cost the country $73,000,000.

Mr. KEMP. Where is that in 'Hansard?'

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) will find it in 'Hansard,' and it would be well for him to look over his old speeches and get some new ideas from them. The genial gentleman who represented Lennox and Addington in the past parliament estimated the cost at $114,000,000; the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) entered into the realm of speculation, and he was not worrying about the $13,000,000, for he calculated that it would cost $100,000,000.

Mr. BLAIN. That was a nearer estimate than yours.

Mr. MACDONALD. I had the good sense not to make any estimate; I wanted the

railway built as soon as possible in the interests of the people of Canada, and I did not indulge in any guessing. A former Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) estimated the cost at $125,000,000; the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) estimated the cost at $150,000,000, and the estimate of Mr. Speaker was $125,000,000. The hon member who then represented Prince, Prince Edward Island, told us that Sir Edmund Osler's estimate of the cost of the railway was $280,000,000.

His estimate was $280,000,000. Then, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was very careful about his estimate; he was not misled by the late Prime Minister at all; he was not misled even by Mr. Schrieber. I give him the credit of being too shrewd to tie himself down on the question. He said that it would cost anywhere from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000, because nobody could tell within $10,000,000 what it would cost if you were going to have a 4/10ths of 1 per cent grade. He knew that the cost was a great uncertainty. In the face of these facts, can any one say truthfully that anybody in this country was deceived as to the cost? Now, what did you suppose this railway was going to cost? It was to be built through a new country. The idea was to exploit that country, to open it up. Those of us who come from other provinces remember how in the province of Ontario, when it was proposed to build the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, even the optimists hesitated about engaging in an undertaking to build into the hinterland. Everybody knows the splendid results which have come from developing that northern country, stretching from Manitoba to the Atlantic ocean, the greater portion of Canada absolutely undeveloped simply because it had no railway communication. Every gentleman who sat in the House in 1903, whether on the right or the left side of the Speaker, knew that no surveys of any kind had been made before the project was floated. There were general reports of the possibilities of the country, but everybody knew that we were going to build this railway without a location survey. That being so, why do gentlemen of responsibility in this House, on the simple question whether for the best administration of this railway we should have one commissioner or three, talk about misrepresentation in regard to this matter, when everybody knew the situation? Are hon. gentlemen opposite such a set of children that they did not know anything about this matter? Did any of them look at the cost of railway construction elsewhere in 1903? Let me give you a few figures. In New South Wales the cost of railway construction is $64,000 a mile, in Germany $107,000, in France $126,000, in Italy $109,000, in Russia $83,000, in Austria $87,000, in Great Britain $272,000.

An hon. MEMBER. Including the right of way?

Mr. MACDONALD. Does not this estimate of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways include the cost of the right of way? In the United States the estimated cost is $58,000 a mile, with grades of from 1 to 2½ per cent and with only 67-pound rails. Then, what has been the cost of other railways in Canada? What was the cost of the Intercolonial railway per mile? Was it $7,000, as some hon. gentlemen say that the government in 1903 was representing that this railway was going to cost? Was it $30,000 a mile, the figure mentioned by the hon. member for East Toronto? Not at all. It was $63,000 a mile—right of way, too.

Mr. CURRIE. Will the hon. gentleman answer a question?

Mr. MACDONALD. No, I do not propose to answer any questions of my hon. friend from Simcoe. This committee know me well enough to know that I do not mind answering questions, and I have no personal objection to my hon. friend from Simcoe; but this question habit of his is becoming too much of a habit. We are told this railway is going to cost something like $130,000 per mile. Now, let us see just where we are. Mark you, Mr. Chairman, the expenditure which the late government were responsible for was the expenditure which was made down to the day they gave up their office. They are not responsible for the expenditure that hon. gentlemen opposite make. If the plans were wrong, change them; if the grades are too good and cost too much, if the curvatures which the late government desired to obtain cost too much, hon. gentlemen opposite can remedy that. It is in their power; it has been in their power ever since they came into office in October, and will be in their power until this railway is completed. Let us see what has been done. Taking my hon. friend's statement, we find that up to date 1,656 miles of main line track have been laid, and the cost has been $66,000 a mile. Grading has been done on 309 miles more. The situation, then, is that grading has been done and rails have been laid on 1,965 miles at a cost of $56,000 a mile. That is what the late government is responsible for, and every dollar that has been expended since that time and that will be expended in the future, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will be responsible for. He knows that the contracts which have been let are not contracts which bind the government to have the road built on any gradient. The contractors are paid so much a yard for the earth removed, and my hon. friend can send his engineers out to tell them to dispense with a grade of 4/10ths of 1 per cent,

to dispense with the features which we had been providing for, and instead of putting in concrete and stone foundations to their bridges, to put in wooden structures; and instead of having iron bridges upon these structures, to dispense with them and put in wooden bridges and put the power in the hands of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways to do it. And let me tell you that if from this hour the cost per mile of this railway exceeds the figures which I am giving to-night, the responsibility will rest upon the hon. gentleman whom he appointed. Let there be no mistake about that. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) laughs. He has a very curious idea about his position. I wonder what kind of a Minister of Railways he thinks he ought to be? I want to tell him that in what he undertakes he is responsible to the people of this country and to parliament who have to vote the expenditure every year. When the hon. minister comes here and asks us to vote money he is responsible for the expenditure, and I say again if from this moment in the construction of the balance of this railway the expenditure of the past of the late commission is exceeded in any way, the hon. gentleman will be responsible for it.

Mr. BURNHAM. Do you mean that the late government had reached the limit?

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. member from Peterborough is one of these singular gentleman in regard to whom it is most difficult to tell where he is at or what he is driving at. What I say is this: That either my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) is complaining about the late government spending too much in the Transcontinental railway construction or he is not. If he is complaining that the railway has cost too much, the remedy is in the hands of himself and his friends, he can cheapen the cost of construction. He can lessen it in the way I have indicated. Now, I have pointed out that the cost of constructing the railway that has so far been built is $56,000 a mile. To complete the balance of 426 miles it is estimated by my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) and I have taken these figures from his statement in order to show the House and the country what a peculiar position of affairs it is—that although it cost the late government only $56,000 a mile to build what they had built, he proposes to estimate the cost of the remainder at $94,000 a mile. In other words, although these gentlemen who are sitting on the right of the Speaker have been talking day in and day out ever since this railway enterprise was initiated, about the tremendous cost to Canada of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the National Transcontinental railway, and that the late government had completed two-thirds of the railway at a cost of $56,000 a mile, when they come to this House to tell us what they are going to do in future they estimate the cost at $94,000 a mile. Those figures are simply taken from the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) and if he wants to exclude the cost of terminals and shops—

Mr. COCHRANE. Which they had no authority to do.

Mr. MACDONALD. Who had no authority to do so?

Mr. COCHRANE. The government.

Mr. MACDONALD. We will consider that in a moment. At present I am discussing with my hon. friend the question of costs, and I say if my hon. friend excludes from this statement the cost of the terminals and the cost of the shops——

Mr. COCHRANE. Did I say that there was any such number of miles built? If I remember aright there was given in his statement so many miles of grading, and so many miles of track laid. That does not finish a road, and the hon. gentleman knows it if he knows anything about building a railway. What about the ballasting?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend says that does not finish the road. It goes a long way to finish the road. I am taking his own figures.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then take them in the right way.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend wants to deceive the House when he brings figures here and tells us——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friends opposite are getting very sensitive. The minister brings before this House a statement and here it is: 'Length of the line from Moncton to Winnipeg 1,804·7 miles. Grading completed 1,587 miles, or 76·82 per cent of the whole. Then track laid 1,378·7.'

Mr. COCHRANE. The track cost something.

Mr. MACDONALD. 'Main line and in addition 278·7 miles in siding.' Track laid certainly advanced construction.

Mr. LENNOX. The rails cost something.

Mr. MACDONALD. 'Telegraph line 9,982 miles, bridges 82·75 per cent'.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). How many miles?

Mr. MACDONALD. Nine hundred and eighty-two. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, it could not, of course, be 9,000. Now, here is the point: I say if we take the figures contained in the statement prepared and submitted to the House by the Minister of

Railways, and if we exclude the cost of terminals and shops from the estimates of the future cost of the road it still means that the minister to-day contemplates spending $85,000 a mile to build the balance of the road when it only cost the late government $56,000 a mile for the railway built by them. Here is a splendid opportunity for these hon. gentlemen to put into practice all their theories about railway construction. They expressed the belief that the late government did not know how to build railroads and they were not going to get a lot of lawyers and put them on the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. When the government wanted somebody to investigate the late Transcontinental Railway Commission who do you suppose they appointed as chairman? They went to Hamilton and secured my very pleasant friend, Mr. Lynch Staunton, a good lawyer, who year in and year out, is the legal adviser of the Ontario government.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). That is why they get along so well.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon friends will find that the Ontario government is not getting on so well some of these days. Well they have appointed Mr. Lynch Staunton as chairman of this commission of investigation, a gentleman who never had anything to do with a railway in his life, whose specialty is water-powers, and whose occupation has been confined solely to matters of that kind. The late government appointed as the first chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, Mr. Wade, a distinguished lawyer, who had connection with railway corporations in the province of Nova Scotia, who had not only engaged in the operation of railways himself, but helped to build them. He was succeeded by Mr. Parent, who had executive and business ability of the highest character, who had been Prime Minister of the province, and whose judgment as a business man is recognized by men of all classes in the province of Quebec, English and French, wherever he is known.

Mr. BRODER. Did he not have something to do with the Quebec bridge affair? What executive ability did he show there?

Mr. MACDONALD. We will discuss the Quebec bridge matter at the proper time.

Mr. BRODER. I do not think he showed much ability in the Quebec bridge matter.

Mr. MACDONALD. We will be ready to discuss that matter with hon. gentlemen opposite at the proper time, but I don't propose to be diverted from the course of my argument merely for the sake of answering the hon. gentleman. I am asking, after all these wails about putting lawyers on the Transcontinental Railway Commission, what did my hon. friends opposite do, when the time came for them to act? They talked about appointing a Royal Commission, but instead of doing that, when they came into office, they appointed the paid solicitor of the Ontario government, a partisan who has been denouncing the expenditure on the National Transcontinental railway, every time he has been on the stump for the last six or eight years, and they put him in charge of the task of investigating this railway, and he enters upon the task absolutely biased. These are the gentlemen who do not want lawyers forsooth for the purpose of constructing railways! When they want to get a commissioner, they go to a gentleman, who is tied hand and foot to their own political fortunes, and expect the country to believe he is going to conduct an unbiased investigation Then, when they wanted to get another gentleman, did they choose a man of long experience in connection with construction of railways?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Gutelius is not connected with the construction of railways.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. He is connected with the maintenance which is entirely different from construction.

Mr. COCHRANE. And construction too.

Mr. MACDONALD. Where did he construct a railway in Canada?

Mr. COCHRANE. He helped in the construction of the Central Ontario railway line.

Mr. MACDONALD. He was in charge of maintenance and my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) will find that his experience is not connected with railway construction. And if I am correctly informed the government could not find a man in Canada who was engaged in railway construction and they had to take a man who was a citizen of the United States.

Mr. COCHRANE. The head of the Grand Trunk railway is a citizen of the United States and you took him up.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is reverting to the old tu quoque argument which is about all flattened out. My hon. friend and his party have boasted of the ability with which they were to come in to do everything so splendidly and properly. None of the mistakes of their predecessors were to be repeated, none of the errors into which they had fallen were to again occur.

Yet after their anti-American campaign of last fall when they were confronted with the fact that they could not get a man in Canada to associate with their partisan lawyer to investigate this commission but had to go to the United States, they retort by saying: 'Oh, the President of the Grand Trunk Pacific is an American.' That is not satisfactory. We say, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have an investigation into the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental railway, do not let us have a partisan one of that kind. Let the investigation be made by Canadians who are not connected with or in the pay of any political party, and whose verdict on the question has not been anticipated even before they commenced the inquiry. The country is entitled to make this request of my hon. friend, and I hope he will pay some attention to it, because I submit anything else would be unfair, and any verdict they might give in regard to this matter would have no effect and would not be received by the people with any confidence. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) is worrying about this question of the cost of construction. What was their policy when they were in power on a previous occasion? If you turn to 'Hansard' you will find the Minister of the Interior of that day telling the House and the country on the 1st of January, 1904, the then government, in addition to cash subsidies, had handed over no less than 44,242,000 acres of land in Manitoba and the Northwest in connection with railways. Eliminate the 25,000,000 acres which went for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, and we find that hon. members opposite, when in power before, gave 19,242,000 acres of land, for what? For the construction of a little railway here, and a little railway there. That land, at a moderate estimate, would be worth to-day $190,000,000. And this amount of the public domain was handed over for railway construction which was really infinitesimal and played no part in the transportation problem of this country. But here you have a railway of the highest possible standard, the best grades, the lowest curves, heavy rails—all the conditions which insure cheap and quick transportation. And hon. members rise in their places and declare that the cost of this is driving the country to the dogs. They gave away a kingdom in the west for railways that did not amount to anything, railways that did not have four-tenths per cent grades, nor any other grades in particular, nor easy curvatures, nor hundred-pound, or even fifty-pound, rails. But all this makes no difference,—the Liberal party built this transcontinental railway and they must be attacked in any case. The whole question was whether it would be better in the country's interest for the government to build a cheap road with high grades, acute curves, wooden bridges, cheap foundations and light rails, or to do what has been done. If one looks at it fairly and desires to arrive at a fair conclusion apart from partisanship, there is but one issue in regard to this matter. Either the government and the late commissioners did the right thing in building that expensive, high-class road, or they did not. Of course, if they had built with wooden trestles and had put in light rails, if they had not been careful in regard to the gradients or the curvatures, the reduction in the cost of the road would have been very great. But the road is the property of the government, the title to it remains in the people of Canada, subject to the leasing rights, and all betterments have to be provided. Was it not better then, to make one good job of it from the beginning rather than to build piece-meal and string out the expenditure over years of the future? That is a plain question and one that can be fairly debated. I know that many prominent railway men in Canada take the view that it would have been better to pursue the other course. If hon. members opposite had confined themselves to a dispassionate consideration which of these two policies would have been better, it seems to me it would be more becoming the dignity of parliament and the sense of the importance of this great issue which should be present in the mind of every Canadian, whether in parliament or not.

Hon. members opposite suggest that the engineering part of the railway was not properly administered. Let us examine that for a moment. There are hints here and suggestions there, that in the construction of the railway the contractors made more money than they should have made and therefore the road cost more than it should have cost. The Minister of Railways knows that the man who makes the estimates as to whether or not the material removed is rock, loose rock or earth, is the resident engineer. He knows that associated with him are the district engineers and that associated with them are the inspecting engineers whose duty it is to inspect the work on which the resident engineer has made his judgment. In addition to that, there were in this railway, over every division of it, the inspecting engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific, which company was liable for the interest on the cost and so was interested in having that cost as low as possible. Now, let us be frank about this thing. Is it possible that a wholesale misinterpretation of quantities took place with all these men associated in the determining of that point? Of course, if the estimate had rested with one man, that

man might be dishonest and might allow the contractor to charge for solid rock when he had removed only earth. But when you have all these men associated for the determining of the cost, each one knowing that the other is a check upon him, each one knowing that his reputation as an engineer may be destroyed by the other man, who may or may not be friendly to him—is it possible to suppose, I say, that under these circumstances, you could have the wholesale misinterpretation of considerations, to put it mildly, that is alleged to exist in regard to these matters? Consider all that inspection and all the care given by the engineers and by the Grand Trunk Pacific, and then consider that only 2 per cent of the cost of the whole of the road was ever in question so far as the dispute is a question of quantities and classification, and you will see that great care must have been exercised by the men who had to do with the work. There is great talk about the commission in regard to this matter. Was it the commission that went out to determine what the quantities were? Not at all. Who, then, determined these matters? Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer, of the Transcontinental railway had to sign every statement. The commissioners only paid what Mr. Lumsden and his subordinates signed. Every man from Mr. Lumsden down to the lowest subordinate in the woods north of Lake Abitibi would have to be a criminal or privy to criminality, or imposed upon, in order to have had wrong allowances made in regard to this matter.

The commissioners had nothing to do with the question in any way otherwise than to accept the results handed in by the engineer. Now under these circumstances is it fair in this court of parliament, where men's reputations are at stake, and where men's characters are to be determined to a large degree for the future, is it reasonable to impugn their conduct, and to charge them with wrong-doing? In order to see how carefully all these arrangements have been made, let me read from a report which you will find in "Hansard" of April, 1910, made by this commission:

As has adready been pointed out, the important thing is to see that the contractors shall be paid for only what they are entitled to under the general specifications governing the construction of the railway, and that the work is executed up to the standard required. The commissioners believe that they have taken every possible precaution to safeguard the public interest along these lines. Two inspecting engineers reporting directly to the chief engineer are practically continuously going over the work in the different districts. In addition, there are the inspecting engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company constantly passing on the work as it is performed, and when they do not agree with the engineers of the commission as to the work, their complaints are promptly filed in writing, to be passed upon by the board of experts acting as arbitrators under the authority of the National Transcontinental Railway Act.

With respect to the cost of the line, the fact cannot be too much emphasized or too frequently repeated, that when the National Transcontinental railway is completed, the people of Canada will have a railway constructed to a standard of perfection with respect to gradients and curvature, character of roadbed, and permanency of structures (such as steel bridges and viaducts, culverts, &c.) which but few railways in the world can equal. Railways such as the Canadian Pacific railway and Grand Trunk have within the past ten or fifteen years expended many millions of dollars to bring their lines in some places up to the standard which will prevail over the entire National Transcontinental railway. The costs of operation will be infinitesimal in comparison with those of lines having ruling gradients of one per cent, and the benefits of this economy in operation should accrue to the people of Canada.

Now there is but one issue when you come to look at this question. Did the commission do the right thing when they built this permanent railway in the way in which hon. members opposite admit the work was done, or should they have gone on and put down a railway without much permanency, building these wooden bridges, and leaving to the future to provide what was lacking? My hon. friends opposite complain about the cost. They say it is too great, it is enormous, huge, vast. Let us again say to the the Minister of Railways and Canals that only two-thirds of this railway are yet completed. Upon my hon. friend and his government will rest the responsibility for the expenditure on this portion of the road remaining to be constructed, if he constructs it according to the ideas that have been promulgated in the past by hon. gentlemen who sit behind him.

My hon. friend who spoke a moment ago read from the speech of the right hon. the leader of the opposition, made in 1903, in which he urged that the country could not wait any longer for the construction of this road. His judgment has been fully verified. I do not know whether my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) was one of those gentlemen who thought at the time that it was not a good thing to build the railway.

Mr. KEMP. My objection was not to the western part, but to the part running down to New Brunswick.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, that is interesting. My hon. friend did not want this eastern section of the road, he wanted it to come down to North Bay. He did not want to open up the hinterland of Ontario and Quebec, that was not his

ambition for Canada at all. He wanted to have a branch line down into the city of Toronto, and Canada and all her aspirations could have gone a begging if he got that. Then of course he was reckless as to whether traffic would pass down through the United States. If I recollect right, the hon. member for East Toronto was not one of those who are in favour of a preference being given to Canadian ports. So my hon. friend's ambition for Canada would have been satisfied by a line running down from North Bay to Toronto, and the rest of Canada could go hang. But the men who were in charge of public affairs at that time had a greater ambition for Canada. They looked to this northern land, and they believed, what we all know at the present time, that from year to year the population would increase, and that that great country would steadily grow in importance. Why, my optimistic friend the Minister of the Interior, I am sure, would not agree with the hon. member for East Toronto, because he told us the other night that he was in favour, after you got the Hudson Bay railway down to Port Nelson or Fort Churchill of building another railway further north than the Grand Trunk Pacific, going down to Labrador, and having connection form there to England. So I say that all the evidence points to the fact that we did not start a moment too soon. I had some doubts at one time as to the attitude of the leader of the government on this question, but in the discussion which we had in the House I think two years ago, he said he was not one of those who agreed with the member for East Toronto. I was glad to know that my right hon. friend at that time took the position that he was in favour of the construction of the road from Winnipeg to Quebec. Now we all entered upon that project. Almost every one in Canada came to the conclusion that this railway was a necessity, and everybody agrees to-day that it was not started a minute too soon. Look at the clamour that comes from that western land with 400,000,000 bushels of grain waiting for transport. My hon. friend from East Toronto who did not want this railway built to Quebec in 1903, complains to-day because it is not built fast enough. So I say the policy of the government in 1903 has been amply justified. Everybody in Canada at that time, and ever since, has taken it for granted that the National Transcontinental railway was a necessity, and has not been started a moment too soon. Yet here to-day, when hon. gentlemen get into power, they proceed to change this commission and dismiss three of the commissioners, and they propose to run this whole thing with one commissioner. They start in a peculiar manner with regard to it. After they have decided upon doing away with three commissioners, they proceed in an illegal way to appoint an assistant chairman.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will satisfy my hon. friend that I am right. The powers of the government in regard to appointing officials in connection with this railway are limited. The National Transcontinental Commission is a statutory body, it has no inherent rights except what the statute confers upon it. It has no authority except what parliament gives it. In the Act of 1903, parliament definitely laid down the relative powers, both of the government and the commission. Let us see what section 9 of the Act says:

> The construction of the eastern division and the operation thereof until completed and leased to the company pursuant to the provisions of the agreement shall be under the charge and control of three commissioners, to be appointed by the Governor in Council, who shall hold office during pleasure, and who, and whose successors in office, shall be a body corporate under the name of 'The Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway' and are hereinafter called 'The Commissioners'.

They were made a body corporate, and were given certain powers. The Governors in Council were empowered to appoint certain people under section 10:

> The Governor in Council may appoint a secretary to the commissioners, who shall hold office during pleasure, and may also appoint a chief engineer for the eastern division, who shall hold office during pleasure, and who, under the instructions of the commissioners and subject to the provisions of the agreement, shall have the general superintendence of the construction of the eastern division.

So that the powers of the government were exhausted when they appointed the commissioners, the secretary and the chief engineer. The following year, 1904, the act was amended so as to give power to appoint a fourth commissioner, but these were all the appointments the government had any right to make. Section 11 goes on:

> The commissioners may appoint and employ such engineers . . . and such surveyors and other officers, and also such servants, agents and workmen as in their discretion they deem necessary and proper for the execution of the powers and duties vested in them under this Act.

It is quite evident that the appointing power of the government was exhausted when they made the appointment to which I have referred. What were the circumstances? The gentlemen who composed the commission are still commissioners, my hon. friend has not accepted the resignations. If there were no commissioners the

whole procedure in connection with the Transcontinental Railway Commission would be tied up, because Mr. Leonard, who was appointed in Mr. Parent's place, would not be able to act, you must have a quorum of the commissioners in order to have legal action. But that is not the way in which it was done. My hon. friend told us how it was done. Mr. Leonard comes to my hon. friend and my hon. friend puts through an order in council and appoints a gentleman vice-chairman, a new office, not provided for in the Act or contemplated in the organization of the board. Mr. Macpherson, who was assistant to the chief engineer, the salary of the chief engineer being $5,000, was illegally and improperly made vice-chairman at a salary of $7,500. They gave him $2,500 more than is paid to the chief engineer of the road, who, under the Act, is the one man on whom responsibility for the carrying into effect of the enterprise rests.

Mr. BORDEN. When was he appointed vice-chairman?

Mr. MACDONALD. I am speaking of the statement made by the Minister of Railways. He said:

The hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) wanted a copy of the order in council. I have a copy of it here. I may say that I find that there was a mistake in that, in the statement that it was recommended by the commission instead of by the chairman of the commission. But I took the matter up with the chairman, and he informed me that his law clerk had advised him that he had a right to do what he had done, and that the matter was brought before the commission, and Mr. McIsaac, one of the commissioners, thought that he was acting within his jurisdiction in appointing Mr. Macpherson. I also wish to say that I was misinformed, and misinformed the House, when I said that Mr. Macpherson's salary had not been increased. I am informed that it has been increased.

Mr. KYTE. What is Mr. Macpherson's salary at the present time?

Mr. COCHRANE. $7,500.

Mr. KYTE. What was it before?

Mr. COCHRANE. $5,000, I think.

The result is the expression 'vice-chairman' was used by the minister.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh no, I said assistant to the chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD. If that gives any satisfaction to the minister he is welcome to it. There is no power to appoint an assistant to the chief commissioner. There are four commissioners, this Bill proposes to wipe them out and make just one commissioner. It does not say anything about an assistant chairman.

Mr. BORDEN. It does not say assistant chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Assistant to the chairman. If there is to be an assistant to the chairman he should be appointed by the commission, clearly so under the law and the commission have not appointed him. But in some way or other the Minister of Railways, who is going to economize and build the railway more cheaply, at the very inception takes a subordinate from under the chief engineer, appoints him assistant to the chairman, and gives him $2,500 more than before, when under the law he has no right to do so. I warn the minister that he will not go very far until he finds some of the acute critics who are versed in all these matters in connection with National Transcontinental railway expenditures, and who sit not far from him, will find that he is inaugurating an expenditure which he has no justification for making. The result of the action of the minister is that instead of doing away with the four commissioners he will still have two commissioners, as he is giving the assistant to the chairman the salary of one of the old commissioners. The minister has acted entirely without warrant or authority.

A word or two in regard to my hon. friend's estimate. Hon. gentlemen will notice that the minister has made some curious estimates here. He says that 72·86 per cent of the whole road is completed. He says that there has already been expended $7,681,700, in engineering expenses. That means that all the location surveys, the preliminary surveys from end to end of the country have been made, and that you have 76 per cent of the road constructed; and yet my hon. friend proposes to spend $3,850,000 more in surveys. How does he work that out in proportion? I have not made an estimate, but any gentleman can figure the proportion.

Engineering and expenses up to date, are set down at $7,681,700, and the minister says that he contemplated this charge will amount to $3,850,000 more, so that I should think some details of that ought to be given.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, that is the statement signed by the engineer.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, the minister is responsible and not the engineer and it is the minister who should give the information to this House, by which it may be guided. The minister comes to this House asking us to pass legislation on the basis of certain information he has given, and I say that it is for him to give us some explanation of that exorbitant estimate of $3,800,000 for engineering expenses yet to be incurred. Now, under 'headquarters, salaries and expenses,' the total expense to date since the initiation of the work, is given at $1,732,900, and notwithstanding that only twenty-four per

cent of the road remains to be completed, we are told that the expenses of the headquarters staff will amount to, for the future, $1,267,000. Surely we are entitled to some explanation as to how the minister and his engineers have arrived at that estimate. In the past, we have had four commissioners, and although the minister is dispensing with the services of threc of them, and although, according to the rule of proportion, the expenses at headquarters should only be one-half million dollars for the balance of the road, the minister tells us that it will amount to $1,267,000. Surely parliament must have some explanation as to that. Then again, with seventy-six per cent. of the road completed, the minister gives us an estimate that it will cost $2,231,000 for right of way.

Mr. COCHRANE. Scarcely any of the right of way is paid for.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, that is the information we want, that is what we want put on the table of the House.

Mr. COCHRANE. You have the figures here.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes, but when the minister comes down with a general statement, showing that the road is supposed to cost $130,000 per mile, surely we must know what the basis of the calculation is. Now, finally, I wish to say that if the present government is not satisfied with the railway as constructed to-day at a cost of $56,000 per mile, the whole thing is in their own hands for the future. From this day on, the Minister of Railways and his commission have to check every dollar of the expenditure; no contractor can get one dollar for any earth he may turn or stone he may blast out, until those now in charge of construction, sign the figures. They can decide what the grades and the curvatures will be, and what the weights of the rails and what kind of bridges will be constructed, and if the balance of the road costs more than $56,000 per mile, it is they, and they alone, who will be responsible for it. It is the duty of the minister to explain these anomalies which I have pointed out, and I submit that the history of this transaction will be that the men who have had charge of this matter for the late government were men who did the work honestly, with capacity, and with integrity, and their work will stand. We will be ready to compare the result of their efforts with those of the gentlemen who have succeeded them as appointees of this government.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially my genial and plausible friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), are disposed to treat this matter with a very light touch, but I can assure them that the people of Canada are not disposed to take that view of it. On the late government, and on hon. gentlemen must be the full responsibility for this miscalculation.

Mr. MACDONALD. What miscalculation?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The miscalculation in the estimated cost of the building of this railway—the miscalculation between $13,000,000 of interest computed by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the $60,000,000 of interest as shown by the estimate of the Minister of Railways, and the miscalculation between the $54,000,000 estimated as the actual cost of constructoin by the former Minister of Finance, and the appalling figure of $236,000,000, which is found to be the probable actual cost. The responsibility for these miscalculations must be assumed by the late government before the people of Canada. There is no use blinking the facts; we must look them straight in the face.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Where is the estimate of $250,000,000?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The amount I referred to was the $236,000,000 brought down by the Minister of Railways as the total cost of this railway, before the Grand Trunk Pacific Company enters upon the lease, and I think I will be able to satisfy my hon. friend that that estimate is correct. I have no desire to discuss this from a political point of view, but, as I have said before, there is no use blinking the facts. It is my opinion that we will discuss no question in this parliament, having regard either to the large amount of money involved or to the future consequences, which will compare in importance with the question of these figures which we have been discussing in connection with the National Transcontinental railway. I make no charges against the Transcontinental Commissioners, but I do say that there have been rumours of misapplication of moneys, and I do say that the people believe that a great deal of money has been misapplied.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Where?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). In connection with the construction of the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Who made the charges ?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It has been charged by some of the engineers, and I say that the people of this country suspect that there has been misapplication of money.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Who suspects that?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Does not my hon. friend keep in touch with public opinion. I make no charge against the commissioners, but I do say that the increase from $13,000,000 interest, as estimated by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to the $60,000,000 estimated by the Minister of Railways, and the difference between the $54,000,000 estimated by Mr. Fielding as the total cost of construction, and the $236,000,000 now shown to be the probable cost, these vast differences form ground for a prima facie case against the late government and against the Transcontinental Railway Commission, which they must explain away. Let us review the situation with deliberation. This agreement was entered into in 1903, and 1904, so that the National Transcontinental railway has been under construction for a period of eight or nine years. Now, I propose to consider for a moment the question of miscalculation in estimates.

Mr. MACDONALD.—Who made it? Mr. Schrieber.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Do not interrupt.

Mr. MACDONALD. You start on the wrong premises.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Wait till I get through. The right hon. leader of the opposition, then the leader of the government, is reported in 'Hansard' as follows:

When completed, the company will lease the road and will pay to us a rental at the rate of three per cent per annum upon the cost of construction, whatever that may be. The same abatement of rent is provided also as in the case of the western section. During seven years the company will be exempt from the payment of rent. For three years the company will be bound to pay the revenues and tolls of the road if they amount to three per cent; and if they fail to amount to three per cent, then the difference between the revenues gathered and the three per cent will be capitalized and added to the cost of construction, and the company will pay interest upon it. So that here again the whole of the liability which is incurred by the government for the building of that section from Moncton to Winnipeg is simply seven years of interest. The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, and not a cent more. Now, Sir, what is $13,000,000 in the year 1903? It is about the surplus of our revenue over the expenditure. The surplus for this year will pay for the construction of this road.

Now, I do not for a moment say, although these words might reasonably give that impression, especially to the public, that the entire cost of this road was estimated by the leader of the late government at $13,000,000. What he had in mind, I believe, was this, that the interest charge during the 7 years of operation by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, during which they were to pay no rental, together with some interest charges which he had in mind, would amount possibly to $13,000,000. What are the facts? The fact according to the estimates of the hon. gentleman from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), based on the figures given by the hon. Minister of Railways is that the cost to this country will be $60,000,000, or five times the cost estimated by the late government. Is that a matter to be treated lightly, as hon. gentlemen opposite have treated it—an estimate falling short of the actual interest $47,000,000? I say there has not been as great a blunder made in estimating in this country since Confederation as that made of the cost of this National Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to Moncton. Take the actual cost. It was shown by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) that my predecessor estimated the cost from Winnipeg to Moncton at $54,000,000. It will not do to say that the government engineer estimated it at $51,000,000 or $52,000,000. In approaching an estimate of this kind it is not wise to go it blind. The government should have informed themselves more fully as to the character of the country through which this road would pass, both from the standpoint of the cost of construction and the standpoint of the traffic which the road would derive when completed. But apparently no investigation of any kind was made; at all events, if it was, it must have been of the most superficial kind, having regard to the result. Now, what is the result? My predecessor estimated $54,000,000, as the cost, or $28,000 a mile from Winnipeg to Quebec and $25,000, per mile from Quebec to Moncton. That is specific; there are his figures. It was upon that understanding that the government entered upon the construction of this line. That is the estimate for which the late government must take full responsibility; and what is the outcome? The outcome is that instead of a cost of $54,000,000 from Winnipeg to Moncton, and instead of $28,000 and $25,000 per mile respectively, we have a total cost of $236,000,000, including interest, equal to two-thirds of the net national debt of Canada, and no less than $130,000 per mile. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say, well, we must build the line, and apparently from their arguments this afternoon, it was not of the slightest consequence what the cost would be, because the Grand Trunk Pacific Company must enter on the lease, but it is of the greatest possible consequence, because in the first place no railway can afford to pay a rental beyond a certain amount, I do not care how strong it is; and the first question that arises in this

case is, can the company afford to pay three per cent on the cost of that line, amounting to over $200,000,000, after the first seven years of operation? Now, what does that amount to? It amounts to no less than $6,000,000 a year—no less than $20,000 a day of rental to meet the $6,000,000 of fixed charges; and that is over and above the operating expenses. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when in the government, had the idea that this road would reduce freight rates. What is there by way of traffic on that line? It runs through hundreds of miles of desolate wilderness, which will afford no local traffic. What about return freights? The grades are all right, they say; they will bring down trains laden with grain from the west. But what goes back? What hope is there of reducing freight rates in this country, with a fixed charge of $6,000,000 between Winnipeg and Moncton? These are considerations which have been overlooked by hon. gentlemen opposite. Their argument this afternoon proceeded coolly on the assumption that it did not make any difference if the road cost $500,000,000 or a $1,000,000,000, because the Grand Trunk Pacific Company would pay three per cent of the cost. But I want to tell them that every dollar of the $113,853,000 that has been paid out and of the balance of $57,873,000 still to be paid, represents cash to be paid by the people of the Dominion of Canada. There is no blinking that fact. When the leader of the late government estimated $13,000,000 of interest as the entire cost of this line to the people of Canada, what had he in mind? He had this in mind, and no doubt it was logical, that the road when constructed would be operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company on a payment of three per cent on the cost, and that this would carry all the interest on the money which the government would borrow for the purpose of constructing the road, and he estimated that the only thing the country would have to bear would be the $13,000,000. But he had not the slightest conception at the time of the colossal cost of this road as it was ultimately worked out.

Now let us take the western situation, and there you will find miscalculation all along the line, although I believe absolutely in the west and I think I have more confidence in it than some of its representatives here, but I will dwell on that a little later. Take the prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and it will cost $40,000 a mile. Take the mountain section of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and it will probably cost $70,000 a mile. Now take it from the standpoint of freight rates. If there was anything which justified the late government in going into the construction of a line such as the National Transcontinental railway it was for the purpose of regulating the freight rates of the country, of having a line which would regulate them, because there is a clause in the agreement under which the rates are to be arranged subject to revision by the government. Now under the circumstances mentioned what chance is there for a reduction of freight rates? Is there a man on either side of this House who will state that the freight rates can be reduced by reason of the construction of a National Transcontinental on the figures that have been produced here by my friend the Minister of Railways? I doubt very much if there is any man who has the temerity to suggest any such thing. Even supposing, there is a clay belt to be settled north of the line and industries to be developed, what practical use so far as local traffic is concerned can be made of the line for years to come from Moncton to Winnipeg? These are some considerations worthy of attention. Supposing the line were completed from Moncton to Winnipeg, what would it be worth without the lease? A line isolated, hung in the air so to speak, without connections? The Grand Trunk Pacific at the time they entered into the agreement for the construction of that line on the estimate of the government contemplated the payment of 3 per cent of the cost of construction which the late Finance Minister estimated at $54,000,000 a year but which has now been shown to amount to no less a sum than $200,000,000, or as I have said $6,000,000 in interest a year. Now when we come to the question of the physical condition of the line all this argument is absolutely relevant to the matter of the commission. I say that the commission had the construction of this line under their charge and under their direction and I say that if that construction has not gone forward intelligently, if that construction has not been carried on as it should have been carried on according to the best opinion in this country, then I think the responsibility must rest upon the late government. The hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) called attention to the fact that there were certain anomalies in the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. If you look at the statement of items 'National Transcontinental Railway, Eastern Division Road' you will find the 'Grading, contract items, including peering, excavation, culverts, substructures of bridges, track laying, ballasting, etc., value of work done to December 31, 1911, $79,368,700, and value of work required to complete $13,510,300.' If you look down further you will find: 'Buildings, including stations, section and tool houses, and divisional point buildings, value of work required to complete $3,971,780.' That is where the heavy cost is coming in, not in connection with the grading and track

laying that has been completed according to the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) to the percentage mentioned. Then a little further down you will find a large item $9,051,500. What is that for? 'Terminals at Quebec and line from Quebec bridge to Quebec city. Value of work required to complete $9,051,500.' If you will look at the two columns you will see that a large expenditure has not yet been made upon a number of the items set forth there. You will notice that there is a very heavy expenditure still to be made, so that there is nothing anomalous in my hon. friend's statement. Referring again to the physical condition of that railway, I say that here the late government in my opinion, and the late commission also are responsible, notwithstanding what my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) has said about that. What is the condition of the line from Mountain to Levis? It is very nearly completed we are told, but of what use is it in that unfinished state? Interest is running upon the cost of it. How long will it be before the line is completed so as to be able to take out grain from the west? My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) smiles at that. He is very much interested in the western situation as we all are. Why is it that grain is not coming down from the west to Cochrane now, and then over the Grand Trunk railway to Toronto, why is it the line is not completed to Cochrane, when the line from Levis to Moncton is practically completed? Hon. gentlemen opposite have been rising in their places and blaming the government for the present situation in the west. I want to tell them that the late government, and the late commission appear to be more blameable than any one else for the present condition of affairs in Canada. There is only one railway line running out to-day from Port Arthur and that is the Canadian Pacific railway line.

Mr. COCHRANE. And the road from Port Arthur to Winnipeg is not completed yet.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That section is not yet completed, but as I say there is only one line running out to-day from Port Arthur. You may have as many lines running down to Fort William as you like. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) mentioned the line running down from Superior to Fort William. I do not care if you had ten lines running down there instead of one. That does not help the western situation to-day a bit because there is only one line out from Port Arthur and that is the Canadian Pacific railway line.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). What about the Canadian Northern?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It is not yet constructed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Does my hon. friend say there is not a line running from Port Arthur to Winnipeg?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). But east of Port Arthur there is only one line. Remember it is eight or nine years since this contract was entered into, nine years to complete the line to Cochrane, and it is not completed yet, and my hon. friend says it will not be completed for two years. Now who is to blame for the fact that the western grain cannot be moved to the east? Who is to blame for the lack of cars and for all the congestion that we hear of almost daily from hon. members from the west? When the late government were in power did my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) opposite ever rise in his place and tell the government that the line to Cochrane was not completed, and should be rushed no matter what the expenditure might be, in order that the grain might be moved from the east and double the railway facilities from the west? I never heard of it. And my eloquent friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)—I am sorry he is not here to-night, because I think I can place the blame where it belongs—did he ever rise at any time and ask whether means were being taken to double the railway facilities of the west by constructing the line to Cochrane? Not at all. That cannot be gainsaid or denied. What about the line to Superior? The line to Superior even was a year late. The Grand Trunk Pacific railway has been operating its Prairie section for two years. The first year they were unable to take out grain from the west. Why? Because the line from Winnipeg to Superior was uncompleted.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows very well that he is unfair in making a comparison with the prairie section.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am not unfair. My hon. friend is not the fairest person in the world himself. My hon. friend says I am comparing the construction of a line between Winnipeg and Superior, with the prairie section. My hon. friend is overlooking this fact, which I have made the basis of my argument: the late government had eight years in which to construct this railway and what have we got to-day? Why it is like starting to build a house by constructing the chimney instead of excavating and building the basement. You were a year late in getting to Superior, and you are three years late—because it will take a year and a half or two years to complete it, between Superior and Cochrane—in getting to Cochrane. Now I ask when we hear about this grain blockade in the west, and about this congestion of cars in the west, upon whose

shoulders is the blame to rest? Let us be fair in this matter; all we want is fair play. The government has been in power since October 6, and almost daily since the House began its sittings, remarks have been made about our preventing the grain getting out from the west. I do not intend to allow this matter to remain there, but every time I hear this complaint I shall place the blame where it belongs.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend seriously pretend that the congestion in the northwest to-day is due to the fact that the road between Superior Junction and Cochrane is not completed? Is he serious in that?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes. My hon. friend does not understand the situation.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Are not the elevators full?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Of course they are full. I thought I had made this matter plain, but apparently I did not. I say, if you had ten lines going to Fort William in winter after the close of navigation, and only one line out from Fort William east, how great is the capacity of your railway? Just as great as that of one line, and no greater. If you have two lines, you double the capacity. One of the greatest complaints of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I think it is one they will not be slow to urge, is that the government has not finished the line between Winnipeg and Cochrane so that they could get the advantage of it. You have the prairie section in operation for two years and only getting down to Fort William last year. So much for the physical condition, except this: First, we have the line from Moncton to Lévis almost completed. But what about the Quebec bridge? Where is it? It is in the river. I do not intend to place the responsibility for the fall of the Quebec bridge; unavoidable accidents sometimes happen. I do not propose to apportion the responsibility for that.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Then why do you mention it?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Because I want to show the situation.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman pretend to argue the condition of the Quebec bridge as a justification for the reduction of the commission?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I was answering arguments that are brought forward on the other side. And what I say is strictly relevant. I am not wandering one whit further afield than did the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). I am dealing with the situation of this road. We have heard of the great advantages of the road in the west. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) told us how it was taking out the grain, and others have told us how it was relieving the situation. I am merely meeting these arguments, and what I say is relevant and pertinent to the issue. I am fairly criticising the commission. I have not charged anything against them, but I am fairly criticising them by pointing out the physical condition of the line, and showing the nature of the construction east of Winnipeg. If the commissioners have constructed the line between wrong points or have gone on first with parts of the line which should not have been constructed first, they are fairly open to criticism. Now, the Quebec bridge—I was taking that up when I was interrupted by the hon. member for Halifax—from Moncton to Lévis the road is almost completed. But, of what use is it to the country? And as to the Quebec bridge, I was only narrating when interrupted by my hon. friend——

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I am glad to hear that.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I was merely setting forth the historical fact that the Quebec bridge is now in the St. Lawrence. How many years will it be before the Quebec bridge will be capable of forming the last link in the chain between Winnipeg and Moncton? The people have a rough way of adjudicating upon these matters. They judge largely upon results; and if this line has not been completed, either through the fault of the Quebec bridge or for any other reason, they are apt to visit the blame upon the government during whose term this all occurred. I am not going into the question of what responsibility attaches through the falling of the bridge. I am merely stating the situation —and there is the situation. Then, we have the remainder of the road finished or nearly completed, as shown by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane). He estimates that the road should be finished by the 1st of January, 1914——

Mr. COCHRANE. The Quebec bridge in 1917.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes, 1917 for the Quebec bridge, and 1914, or two years hence, for the railway. Eight years since the beginning, plus two years more to the finish, makes ten years—ten years for the construction of this line before it is in a position to haul out grain from the west.

The considerations that I have mentioned, I think, are of the greatest possible importance, and I think that they are absolutely relevant to this discussion. Now, what is our position as a government? Our position is that we have fallen heir to this National Transcontinental as a heritage. A damnosa hereditas, or, I would rather call it a hereditas damnosa; I think that is a little better Latin—but either will

do; and at all events that is our heritage. On this side of the House we are patriots and Canadians before we are partisans; and there is not a man on this side who does not want to prosecute this enterprise with the greatest vigour and carry it through to completion. The cry was raised during the elections before the last, 'Let Laurier finish his work.' We will have to finish this work, and we will finish it well. I hope that the end of the National Transcontinental will be better than its beginning; and I know that the Minister of Railways will carry this enterprise to completion more economically than the work hitherto has been carried on.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The minister himself does not seem to think so judging by his estimates.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Let my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) consider what the completion of a railway means. You may have a railway with a part of its right-of-way not paid for, and yet complete in a physical sense. You have telegraph lines, stations, round-houses and other such things to provide. The heavy expense comes in connection with these matters, and must be considered when looking at the road from a physical standpoint.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. White, Leeds) agree that it is good policy to continue the construction of the road with 4-10 per cent grade? Let us have an answer to that?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We have inherited a situation. When gentlemen have gone ahead and spent $113,000,000 on construction, and have completed the line at different points, it would not be possible to change the grades even if we wanted to. But more than that: My hon. friend is a good lawyer, yet he has overlooked one thing, and that is that there is an agreement between this country and the Grand Trunk railway as to the standard of construction. The question arises, how far can we change that situation? But all that does not alter the fact that these hon. gentlemen opposite estimated this road at only one-fifth of what it has actually cost. That is the great outstanding fact and you cannot forget it nor gloss it over. But it is what they are trying to do—gloss it over. Thirteen millions as against sixty millions; fifty-four millions as against two hundred and thirty-six millions,—how are you going to get away from the logic of these facts?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). The hon. gentleman (Mr. White, Leeds) agrees that it is a good policy to build with grades of 4-10 per cent, and will continue that policy?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). There is not a man on this side, from the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) down, on his side—and they are down so far as we are concerned—nor on this side of the House either, who would have voted for the National Transcontinental railway if he had known that these figures would be brought down eight years after that agreement was made. I say, where is there a man on either side of this House who would have voted for the National Transcontinental railway if they had known that these figures would be brought down here eight years afterwards? That is why I say that there is nothing we are going to deal with in this parliament that has anything like the importance of this question.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The country does not think so.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The country does think so, and the country is shocked at these figures. Why, Sir, even our hon. friends opposite do not realize what these figures mean—$6,000,000 interest on the line from Winnipeg to Moncton in one year. Now what is our duty? There is not a man on this side of the House that does not want to see the Grand Trunk Pacific railway made a success, that does not want to see it completed through to Prince Rupert, that does not want to see it carried to completion from Moncton to Winnipeg. They know that the country can stand the cost. I want to say this, that the most gratifying feature in this whole matter is that the surplus revenues of this country in the past have been such as to liquidate so large a percentage of the capital cost of that railway. I say that is a most gratifying fact; because I am a patriotic Canadian, I am not a partisan, and I acknowledge the great prosperity of this country during the regime of the late government. Therefore I say there is not the slightest fear for the future. I say, without anticipating the Budget, that we will be able to write off almost the entire expenditure on the National Transcontinental railway for this year, I look forward with faith to the future, and I want honestly and in good faith to carry out this enterprise to completion.

Now the increase in our national debt. Our national debt is of comparative insignificance, having regard to our resources, $340,000,000, not a large national debt. So I say, speaking as the minister responsible for the finances of Canada, that notwithstanding this expenditure, of which a great part has already been liquidated by our surplus revenue, I look forward without the slightest apprehension from the financial standpoint. It is only proper that I should say this, while we are justly criticising the miscalculation made by our predecessors, and when we are

meeting their arguments, or their censures, against us in regard to the existing western situation. I think I may rightly traverse their arguments by presenting the other side. At the same time I am free to say that notwithstanding the enormous expense the position of this country is such that we will be able to carry the work through to completion. I have the greatest possible faith in the west. There is no man in this House who is more interested in the west than I am, I claim to be as well acquainted with it as any eastern man can be. I say that our western friends from Alberta and Saskatchewan are continually misrepresenting that country in this House. You have the province of Saskatchewan, probably five per cent under cultivation, and ninety-five per cent still to be cultivated; you have the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba capable of immense development, and of sustaining populations in comfort many times the population they have at the present time. I look forward without the slightest apprehension to the western situation. The Grand Trunk Pacific, and the other lines will take care of themselves. What we want in the west, and what this government stands for, is to give additional spouts to that country, and as many as we can. The Grand Trunk Pacific is pushing through to Prince Rupert, the Canadian Northern railway is running another line to Vancouver, and this government stands pledged to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, another spout to the north; and the Minister of Railways will urge the construction forward of a line between Superior and Cochrane as vigorously as he can, no matter what the expense may be, in order that that link may be completed at the earliest possible moment. Now, with these spouts, two more to the west, one north to Hudson bay, and one east to Cochrane down by the Grand Trunk Pacific to the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario to Toronto, then with Mackenzie and Mann constructing the Canadian Northern railway and Ontario east from Port Arthur duplicating the line of the Canadian Pacific railway east to Port Arthur, we have all these additional spouts.

Mr. SINCLAIR. When does the hon. gentleman expect the spout to Hudson bay to be completed?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Just as quickly as we can complete it. Give us the eight years time that you had from Winnipeg to Cochrane, and the Hudson Bay road will be completed.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). When will that road of the Minister of Railways be completed to Labrador?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We are all optimists here, it is only the hon. gentlemen in opposition who are pessimists. When I was in the west I saw this sign in half-a-dozen hotels, 'If you can't boost don't knock'; and I have heard more knocking of the west from the western members in this House since I came here than I ever heard before. Why, it will take a hundred immigration agents to repair all the damage that has been done by the talk of western members since this session began. What is the situation this year? It is an extraordinary situation, as we all know, a wet year, and a late harvest. We know what the climatic conditions were, and the enormous strain placed upon the railways. The situation is extraordinary, it is not normal. Is it fair therefore to dwell upon such a situation and take so gloomy a view of it as our hon. friends opposite are doing? I say they do not fairly represent the west. The west is the land of invincible optimism, the people of the west are the most courageous in Canada, and they are confronting the situation bravely indeed. They know the climatic conditions are responsible for the situation, they know the congested situation west from Fort William, and still they believe thoroughly in their country. Notwithstanding what has been said by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) as to how many bushels of grain it costs to buy an agricultural implement on this side of the line as compared with the cost on the other side of the line, notwithstanding all that, what are the facts? There must be some permanent attraction in that great country that draws the people from the republic to the south to come in and take up their homes in that land. What happened last year? Notwithstanding all these gloomy pictures that have been drawn by the hon. member for Edmonton and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) what happened last year? 130,000 immigrants came in from the United States to make their homes in the Canadian west, to settle upon the soil of the great west. They get the advantage of cheaper land, and of better land, and they have continued to come, and will continue to come notwithstanding the pessimistic talk we hear from hon. gentlemen opposite who misrepresent the west. The western representatives will be looked upon as Jeremiahs if they keep on much longer. But the western people do not want Jeremiahs to represent them, they are optimistic, they are men of the greatest possible courage. Next year they will get a good crop, their harvest will come in earlier, and I hope that the conditions of last year will not be repeated for many a long year to come. The railways will be able to take care of the situation better, and hope will again smile

on that great land. I mention these facts to show that our railway systems in the west will be profitable enterprises. There will yet be mixed farming in the west, there will yet be great manufacturers, so I have no fear at all with regard to the railway situation in the west. Those are my views with regard to the west, and with regard to these items of expenditure which the Minister of Railways has brought down to the House.

The late government cannot escape responsibility for this situation, they cannot gloss it over. It cannot be minimized, it was a miscalculation, one of the grossest miscalculations that has ever occurred in this country since Confederation. What the consequences will be, whether, as the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) has said, this government may yet have to assume a part of this responsibility, I shall not venture to prophesy. But you cannot escape two facts, that $13,000,000 estimated by the late Prime Minister as interest, and I must do him the justice to say that he never estimated it as anything else, has grown to $60,000,000 and the $54,000,000 estimated by my predecessor, I have no doubt in all good faith, $28,000 per mile from Winnipeg to Quebec, and $25,000 a mile from Levis to Moncton has now grown into $236,000,000, nearly five times as much and equal to $130,000 per mile. I say that whatever the significance of these figures may be, whatever may be the consequence of that calculation, the responsibility must rest not on the government that finished it, but on the government that started it, that conceived the project and carried it through almost to completion before we came into power.

Mr. CARVELL. Mr. Chairman, rarely have I listened to such a pessimistic speech from a gentleman who claims to be an optimist as we have heard this evening. My hon. friend has devoted pretty nearly one half of his very earnest appeal to the people of this country to an effort to convince them that this road will cost $130,000 a mile, and that the late government should be censured for that condition of affairs. My hon. friend knows that is not the case at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order !

Mr. CARVELL. He knows that the road will only cost $90,000 a mile.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order !

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friends need not get fussy about " order, " I shall not make any statement to which the Minister of Finance could object because he knows the figures as well as I do. So the lesser lights may wait until he objects. I do not want to be unkind enough to ask my hon. friend if he knew anything about this condition of affairs which he so laments to-night when he was supporting the Liberal party. I shall be charitable enough to say that he did not, but that is his misfortune because all these facts have been patent to the people of Canada ever since the construction of the road commenced. Year after year the engineers handed in reports to parliament, and as late as 1908 absolute facts were given the public and the people knew exactly what the road had cost to that date. The leader of the government of that time stated that the road would cost $60,000 or $70,000 a mile and it has been stated time and time again that that would be the cost. I do not mean the cost of the road with the interest added. These Commissioners are being fired from office, according to the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) and the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) because, owing to their lack of business knowledge, this road is going to cost $130,000 a mile, when, according to the figures of the Minister of Railways, as far as the commissioners are concerned, the road will cost less than $90,000 a mile.

Mr. WHITE. (Leeds). Does my hon. friend know what cost of construction includes under this agreement ?

Mr. CARVELL. I think so.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Does it include interest?

Mr. CARVELL. Under the agreement seven years' interest will be added to the cost of construction for the purpose of paying interest, but these commissioners are not responsible for that.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I did not say they were.

Mr. CARVELL. That is the inference from the statement of the hon. gentleman, that is the statement of the hon. member for St. Antoine, of the hon. member for East Toronto, to-night. These commissioners have nothing to do with the interest, they are simply the medium through which this road is being constructed.

I want to congratulate the Minister of Finance on one point. He is the first hon. gentleman on the Conservative side of the House who has been fair enough to admit that when the late Finance Minister made the statement about the $13,000,000 he was talking about the interest the country would have to pay and not the cost of the road.

Mr. LENNOX. I would remind my hon. friend that on two occasions at least I distinctly called attention to the fact that I understood the Prime Minister to be re-

ferring to what it would actually cost the country in outlay which it would not get back.

Mr. CARVELL. I shall have to accept the statement of my hon. friend but I could not have been in the House at the time he made the statements. It has been reported from end to end of Canada that this road would cost $13,000,000 only.

Mr. BLAIN. Did my hon. friend hear the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) make exactly the same statement as is made by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) this evening?

Mr. CARVELL. I was talking about members on the Conservative side of the House, my friends from Peel and from Simcoe and the others have stated in the House and it has been taken up by every Conservative almost in Canada, that Mr. Fielding said this road would cost only $13,000,000.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. When the hon. member says that the member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) on any occasion either in the House or out of it alleged that the late Prime Minister said that this road would only cost $13,000,000 he is making inadvertently a mistatement. I never said so inside or outside the House.

Mr. CARVELL. I had accepted my hon. friend's statement, he need not get nervous. I am glad the Minister of Finance has forced these gentlemen to come out in the open and make the statement that they did not mean that we said that this road would cost $13,000,000. What Mr. Fielding said was that as he figured it the interest charges would be $13,000,000. Mr. Fielding was in error, there is no question about that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friends say 'hear, hear'. I would like to know if Mr. Fielding was the first public man who was ever guilty of an error of judgment in discussing a great public work. Any hon. gentleman who has ever built himself a house knows that the cost exceeded the estimate of his architect. Have they ever heard of a public work that did not cost more than they figured? But my hon. friends say it costs too much more. Let us take the conditions at the time the statement was made. It was made in 1903. No surveys had been made, no expert information had been obtained. The government took the statement of Mr. Schreiber, then deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. Mr. Schreiber told them that in his opinion the road could be built for about $30-000 a mile. It happens that Mr. Schreiber was wrong. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) complains of the delay and says that after nine years this road is not completed. The legislation for the road was not passed until late in 1904. The elections were held that autumn, the actual work of surveying did not commence until 1905, and I think the first contract was not let until 1906. According to my recollection work was done on only a small proportion of the line until 1907. The Minister of Finance (Mr. White) complains that we commenced at the wrong end of the road. Take the physical conditions of the country and see where you would commence to build the road. They commenced building at Moncton, at Edmundston in New Brunswick, at Chipman, at Plaster Rock, at Levis, at Cochrane and at Fort William. They commenced building this road at every point at which a railway crossed or intersected the proposed line of the National Transcontinental railway.

Now, it is about five hundred miles from Cochrane to Fort William and the government, in calling for tenders had stated that the contractors would have to push into the forest two hundred and fifty miles each way from lines of communication, the Minister of Railways knows very well that the schedule rates of the prices in the tender would have gone up fifty per cent. aye yes, or even one hundred per cent. The government took the ordinary reasonable course and they called for tenders giving a fair time in which to build the road. Hon. gentlemen opposite have complained that the road will be completed in New Brunswick first, but they must remember that the contracts for the New Brunswick portion of the line had been all let in 1906 before the unfortunate accident to the Quebec bridge, and at that time, it was believed that the St. Lawrence river would be spanned before the year 1912. The contractors had their plant on the ground in New Brunswick, and they were doing the work, and if they had been called off the damages against the government would have been enormous. It is always easy for people to be wise after the event, and to-night the Minister of Finance comes here and finds fault with the late government for not doing things which, in the light of past events, he thinks, should have been done, but I can tell him that were he face with the conditions of affairs which existed in 1905, 1906 and 1907, he would not have taken any different action from that which the government of the day took. As to the estimated cost, it is true that the rule was laid down in the Statute that the Transcontinental railway should be up to the general standard of the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Toronto, and we all know that the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Toronto is a water level road all the way. Of course, it goes without saying, that

man could tell what would be the cost of building a road of that character through a country such as the Grand Trunk Pacific traverses, until he had the actual experience of building the road. Now, these gentlemen opposite know Mr. Schreiber better than I do; many of them have known him all their lives, and they must know that had Mr. Schreiber the faintest idea that we were going to build a road with a four-tenths grade from Winnipeg to Quebec, through the country traversed by the Grand Trunk Pacific, Mr. Schreiber would never for a moment, have said that such a road could be built for anything like $30,000 a mile. Well, the road has been built and it has cost more than Mr. Fielding or Sir Wilfrid Laurier, or any man in this House, believed it would cost. The figures given by the Minister of Railways on Wednesday night show that the road, when completed, so far as the actual construction of the road is concerned, will cost $171,725,000, which, divided by 1,803 miles, represents $95,000 a mile.

Mr. BORDEN. That does not include interest.

Mr. CARVELL. No, that is for the construction of the road proper. I admit we have to pay interest.

Mr. COCHRANE. And under the contract they are to add the interest for seven years.

Mr. CARVELL. I appreciate that.

Mr. COCHRANE. And that adds to the cost of the road.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, so far as interest is concerned, and, therefore, the road if it be a success must pay interest on the interest as well as on the actual cost.

Mr. BORDEN. As I understand it, not only by custom, but also by the terms of the contract, interest must be calculated.

Mr. CARVELL. I am not begging the question at all; I am admitting that according to the contract you must add the interest to the cost of construction for the purposes of the interest earning capacity of the road. The Minister of Finance tells us that there will be about $3,500 per mile of interest annually and he does not believe that the road can pay that interest. Well, I am not a railway manager and, therefore, I cannot give an absolute answer to that from experience, but I think I can give a pretty good answer from the experience of other roads. I find on looking over the annual report of the Canadian Pacific railway for 1909 that there was of capital stock, preference stock, consolidated debenture stock, and mortgage bonds, outstanding at that time, $372,000,000.

Mr. BORDEN. How many miles of road?

Mr. CARVELL. About 9,000 miles of road at that time. I think I am safe in saying that on that the Canadian Pacific railway pays in dividends and interest from six to seven per cent annually. They are paying a higher rate of interest now but for the purposes of calculation I will take the figures as they were then. Thus it will be found that the Canadian Pacific railway in the 9,000 miles, including branch lines, cheaply constructed lines of every kind, roads that do not pay, hundreds of miles of railway that never paid; all included they are paying about $2,500 per mile interest, and we know they have a surplus sufficient to pay if they wish to, another $2,500 per mile interest.

Mr. LENNOX. Does that include their land sales?

Mr. CARVELL. It does not. I, therefore, say that the earnings of the Canadian Pacific railway to-day are sufficient to pay $5,000 per mile interest. But says the Minister of Finance, the Grand Trunk Pacific is going through a district that is not settled, and that I admit, but I leave it to the Minister of Railways who knows the country traversed by the Grand Trunk Pacific, if it is not a far better country than two-thirds of the country travelled by the Canadian Pacific railway from Winnipeg to Montreal. There are a few more people on the Canadian Pacific railway from Winnipeg to Montreal than there will be at first on the Grand Trunk Pacific line, but I am told by engineers who have been in that country that it includes a territory five hundred miles long by two hundred miles wide and that it contains a gread deal of the finest arable land on the continent, so that the country traversed by the Grand Trunk Pacific will assuredly be the home of thousands, yes, of millions of people, in the near future. This railway traverses a wooded country from 150 miles east of Winnipeg to Quebec and on down through New Brunswick, and does any man tell me that a road traversing a country like that will not earn as much as the Canadian Pacific railway does between Winnipeg and Montreal?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Do not the figures which my hon. friend has given include the hotel system, and the steamship lines?

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think they include the steamship lines. They may include the hotels, but they are a mere bagatelle, and I presume they are run at a loss. But even if the figures do include the steamship lines, there is such a margin every year that the line will still pay $4,000 to $5,000 a mile and have a surplus. The Canadian Pacific railway has grown rich through transcontinental business. Take away the transcontinental business

which that company gets at Winnipeg and I do not suppose they would feel like maintaining the tracks from Winnipeg to Montreal; and what is true of the Canadian Pacific railway will be true of the National Transcontinental railway. It will cover just as much territory west of Winnipeg; it will get just as much freight to haul; it will have just as much business to do; it will have just as much return traffic; it ought to be in a few years just as big an institution from a business standpoint; and if the Canadian Pacific railway can pay $4,000 or $5,000 a mile of interest, I do not see how any man can say that the National Transcontinental cannot pay $3,500 a mile. But there is something else that my hon. friends fail entirely to recognize in discussing this question. It has been stated by some hon. gentlemen, and strongly intimated by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), that this road has cost too much. I deny that, and I say that it would be a misfortune for Canada if this road had cost one dollar less than it has cost, provided that cost has been honestly expended.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the last $10,000,000?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, I will include that as well, although I was not referring to it at the time. I will say that the last $10,000,000 was well expended. When that road is completed, it will be the best asset the Dominion of Canada has ever had or will have in the lifetime of any living man. Perhaps there are not many gentlemen here who have taken the trouble to investigate the earning possibilities of a road with a grade of only four-tenths of one per cent, as compared with the ordinary grade of from 1 to 1½ per cent, which is to be found on all the other roads in Canada. I have taken the trouble to investigate certain sections of road. The Canadian Pacific railway, from Montreal to St. John, which is indicative of the ordinary roads through Canada, can transport, with the best engine it owns to-day, about 600 tons of freight per train. Take the same engine and put it on the International railway from Montreal to St. John, and it will handle hardly 1,200 tons. The same engine, put on the Grand Trunk Pacific from Quebec to St. John, with the assistance over two short pusher grades, will transport over 2,000 tons under exactly the same conditions. But take the same engine from the Rocky Mountains to Quebec, without a pusher grade of any kind, and it will transport over 2,000 tons. That is done with the same coal consumption, the same trackage cost, the same overhead expenses. You have three times the earning capacity in the one case that you have in the other. When you have millions of tons of freight from the great west—because that is where the freight comes from for the Canadian Pacific railway and for the Canadian Northern, and will come from for the Grand Trunk Pacific—does any man tell me that when the Canadian Pacific railway can pay interest of from $4,000 to $5,000 a mile, this road will not be able to pay $3,500 a mile? One has only to state the proposition to demonstrate how unreasonable is the argument of the Finance Minister. Then, you have the undeveloped local traffic which will be developed. You have a thousand miles of primeval forest through which the road will pass; you have a thousand miles of territory which has hardly yet been invaded by man; you have all that lumber to transport and all the supplies to go in, and the men to develop that great industry. I come next to the question, has this road cost more than it should cost? Unless my hon. friends contend that it has, they must admit, if they would be logical, that it will be the greatest carrier ever built on the continent, and I believe in the world, for its length. I wonder if these hon. gentlemen know the kind of road that this road will be when completed. Some of them have seen the prairie sections of the road, but very few have seen that portion from Winnipeg to Moncton. I have not had the privilege of going over the whole, but I have gone over a considerable portion of it—on handcar, on flat car and on engine, therefore I think I know something of what I am talking about when I say that I believe there is not such a road in America, and I know there is not in Canada. It will be absolutely complete when handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company two or three years hence. The grading is absolutely perfect. There are probably two or three times the number of culverts that are to be found on an ordinary road, and all of concrete or stone. Nothing has been saved in the way of drainage, or in the way of road-bed ballast; the station houses are to be complete; every mile will be fenced with the most secure and substantial fence. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals made the statement that in his judgment, or in the judgment of somebody else nearly $8,000,000 will be required in the next eight or nine years for betterments on this road; and just here the minister will perhaps tell me whether these figures are the estimates of Mr. Grant or not. I would like to know if that statement of betterments came with Mr. Grant's sanction?

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not sure whether it was by Mr. Grant or Mr. Leonard.

Mr. CARVELL. I have nothing derogatory to say concerning Mr. Leonard, but I want to tell my hon. friend that these figures would appeal to me with very much greater force if it came from Mr. Grant

rather than from Mr. Leonard. What I am trying to get into my hon. friend's head is that there never was a road built in Canada or the United States like the National Transcontinental. I do not believe that Mr. Grant ever made the statement that the road would require nearly nine million dollars of betterments in the next ten years. Therefore you can cut out that $8,000,000 with one stroke of the pen, and you will be perfectly safe in doing so. Now, I come down to the next branch of the case; that this road cost more than it should cost. That is a very important question, because it is all very well for the Minister of Finance to get up here in a pessimistic manner——

An hon. MEMBER. Optimistic.

Mr. CARVELL. No, pessimistic, and say the people are not disposed to treat this matter lightly, and that they believe there has been a great misappropriation of money in the classification of the road. Does the Finance Minister know that the original contract provided for a commission to settle this question of classification, and that a committee of three of the ablest engineers in Canada——

Mr. AMES. Blockers.

Mr. CARVELL. I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw the statement that Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Grant and Mr. Kelliher are three of the ablest blockers in Canada.

Mr. AMES. I thought you referred to the commission.

Mr. CARVELL. Will my hon. friend withdraw the statement?

Mr. AMES. Certainly.

Mr. CARVELL. I am glad of that, because if the hon. gentleman had been listening he would not have made the statement he did. It is in the same class with the statement he made last Wednesday night, when he said that the curtain has rung down on the gentlemen responsible for building this road and that they should go into oblivion as soon as possible, and that if hey were allowed their liberty they should be grateful. I have not any brief to defend the gentlemen who formed that commission, but I think that so far as honesty is concerned and their dealings with the people of Canada, their records will bear comparison with many of their traducers.

Mr. CURRIE. Was there not over classification discovered on the Transcontinental railway?

Mr. CARVELL. We have had an investigation of the classification by a committee of this House, also by a board of arbitration, consisting of Messrs. Kelliher, Grant and Schreiber, and what is the result? That out of some fifty or sixty million dollars on classified work on this road, they cut out in district F, about $300,000 or $400,000, and I think in district B, something like $150,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. How much on the Winnipeg section?

Mr. CARVELL. That is district F, about $300,000. Anyway, it is less than half a million. I want to tell my hon. friends opposite that not 5 per cent. of that was the result of over-classification, but was due to a change in overbreak The arbitration held that the engineers had allowed too much for overbreak, and therefore, it was not a matter of overclassification. In plain English the contractors had taken out too much excavation, they removed more material than was necessary, and were not entitled to be paid for it, and a reduction was made of from $300,000 to $500,000. In district B there was also a slight reduction due to overclassification, and with these three exceptions so far as I know, there has not been one dollar taken off the engineer's estimate for classification and overbreak.

Mr COCHRANE. Why have they not paid the contractor?

Mr. CARVELL. What contractor?

Mr. COCHRANE. The contractor west of Cochrane, there is a dispute in regard to that contract yet.

Mr. CARVELL. I want to tell my hon. friend that so far as the arbitrators have gone, that is the net result of their investigation. He and his friends here may rest assured that no investigating commission will ever take off anything appreciable from the charges, by reason of classification or overbreak. More than that, when this investigation is finished, you will be surprised to find out how nearly the results will agree with the results returned by the engineers of the late Transcontinental Commission.

Mr. COCHRANE. I hope so.

Mr. CARVELL. Furthermore, I tell the minister that he cannot probe the New Brunswick end of the Transcontinental too carefully to suit me, and every member from that province, and also to satisfy every contractor on that line, to say nothing of the commissioners. I know the excellent condition of things he will find in New Brunswick, and the same good results will be found all over the remainder of the road. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that this railway has cost too much. Do they take into consideration the fact that three fourths of the cost consist of labour which has gone up from thirty-five to fifty per cent. in the last seven or eight years?

Do they also consider that supplies have advanced from 25 to 30 per cent. in that time? Do they also consider the fact that a line with a four-tenths grade has been constructed?

Mr. COCHRANE. Does not the hon. gentleman think that labour is dearer than when the road was started?

Mr. CARVELL. I know it is; I don't 'think' it.

Mr. LENNOX. But that would hardly account for it, would it?—in view of the fact that these contracts were let at schedule rates before the rise in the price of labour took place? These contracts were made as far back as 1905, I presume. In that case the rise in the price of labour would hardly account for what the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. CARVELL. To some extent it would, because there was labour that was not anticipated at that time. It would be interesting if we were able to make a comparison between the cost of this road and other great roads on the continent. But I am afraid that only the railway companies themselves could give us the exact figures. But we can get somewhere near the matter, and I propose to give my hon. friend some of the information that I have been able to extract from the authorities whom I have consulted. I have here statistics on railways in the United States and Canada furnished by the Interstate Commerce Commission down to 1908. Let us consider the case of the Canadian Pacific railway. The commission gives the amount of outstanding stocks and bonds and other securities in 1908 as $327,675,000. This makes an average of $58,000 per mile. So far as the bonds and debenture stock and the preference stock are concerned, I am satisfied that they sold at par. So far as the stock of the Canadian Pacific railway is concerned, it is almost impossible to tell what it realised for the road. We know that the first $25,000,000 was sold as low as 25 per cent, 35 per cent, or 50 per cent. But we know also that later issues have sold at par, and the latest was sold, I believe, at 160. Average it up and you will find that the stock of the Canadian Pacific railway has produced pretty near par, and, of course, the bonds have produced par. Now, admit that the stock and bonds of the Canadian Pacific railway produced par, and you have an average cost for the 9,154 miles of this system at that time—including branch lines, colonization roads and all the rest, of over $58,181 per mile.

Mr. BORDEN. Does that include rolling stock?

Mr. CARVELL. I cannot tell; it is not shown here. We know that probably some part of that issue was spent for rolling stock, and we know certainly that millions of earnings have gone into rolling stock and into betterments. I have acknowledged that it is hard to get accurate figures; I give the committee the best I have got. If they are not logical and reasonable, then they are worth nothing. If we admit that $58,000 a mile would be a reasonable amount for the main line on the basis of these figures, then consider something further. We gave the Canadian Pacific railway when it was incorporated about $35,000,000 or $40,000,000 of completed works; that is a matter of history. We also gave them $25,000,000 in cash. And a few years afterwards we loaned them for the purpose of completing their road, $30,000,000 in cash. We know that these three items went into the main line. You have a total there of $95,000,000 to be divided over 3,000 miles in length of the main line, or about $32,000 a mile extra. Add that to the $58,000 already given, and you have $90,000 for the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway—as compared with $95,000 for the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth). Was not the $30,000,000 returned?

Mr. CARVELL. Of course it was.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth). Was it not paid out of the capital stock of the company?

Mr. CARVELL. No.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth). Are you sure?

Mr. CARVELL. No. I have admitted that these figures are only the best I can find. There have been stock transactions and earnings that have gone into the road, and it is pretty hard to form an accurate estimate. But if I am anywhere near correct, you have $90,000 a mile as the cost of the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway. But no man would tell us for a moment that the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway is anywhere up to the standard of the main line of the Transcontinental. We know that it has not cost so much money, and it ought not to have cost so much money; it has not the transportation facilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific; it is not in it for a moment with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Now, these figures bring us down to 1908. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) could tell better than I can something of what the Canadian Pacific has spent in bettering their lines since 1908. I can speak about the branch line on which I live, which runs from Macadam Junction to Perth. They spent on that since 1908 over $1,000,000 or $10,000 a mile. And this on a branch line. We know that they have

spent two or three millions in the west tunneling through the mountains. We know that they have spent immense sums in the great viaduct at Lethbridge. We know that they have practically rebuilt the main line since 1908.

Mr. WILSON. (Wentworth). But all this is included in what the hon. gentleman has already doubled up three or four times.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman has not listened to me. I have told him that these figures are down to 1908; and now I am giving him facts to indicate that tens of millions have been spent since then. Yet the road has never got up to the standard of the Transcontinental and never will, it is impossible. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not like to listen to these figures. And no wonder. They say that the road has cost too much, while we contend that it has not. And we put forward the facts that we have the greatest road on the continent, a road that has been honestly built, every dollar of which has been honestly expended. We court the fullest investigation. And when you have an investigation, as I hope you will, the commissioners will report to the government and the government to the country that we have the finest road on the continent, a road that will pay interest from the day it is handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific. And it will not be more than three or four years before hon. gentlemen opposite will be taking credit to themselves for this great proposition which will bring such benefit both to the east and to the west.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. White) says that if the road had been completed, we should not have had the grain blockade of to-day. I am not prepared to assent to that statement, but, on the other hand, I will not quarrel with him. If we had the road completed we could handle grain that is not now handled. If the Canadian Northern railway were completed, the same would be true. But all this bears out the wisdom, the statemanship of the right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) of the government under which this work was inaugurated. It all bears testimony to the leadership and ability of the men who are building the road and the good judgment they have exercised not only in starting the building of the road when they did but in starting to build that kind of line that is being constructed. Nothing will go down in history which will redound more to the credit of Canadian stasesmen than this great Transcontinental will to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who was leader of the House at that time. I want my friends opposite and their friends throughout the country to address themselves, if they can, to this aspect of the case. If they can prove that this road has cost more than it should have cost, I shall be perfectly willing to admit the corn and say that we are wrong. But until we have evidence of that I stick to what I have said —that this road has not cost a dollar more than it should have cost or a dollar more than the people will get results for.

There is another thing which these hon. gentlemen seem to forget. And that is that this money has not been given away, as the money was given away by the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway.

I am not going to find fault with the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway. I want to bear testimony to the fact that it was one of the great works of one of the great men of Canada. Without the Canadian Pacific railway the great west would not have been opened up. But when you compare what the Canadian Pacific railway has cost this country with what the Grand Trunk Pacific has cost, the latter pales into insignificance. We gave the Canadian Pacific railway $25,000,000 in money, $40,000,000 in constructed work, and 25,000,000 acres of land. Those 25,000,000 acres of land have been partly sold, I think they have about 10,000,000 acres left.

Mr. COCHRANE. What were they worth when we gave them?

Mr. CARVELL. What are they worth now? Suppose they gave away the 15,000,000 acres that are gone, and they have only the 10,000,000 acres left, why, these 10,000,000 are worth $300,000,000 to-day. They have got probably $200,000,000 out of what they have sold, or $100,000,000 any way; so we have given them altogether $400,000,000 worth of land. They have given all that away to the Canadian Pacific railway in addition to the $65,000,000 or $70,000,000 given in actual cash or in constructed works. What have we done? The very worst case which even the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) can make out is that we are losing $60,000,000 in interest. But remember that we are getting a splendid piece of property, a property which is ours, it is not the property of the Grand Trunk. We are building a road for ourselves, we own every rail and every sleeper in it. We are leasing it to the Grand Trunk for forty-three years, for which they pay interest on it, and at the end of fifty years they hand us back our property in the same condition in which they received it. Does any one mean to tell me that at the end of fifty years this road will not be worth the $200,000,000 we are putting into it? I would be ashamed to call myself a Canadian if I did not have sufficient faith in this country to believe that in fifty years that road will be worth $500,000,000. I consider it was the most magnificent trade the late government ever made. The greatest bargain they ever

made for the country, for the present and for posterity, was when they were able to induce this company to go into the construction of this road. It will not cost the country more than $60,000,000 interest at the end of fifty years, and the $60,000,000 interest will be paid back three or four times over by the appreciation in the value of the property. Now if I am right in my arguments and if I am right in my conclusion, then I say the Minister of Railways is not justified in dismissing from office those three commissioners who have so honestly and so earnestly attempted to carry out their important work in the interest of this country. Is it not a piece of political spite, which is almost too small to be expected from men who have just come into office? Would it not have been better to wait a little while and investigate? But no, it seems that the place hunters were so powerful that something had to be done and it was necessary to dismiss these commissioners from office.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where does the Bill speak about place hunters?

Mr. CARVELL. It is like the rest of the commission. They take a man who has occupied a subordinate position for six or seven years, and for some reason was unable to get promotion, and they have promoted him and given him $2,500 a year more than he got before. I want to tell my hon. friend he will be the first man to regret the course this government is taking in removing from office the men who know the conditions, and who have had oversight of this work down to the present time. I want to tell him something else that he doesn't know; he does not realize the fight these commissioners have had with the Grand Trunk and with the contractors.

Mr. LENNOX. I never heard anything of that. We only heard of this commission fighting for the contractors, and against the country all through.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend has not been so far behind the scenes as I thought he had been. Let me tell him this, the commissioners did fight for the country and against the contractors, and there is hardly a contractor on the line that does not feel he has been improperly treated, because the commissioners have held them down, and have not allowed them to make the profits they hoped to make. The hon. gentleman will know this before very long. For these reasons, I feel that this is ill advised legislation, and the minister would do well to reconsider the rash step he has taken, and not proceed with this Bill.

Mr. STEVENS. I have listened, as a new member, with a great deal of interest to this debate, and to what has been said by those responsible for what I think is one of the most gigantic public crimes that has ever been perpetrated in the history of Canada. It is amusing almost to listen to the remarks that are made to justify the action of the late government with regard to the Transcontinental railway. As I listened to the last speaker (Mr. Carvell), I was impressed with the remarkable knowledge of detail and insight he seemed to have of this question from the contractors' standpoint, for a man who is not in any sense interested in the work.

Mr CARVELL. Does the hon. gentleman mean to insinuate that I am interested?

Mr. STEVENS. I was saying that I was very much surprised to note the intimate knowledge the hon. member had in discussing this question. I was going to say, when he interrupted me, that I must compliment him upon the means he has taken to secure that knowledge, riding up and down the line on a hand car, a locomotive, or a flat car, studying the situation. Possibly if we had had the privilege of studying the question as intimately as he has done, we might be able to speak with more authority on the details of the construction. But I would like to remind hon. gentlemen opposite of this statement of the Minister of Finance, that here is a road which we were told a few years ago, was to cost a certain figure and we find out that it has cost aproximately five times that figure. I also want to call attention to the contradictory arguments that have been presented by hon. members opposite on that question, compared with their statements made a few days ago, with regard to the condition of crops and grain in the Northwest. One set of hon. members tell us they don't care about a railway that connects the prairie provinces with the eastern and western waterways, they only care about an outlet to the south. On the other hand, it was the proud policy of the leader of the late government, in bringing forward his Bill for the construction of this railway, that it was to join the east with the west of this continent. I submit that these arguments are entirely inconsistent. We claim on this side of the House that our policy has been consistent throughout, our policy is to give the prairie provinces relief at the earliest possible moment. As the Minister of Finance has pointed out, that portion of the road from the prairies eastward to Cochrane has been practically neglected.

Further, the western portion, which would have given an all-the-year-around outlet for the grain to Vancouver and Prince Rupert is scarcely started. That was to be completed in 1911, and there is only constructed a few miles from Prince Rupert eastward, and a short distance

through the Yellowhead Pass. There is an outlet which could have been easily completed in 1911, and which would have given a very material relief to the congested conditions of the grain areas of the prairie provinces.

The hon. gentleman has told us in criticising the action of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that all the facts in connection with this railway have been before this country for 4 or 5 years. If they were aware of these facts why is it they did not once raise their voices to have the road completed at an early date? They complain about adding interest to the cost of the road although there has been a delay of two or three years. Any business man will agree that in any constructive work until that work is completed and revenue producing, you must charge up to capital the interest on the money during construction and the longer you delay the time of construction the greater will be the amount of interest charged up. I protest that that interest must be added to the cost of construction which thus becomes $130,000 per mile. Some comparisons were made. The hon. member stated that the Canadian Pacific railway had issued $350,000,000 worth of stock, debentures and preferred stock.

Mr. CARVELL. I stated $170,000,000. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), asked me if steamships were included in this estimate. I find they were to the extent of $18,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS. Take a total stock debenture issue of $350,000,000 and it comes to $37,500 a mile. That also includes the rolling stock, a very material factor, and includes betterments down to 1908. Another very unjust statement was made by the hon. member. He included the $30,000,000 which had been repaid, and must necessarily have been repaid out of the capital stock of the company or the proceeds of its sale. So the Canadian Pacific railway cost $37,000 a mile, and the hon. member should keep in mind that when the Canadian Pacific railway was built it went through a practically uninhabited wilderness, it was an engineering feat that was thought to be an impossibility, and one of the great members of the Liberal party said that the Canadian Pacific railway would not pay for axle grease. As a matter of fact the Canadian Pacific railway has been a national and a financial success, and has not cost anything like the figures suggested by the hon. member, whereas with all the facilities for transportation of supplies which the present line has to within a very short distance of the actual construction, this road is costing $130,000 a mile, and the hon. member does not think it is costing a cent too much. The question is so simple and plain to the people of this country that it is viewed as one of the most gigantic public crimes in the history of the country.

Speaking of the land grants to the Canadian Pacific railway, if we were discussing the construction of that railway now I would strongly oppose the granting of a large land bonus but it is well-known that when that road was under discussion the land grant was not only a necessity but the land given was practically valueless, and was so until within the last few years, when, with the development of the country it has assumed considerable value. The hon. member believes that it has a value of $30 an acre and when he asks us to accept these statements it would be well for him to look at the figures of the Grand Trunk Pacific in their present light and not in the light of other days.

Hon. members should remember that two sections of the road that should have been completed two years ago, are scarcely commenced, and that is one of the reasons and the chief reason why we now have such congestion in the west, and I trust that the present Minister of Railways and the present administration will see to it that the Pacific division of the National Transcontinental railway and the division from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, are pushed to an early conclusion in order to give us this relief, which is so much needed in the west.

Mr. OLIVER. The minister might have given more light on the portion of the road remaining to be completed, as compared with the charge which he puts in his estimate.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think I have given a pretty clear detailed statement.

Mr. OLIVER. But he has not explained the reasons for that detailed statement. The details are there but the reasons for them are not. I am not a railway builder or the Minister of Railways, and I must say it seems peculiar to me that a road which has been ironed for over 1,400 miles and which has been graded for nearly 1,600 miles, still is only two-thirds completed so far as cost is concerned. That is rather a peculiar statement and calls for some explanation. It must be that my hon. friend has in some way secured an adjustment of the figures which is not apparent upon the face of the statement.

A road that is within less than twenty-five per cent of completion, should not cost thirty-three and one-third per cent to complete, and yet that is the statement the Minister of Railways puts before us.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is one item of nearly nine million dollars for the terminals in Quebec.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely, and that is what I want to come to. The Bill before us is a question as to the propriety of decreasing the number of members of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, and our discussion has been on the merits of the policy of the government. It has seemed good to our friends on the other side of the House to lay blame upon the members of the commission because of what they are pleased to call the shortcomings in the policy of the late government. Now, I want to know from the minister if this large charge which he puts in here as the prospective cost of the Quebec terminals is properly chargeable to the commissioners whom he proposes to discharge.

Mr. COCHRANE. The head engineer gave a signed statement there, and he was the head engineer under the late commissioners.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not questioning the figures. Will the minister listen to me, and follow what I am trying to get him to tell me. I am not questioning that the terminals will cost the amount stated here, but I am asking him if he is charging that the ministers are responsible for that proposed expenditure.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have not charged the commissioners with one single thing; I have not even criticised the commissioners.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not use the word 'charge' in the sense of the minister alleging anything against the commissioners. What I am asking him is whether he says there is anything wrong in the action of the commissioners, or of the late government with respect to these terminals.

Mr. COCHRANE. That you will have to settle between yourselves.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think there is anything to settle about it. There is no question whatever that it is a matter chargeable to the government and not to the commissioners. The whole argument of gentlemen opposite has been that because the railroad has cost so much the commissioners must be to blame.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not blaming the commissioners.

Mr. OLIVER. Not to push this argument too far, I think it would be more decent for the minister to make allegations against the commissioners he proposes to dismiss rather than to present a Bill to the House providing for their dismissal, and have his followers on the back benches make insinuations which they cannot support, and which the minister does not dare to. I think that position is absolutely unfair. If these men are being dismissed for fault, let the minister get up and say so, and if they are not being dismissed for fault, I think it is absolutely improper that his followers should get up and make insinuations against the commissioners. Of course, criticism of the policy of the late government is perfectly legitimate; the late government must stand or fall by its policy and take the consequences, but it is not right that the commissioners should be charged by the supporters of the government with that for which if blame there is, the late government was to blame and not the commissioners. There has been nothing brought before the House to warrant the purpose of this Bill. If the suggestion is that the commissioners have been incompetent, there has been nothing brought before the House to show them incompetent, and if the suggestion is that two men can handle the completion of this railroad better than four, I submit that that yet remains to be shown.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is a question of policy.

Mr. OLIVER. As to the suggestion that these commissioners were being dispensed with to save expense; my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) was very strong on the point that we had now a government of economy and the Minister of Railways was going to economize on the Transcontinental Railway Commission by dismissing three of these commissioners. But, as a matter of fact, we have two men on salaries to-day equal to the salaries paid to two of the late commissioners, so that all the Minister of Railways is saving is the salary of two of the commissioners and not even of three.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is not a fair statement, because the other man got $5,000 a year, and he was in the employ of the commissioners before.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose the gentleman in question is not double; he is still discharging the same duties as he was discharging before he received extra pay?

Mr. COCHRANE. The same duties.

Mr. OLIVER. Is he discharging the same duties as he discharged before, or is some one else discharging these duties?

Mr. COCHRANE. We have not taken on any one else.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to understand what the position of the Minister of Railways is in this respect, but we need not quarrel about that. At the present time we have two men doing administration that was done by four, and the two men are getting the same salaries as two of the four were getting. That is unquestionable.

Mr. BORDEN. It is not true in that sense.

Mr. OLIVER. Well I have made my statement which appears to be a statement of fact, and we need not delay all night on that question. There are two men to-day administering the business of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, and these two men are drawing the same salaries as the two other men who previously assisted in that administration. I suppose that is right.

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, but one of these men is also doing the same work for which he was paid $5,000 a year before.

Mr. OLIVER. Then, either he was doing very little work before, or he is doing very little extra work now. If he was doing $5,000 worth of work in the position he previously occupied he is not able to discharge these duties and take the position of Assistant Chief Commissioner and earn $7,500 a year in that capacity. If the change has been made it is because it means that somebody else will have to be hired to do the work that Mr. MacPherson formerly did, if the work is to be done efficiently. Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the use of talking about administering the expenditure for the completion of this Transcontinental road by one or two men less or more; there is a stupendous work to be done; there is a stupendous amount of supervision to be exercised, and, unless, you have the men to exercise that supervision it is not going to be well done and there is going to be loss and not gain. If the men who have been commissioners have been dishonest or incompetent then certainly they should not remain in their positions, but, presuming them to be honest and competent there is nothing in the argument that they have been dismissed as a measure of economy. It is true that two-thirds of the total expenditure has been paid on the Transcontinental road and that one-third only remains to be paid. But is it not also a fact that it is in closing up the expenditure that the greatest necessity exists for experienced supervision? Is it not also true that as the work of construction is being closed up, there will arise the question of the operation of certain sections of this completed and partly-completed road, and is it not advisable and desirable, in the interest of the country, that there should be commissioners of experience and of reliability to take charge of the arrangements for traffic as well as for construction? Instead of there being less work to do, there is more work to do, of a kind that men of the standing of the commissioners are most capable of doing. It is not now merely a matter of construction; it is a matter of being sure that the work has been properly finished, and of making traffic arrangements that will be both for the benefit of the country and for the benefit of the road itself.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member is aware, is he not, that those traffic arrangements are all laid down in the statute and in the contract, and that if the Grand Trunk Pacific company sees fit to take over a portion of the road as it is completed, it can do so; and if it does so, the statute provides that it shall take it over on the same terms as the whole, that is, on the basis of 3 per cent. There is no difficulty about arranging anything, because it is all arranged.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no difficulty about arranging anything except that somebody has to arrange it. Nothing has ever been laid down in a statute that has not required some intelligence to carry it out; and our experience is that in coming to arrangements with railway companies, it is absolutely necessary that there should be a high order of intelligence and of regard for the public interest employed on the side of the public in making these arrangements, or the public will get the worst end of the deal. So that instead of there being less need for four commissioners, there is more need now than there has ever been in the history of the road; and unless it is asserted, as it has not yet been asserted by anyone in responsible authority, that these men were either incompetent or dishonest, there is no ground whatever for the provisions of this Bill, and the Bill is on its face not in the public interest.

As to the policy of the government and its responsibility in connection with the construction of this road, I was not a member of the late government when the arrangement was made, but I was a member during the greater part of the period of construction, and I want to say that the late government is prepared to take the fullest possible responsibility for its cost. The late government is prepared to take the fullest responsibility for the bargain with the Grand Trunk Pacific company and for its results as far as it has gone. As the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has said, the present government must take the responsibility for the completion of the enterprise. The late government cannot be charged with any extraordinary expenditure that may take place from now forward; but for what has been done the late government is absolutely responsible and is prepared to take the fullest responsibility, and for my part, I have no apology whatever to offer. In my humble judgment, it would have been a crime against Canada if the eastern section of the Transcontinental railway, extending from Winnipeg to Moncton, had been constructed on any lower standard than it has been. If the present government can find

any way of constructing railways without paying for them, they will certainly have found a good line for the benefit of the country. The late government never made that discovery; they were able only to get what they paid for, and in doing that they considered they were doing their duty by the country and the country was doing well. Now, there was no other way of getting a first-class road from the prairies to the seaboard than by paying for it; and whether the present leader of the opposition was mistaken or not as to what it would cost, makes no difference whatever in the ultimate result. The country needed the construction of that railway; the late government entered upon that project; the railway is now being constructed; and no government could exist in Canada that would not carry that project to completion, according to the standards of construction which have prevailed up to the present time. When my hon. friend came to office, his first act was to call off work on that construction, but he put it back again very quickly. If he ever had any intention of stopping construction, he got inside information on the subject very soon, and he decided wisely that the work should go on.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where did they call off the work?

Mr. OLIVER. It was announced in the press.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not answerable for that.

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad to know that my hon. friend did not call off the work, but an announcement to that effect was made in the newspaper press supporting the party with which he is associated.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not responsible for that.

Mr. OLIVER. At any rate the announcement was made and it was not denied. It was announced that he had called off work on the Hudson Bay railway, but he took another think after that and gave orders for it to be restarted.

Mr. COCHRANE. If I had known what the port would be, the project would have been pressed much faster, but the hon. gentleman and his friends did not have any port to start with.

Mr. OLIVER. We did not have any port to start with and my hon. friend has not got any port yet although he has ordered the construction to go on.

Mr. COCHRANE. You are not sure of that.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes I am absolutely sure that the Minister of Railways has not decided which port the railway is going to. I am not so sure that this work is to be recommenced. But the newspapers have announced the fact, and the minister has not stated that the newspapers were mistaken.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not contradict everything in the newspapers any more than I contradict a lot of statements which are made in this House.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure the House would be interested to have a statement from the minister on the subject.

Mr. LENNOX. Let us go on with this Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. The minister introduced the question of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman introduced it himself.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg the Prime Minister's pardon. However, if the minister does not see fit to answer a question in regard to a matter he introduced himself that is his business. I must say he seems to have a great lack of information in regard to the business of his department.

Mr. COCHRANE. I gave too much, that is the trouble.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to a necessity for the early completion of this railway I do not think there should be any question about it. We are all agreed that the railway must be completed at the earliest possible moment and according to the standard laid down in the contract.

Mr. ARTHURS. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) did not say that a few minutes ago. In that respect you differ from him.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes the member for Pictou most decidedly said that we could complete it according to any grade we liked.

Mr. ARTHURS. The hon. gentleman said a few moments ago that we were bound to complete it according to the standard established by his government, and that no government could stand that would do anything else. That is quite a different idea.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all. I say that this government, although its supporters are to-day criticising the policy under which the road was constructed, up to the present time do not dare to change that standard of construction, although as the member for Pictou said they have the privilege of doing so if they dare. But they do not dare. The Minister of Railways had no hesitation in calling off the contract on the Hudson Bay railway, and I suppose he could do the same on the

Transcontinental as well. I have made the statement that all the criticism that has been levelled against the bargain made by the government, and the carrying out of that bargain by hon. gentleman opposite, falls to the ground in the face of the fact that they themselves do not dare now to deviate from that standard, and are compelled by public opinion to build the road according to it, although the expense may run to the figures that they have placed before the House. Therefore there is no accusation against the members of the late Transcontinental Commission, nor against the late government in regard to this policy.

Mr. ARTHURS. Will the hon. gentleman say that the railway as so far completed is up to the standard of the Grand Trunk Pacific as set forth in the agreement with that company?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. ARTHURS. I do not think so when a large amount of spruce ties have been used by the Grand Trunk Pacific for hundreds of miles along their line.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what my hon. friend is talking about, and I do not think he knows himself. I heard a reference to spruce ties. May I ask to what part of the line that applies?

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). To the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman had said that I would have understood him. Now in regard to the standard of this road and in regard to its serviceable character, one would have thought from what has been said that no one had any control over the construction except the Transcontinental Commission or the government. According to the bargain made, this road is to be built to be leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and if it is a fact, as the Finance Minister assured the House, that the Grand Trunk Pacific cannot earn the interest upon that cost of construction the company will have to go bankrupt, although I presume the Grand Trunk Pacific Company know their business as well as the Minister of Finance knows it, or the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). The Grand Trunk Pacific must know their business as well as these gentlemen know it for them, and if they saw, from the cost of construction, that they were not going to be able to operate their railway and pay interest, surely they would have had something to say about the matter before now. But as a matter of fact the Grand Trunk Pacific Company are absolutely parties to that standard of construction, because the company wanted that standard and know that they have to pay the interest on the cost. They are aware what the cost is from time to time, because their engineer has to pass upon the cost of every foot of the line. Now these hon. gentlemen have entertained the House at great length upon this question. I do not want to characterize their style of argument, because I am sure, Mr. Chairman, you would call me to order if I did. But when they say that the management of the Grand Trunk Pacific have so little knowledge of their business and so little regard for it that they would assist in carrying on that construction according to that standard with the results that they have suggested to this House, if they could impress the directors of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company or the Grand Trunk Company with that idea there would surely be a change of management very quickly. The reputation of the management of both companies is that of men who thoroughly understand the railway business, and are able to make dividends out of railway traffic.

And I think that, so long as that matter is in the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the extent that it is, with the responsibilities resting upon the Grand Trunk Pacific as they do, these hon. gentlemen may make their minds easy and not worry about the ultimate result to the western producer or the eastern consumer, or producer either.

The prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific, it is said cost $40,000 a mile. Did the government pay that $40,000 a mile? The government guaranteed the bonds on $13,000 a mile, and the railway has to find the balance of $27,000 a mile in order to have a railway of the standard of this road across the prairies. Why do they make a road of that high standard when they could have a road across the prairie for $13,000 to $15,000 a mile? Because they believed it would pay them to do it and just so they believe it will pay them to have the road from Winnipeg east to Quebec and Moncton of such a standard as it is. For that standard is absolutely with the consent of the Grand Trunk Pacific. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has joined forces with the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) as the champion of the interests of the northwest. And he has added his word of advice to those of a good many other members of this House as to what the man in the northwest ought to do. Some people advise the man in the northwest to go into mixed farming; some people advise him to build granaries; some people advise him to raise chickens. But the Minister of Finance advises him to be an optimist.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I said he is an optimist.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the man of the west lives on optimism, he is very much mistaken. If he thinks the western farmer is such an optimist that he likes to pay high railway rates, likes to have his grain tied up so that he cannot get it out, likes to be in such a position that he cannot pay his bills, likes to be compelled to pay an extra price for everything he buys—then my hon. friend is mistaken; the western farmer is not that kind of an optimist.

Mr. STAPLES. Why did you not remedy the difficulty during the fifteen years you were in power?

Mr. OLIVER. The Liberal government went out of power on a policy that meant remedying that condition; that is the very thing that put it out of power. And the late government has no apology to offer and no regrets to express that it went out of power on that issue. But never mind about the late government; it is to the present government that the people look for that relief which, according to their policy, this government denies it. My hon. friend told us that the late government was responsible for the grain blockades in the west because this Grand Trunk Pacific was not completed to Cochrane.

Mr. SHARPE. Because you did not build the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. STAPLES. Did not do anything.

Mr. OLIVER. If the road was completed to Cochrane, does not the hon. gentleman know that the grades on the Ontario railway from Cochrane to North Bay are such that the Grand Trunk Pacific to Cochrane would be only half the value that it would be otherwise ?

Mr. COCHRANE. That is only what was built by the Ross government.

Mr. OLIVER. No, what was built by my hon. friend's (Mr. Cochrane) government.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, the Ross government; that is the only grade there is.

Mr. OLIVER. At any rate the facts are as I have stated, that that road has to be completed to the city of Quebec according to the grades laid down before the whole line will be of the fullest benefit to the people of the west. It is true the road is not yet completed. It is also true that hon. members opposite, led by the present Prime Minister, held that arrangement up in parliament for one solid summer, held it back for a whole year; and that if that obstruction had not taken place in 1903, and if the same rate of construction had gone on that rules to-day, the road would have been linked up between Superior Junction and Cochrane. This connection would have been made and would have proven valuable to the people of the west had it not been for the obstruction on that occasion.

There is no question that the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific will be of stupendous benefit to the west. There is no question that the Canadian Pacific railway which offers to-day the only connection, is a road of such grades and curves that no amount of money will ever make it so that it can haul grain to relieve the conditions that exist there to-day. The Canadian Pacific railway is not able to move two hundred cars a day over its line from Fort William eastward; and because of its inability to do this, it is not able even measurably to relieve the grain congestion that exists at this time.

I was struck with the argument of the hon. Minister of Finance. At one period of his discourse he was explaining to us the fact that this Transcontinental railway running through the undeveloped country would have no local traffic, and in the next breath he complained because of the lack of optimism in regard to railway construction. Now, let me say to my hon. friend, who lives in Ontario, and represents Ontario more especially, that the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific through this very region that he talks about is the only thing that will add serious value to the greater part of that province of Ontario. If northern Ontario has any future at all that future will be absolutely created by the construction through it of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Furthermore, my hon. friend told us of the outlets that we should have, to the west, by Hudson bay, and to the east. A magnificent prospect, he said; a magnificent prospect truly; and every part or element of it a part of the policy of the late government, the very policy that he and his friends have been criticising and speaking of as a crime against Canada on this occasion and on previous occasions in this House.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Ontario government subsidized the Canadian Northern before you did.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not speaking of the Canadian Northern railway, but of the Transcontinental. The Canadian Northern railway is another issue altogether. I say that the Grand Trunk Pacific is opening up what is called the clay belt of northern Ontario and giving value to that part of the country, at the expense of the Dominion government, and as a part of the policy of the late Liberal government.

Mr. COCHRANE. You could not get there without going through Ontario, could you?

Mr. OLIVER. I presume it is just as desirable to open up Ontario as it is to

open up any other part of the country, and if Ontario has 16,000,000 acres of valuable clay land in the northern part of the province, it is just as much a national enterprise to open that up to settlement as it is to open up any other part of the country.

Mr. COCHRANE. Ontario can open that up herself.

Mr. OLIVER. Ontario did not, and under the present government, never would. There is no doubt that the people of that northern part of Ontario to-day are so ill satisfied with the measure of development they received at the hands of the Minister of Railways and his colleagues, that they are to-day asking to be erected into a separate province in order to get their share of the Dominion subsidies to enable them to carry on their local business.

Mr. NICKLE. Is the hon. gentleman aware that in the last local election recently held, the present government carried thirteen seats out of 14 in new Ontario?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I am; I am not aware, however, of the methods by which they carried them.

Mr. BORDEN. A word or two with regard to some matters the hon. gentleman has mentioned. He told us that the late government had no apology to offer for their defeat at the last election. Well, I am sure the country has no apology to offer for defeating them. He has stated that this contract was held up by a policy of obstruction in 1903. Is he aware at what date that contract was introduced?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not recollect the date at the moment.

Mr. BORDEN. He had better examine the dates before he makes a statement of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER. What was the date?

Mr. BORDEN. The date was the 30th of July, and the session opened on the 12th of March.

Mr. OLIVER. When did it close?

Mr. BORDEN. It closed on the 24th of October, within two and a half months after the greatest measure of the session was introduced, within two and a half months after effective discussion began on it. My hon. friend refers to that as obstruction. I say there was no obstruction, and the hon. gentleman has no warrant to say otherwise. The hon. gentleman has misquoted gentlemen on this side of the House very often in the course of his remarks. He said that hon. gentlemen on this side referred to the building of this road as a crime. They did not refer to it as a crime, they did refer to the inexcusable delay and the methods of construction as a crime, and I entirely agree with them in that estimate.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the Prime Minister then specify the criminal in the case.

Mr. BORDEN. I say it is absolutely inexcusable that they did not begin the construction of that road eastward from Superior Junction. Why was it any more difficult to do that than to undertake the construction of the road westward from Quebec? Can any hon. gentleman explain that? Why was it any more difficult to begin the construction of the road from Winnipeg eastward, than to begin the construction from Levis towards Moncton, or from Moncton towards Halifax? There is no distinction. Yet the hon. gentleman stands here, when he sees the result of that, and upholds the course of the late government, which undoubtedly now is having very serious consequences.

Mr. OLIVER. There must be some misunderstanding. I am under the impression that the construction was commenced eastward from Winnipeg.

Mr. COCHRANE. It was the Lake Superior division.

Mr. BORDEN. I am referring to the particular portion of the road where there is now no prospect of completion within about two years, from Lake Superior to Cochrane.

Mr. CARVELL. The right hon. gentleman must be in error. I know they commenced the construction from Winnipeg towards Superior Junction.

Mr. BORDEN. I am referring to the whole line from Winnipeg to Cochrane. There cannot be that outlet from Port Arthur to the east, which is absolutely necessary under present conditions.

Mr. OLIVER. But that is from Superior Junction eastwards, not from Winnipeg eastward.

Mr. BORDEN. I see no reason why that road from Superior Junction to Cochrane could not have been proceeded with in just the same way as the road between Moncton and Levis.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman said from Winnipeg.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did inadvertently use that expression. I was referring to that particular portion of the line that will not be completed for a year or two.

Mr. OLIVER. I asked the Prime Minister, if there was a criminal, who was the criminal?

Mr. BORDEN. Why, my hon. friend and his colleagues.

Mr. OLIVER. Then it was not the commissioners ?

Mr. BORDEN. No, I will come to that at once. I stated here before that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals did not come here either to censure or to commend these commissioners, and the leader of the opposition nodded his approval, when I made that statement. He took the responsibility of introducing this measure as one which he thought to be in the public interest, having regard to the condition of the road, and having regard to the capacity of the man whom he placed there as chairman of the commission. This controversy about the work of the commissioners has entirely arisen, as pointed out before, because hon. members on the other side of the House raised the question as to a certain allowance which should be made to these commissioners upon their retiring, and in the course of urging that this should be done, undertook to express very great commendation of the work which these gentlemen have performed. We had not criticised or said anything about them up to that time, but naturally, when that commendation was expressed, in possibly somewhat extravagant language, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House took exception to it, and in that way, the criticism has arisen, and it was solely due to the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have not come here, nor has the Minister of Railways come here, to commend or censure these commissioners; but we take the responsibility of saying that, having regard to the state of construction of this road, we think it eminently in the public interest that it should be completed under the man who has been appointed as chairman of that commission, and we take full responsibility. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was not, it seems to me, quite as fair as he usually is, when he made the statement with regard to the assistant to the chairman. He undertook to say that we proposed to pay the salary of two commissioners instead of four.

When any hon. gentleman undertakes to refer to place-hunters in respect to this commission, I want him to understand that the chairman of that commission very reluctantly undertook that work at my urgent and earnest request, and at the earnest request of the Minister of Railways. He did not seek it at all, he was not desirous of it, and the salary is a matter of absolute indifference to him. Every one who knows that gentleman knows that no such expression as that should have been used in regard to him.

Mr. OLIVER. I hope my hon. friend does not think I used it.

Mr. BORDEN. Some hon. gentleman used it.

Mr. COCHRANE. You used it.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Not with reference to the chairman.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not know if it was with regard to him, but it was used. As a matter of fact, if we had followed the example of hon. gentlemen opposite we would have filled up the number of the commission even although we thought that it should not be done. We reduced the number of commissioners from four to one, and appointed a man to whom the salary is a matter of utter indifference and who took the position simply with a desire to perform a public service against his own interest and inclination. As to Mr. Macpherson, he was being paid before $5,000, and is being paid now $7,500, an increase of $2,500. In addition to the duties he was discharging before he is now discharging certain other responsible duties. From what I have heard of him, I believe he will give good value to the people for every dollar of salary which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) proposes to pay him.

The hon. member for Pictou made some rather remarkable statements about the report placed on the table by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) and used language with regard to it which means one of two things, either that the man who prepared it is incapable, or that he is dishonest. The man who prepared that statement is a man appointed by the late government by order in council and the observations of my hon. friend in that regard are deserving of consideration.

Mr. MACDONALD. To what does the hon. member refer?

Mr. BORDEN. I cannot quote his language but my hon. friend will see it in 'Hansard.' He criticised the statement in such terms as would indicate that the man who would make a statement of that kind to be submitted to parliament is not a man to be kept in the position he occupies.

Mr. MACDONALD. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend will see his language in 'Hansard.'

Mr. MACDONALD. I said the House was entitled to information as to how the three items were made up. I made no remarks of any kind on the subject beyond requesting that information. One hon. gentleman said he was our appointee. I said that that had nothing to do with the information I wanted.

Mr. BORDEN. I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but that

is not how the matter impressed me, and if his statements are justified they are surely deserving of the attention of this government, and that necessary attention will be given to them.

Mr. MACDONALD. What about the information and the details as to the three items, headquarters' salaries and expenses, engineering expenses, and right-of-way?

Mr. BORDEN. We asked the man appointed to this responsible position by the late government for accurate and definite information in respect to these matters. If these items are not correct then that man appointed by the late government is responsible for their inaccuracy.

Mr. MACDONALD. That answer was never good enough for the hon. gentleman when the tables were turned.

Mr. BORDEN. In what case?

Mr. MACDONALD. In any case.

Mr. BORDEN. If my hon. friend will give a case I will be very glad to deal with it. All I have to say is that we have been relying on the statement of the responsible officer of these commissioners who was appointed by the late government. We are entitled to rely on that until it has been demonstrated to us that he is inaccurate, and we have presented the statement to the committee exactly in the manner in which he has presented it to us. My hon. friend repeated several times in the course of his speech that this road had been completed to the extent of 76 per cent. There is absolutely no warrant in this statement for any such assertion.

Mr. MACDONALD. What is the meaning of the statement at the top of the page?

Mr. BORDEN. Exactly what it says, that the grading has been completed to that extent, but the hon. member knows that other matters are involved besides grading. When he says that the road has been completed to the extent of 76·86 per cent, he says what has absolutely no warrant in the statement produced, and he used that statement to make an argument which was absolutely unfair and improper from the statement as a whole. As a matter of fact, the road has not been completed to the extent of 76 per cent. The grading has been completed to the extent of 76 per cent, the track has not been laid in anything like that proportion and any one who examined the items in this report will see that in several unimportant respects three-quarters or nine-tenths of the work still remains to be done. Take the terminals at Quebec, $508,500 have already been expended, there remains to be expended more than $9,000,000. Take car shops with their equipment, $1,171,000 have been expended, and there are $1,120,800 still to be expended. When any hon. gentleman finds fault with the report of this engineer, who is the engineer appointed by their own leader by order in council, and criticise his statement that the betterments during nine years from January 1, 1912 to December 31——

Mr. CARVELL. I asked the Minister of Railways positively if Mr. Grant made that statement, and he would not say he did it, and I am satisfied it was Mr. Leonard who did it.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend criticised it and wanted it struck out altogether.

Mr. CARVELL. I did.

Mr. BORDEN. I would give to my hon. friend some information. The Grand Trunk Pacific has been completed and in running order from Winnipeg to Edmonton for I think about two years and has been carrying grain; and it is estimated and I speak of what I know, that within the next two years the cost of betterments upon that road in order to complete it up to standard, will be just about the amount mentioned here as being required to be expended on this road within the next nine years.

Mr. CARVELL. It was not completed when it was taken over.

Mr. BORDEN. It has been in operation for two years carrying grain.

Mr. CARVELL. They commenced operating it before they had it completed.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the minister give an idea of the nature of the betterments?

Mr. BORDEN. If my hon. friend will apply to the Grand Trunk Pacific and they will take him into their confidence they can give him full particulars as to what the proposed betterments are because in my statement I am relying on their representations and that is precisely the statement that was made to us with regard to betterments that ought to be made upon this road during the next two or two and a half years. That road from Winnipeg to Edmonton is, I suppose, not much more than half the length of the line from Moncton to Winnipeg and the betterments proposed on that road in the next two or two and a half years are about equivalent to the sum which has been estimated by some one, Mr. Leonard or Mr. Grant, as being necessary to effect upon this road during the period of nine years after its completion.

Any hon. gentleman in this House who is familiar with the ordinary subsidence of embankments, knows that no matter how perfectly you may build an embankment in the first instances, it will require

repair and betterment in order to bring it up to a standard when it will subside no more. You cannot build a road in the first instance so that it will absolutely require no betterment for a number of years.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps there is a distinction between betterments and repairs.

Mr. BORDEN. I am not familiar with the technical distinction but I do say that no matter how well you may build a railroad in the first instance, it is absolutely necessary for some years afterwards to spend money upon it for the purposes I have mentioned. That statement will commend itself to the common sense and judgment of every hon. member present.

I would like to allude to one other matter; a great deal has been said about the original contract with the Canadian Pacific railway, and the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has informed us that the country gave away $800,000,000 according to his estimate, in land value. But, a great many hon. gentlemen who speak of that contract forget that their own leaders between 1874 and 1878 proposed a contract by which not 25,000,000 of acres but 50,000,000 of acres would be given away to any company that would construct the Canadian Pacific railway. If we apply the principle of valuation which my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) adopted, then the government of Mr. Alexander Mackenzie of which the present leader of the opposition was a member, was prepared to give away lands in western Canada worth $1,500,000,000. I would not be prepared to make any such absurd argument as that.

Mr. CARVELL. Neither would I.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend estimated these lands as being worth $30 per acre.

Mr. CARVELL. I said that the ten million acres remaining to be sold were worth $30 an acre and I say so now.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend made an estimate of $800,000,000.

Mr. CARVELL. I did not say so. I said that the ten million acres still remaining were worth three hundred million dollars and 'Hansard' will bear me out in that.

Mr. BORDEN. I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman; I understood him to value these lands at $30 per acre.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, the 10,000,000 acres remaining to be sold.

Mr. BORDEN. And I am simply remarking that if you applied the $30 per acre valuation to the 50,000,000 acres of land that were offered by the Mackenzie government——

Mr. CARVELL. But I did not apply it.

Mr. BORDEN.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. gentleman denied a statement the other night and 'Hansard' showed he was wrong.

Mr. BORDEN. Perhaps I had better put it this way so as not to wound the feelings of my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell). If you apply a valuation of $30 an acre to the 50,000,000 acres that were offered by the Mackenzie government you would have a sum of $1,500,000,000. I trust the statement in that form will not offend my hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL. I don't object to that.

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to point out that section 8, subsection 3, of the Act which the Mackenzie government passed through this parliament, provided that a subsidy of $10,000 a mile for the 2,544 miles from North Bay to Vancouver, making altogether $25,440,000. In addition to that the Mackenzie government also offered a guarantee of interest at the rate of four per cent. for twenty-five years from the completion of the work, on a sum to be agreed upon. As a matter of fact, the arrangement that was made by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald for the building of the Canadian Pacific railway was an infinitely better arrangement in the interest of the people of this country than the arrangement proposed by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. Of course to-day, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House can talk glibly about lands that are worth $30 an acre, but those who know what the actual conditions were at the time the Canadian Pacific railway was commenced in 1882 know that the Canadian Pacific railway would have been glad to hand these lands over at that time for fifty cents an acre; it would have been glad to get twelve and a half million dollars instead of the 25,000,000 acres of land. Every one in this country realizes that the conditions were then absolutely different from what they are to-day. It is true that the lands did become very valuable afterwards, but in considering the fairness and reasonableness of the contract, we must estimate the conditions which confronted the country and the Canadian Pacific railway in 1882 and not the conditions as they are at the present time.

Well, we have wandered a good deal from the line of argument applicable to this Bill and perhaps some of my own observations are not pertinent to the actual question before the House, but I can only say that it is the belief of the government that the course which they are adopting in respect of this commission is in the public interest, and that the road can be effectively completed under the chairmanship and superintendence of Mr. Leonard. No effort will be spared to hurry that road on to completion,

and especially that part of it which is necessary in order that there may be a line from Winnipeg to the east to afford an opportunity to the people of the western country to get their grain out more effectively in the future than they have been able to do in the winter months in the past.

Mr. CARVELL. I would like this information from the Minister of Railways. I do not want to be offensive, but I do hope he will not tell me again that the figures are Mr. Grant's. I know they are Mr. Grant's figures, but the hon. gentleman is here as the responsible head of the department, and we, as members of this House, have a right to ask for further information before the third reading of the Bill. For instance, in the statement submitted to the House, we are told that the rails and fastenings, including frogs, switches and diamond crossings already completed amounted to $10,214,000, and that there remains to be done of this, work to the extent of $2,995,000, or in other words there is about thirty per cent of that work uncompleted. If you take the total mileage completed of 1,587 as against the total mileage of 1,803, you have only twenty-two per cent of that work to be done and perhaps the minister will tell us wherein the discrepancy comes. There is only twenty-two per cent of the track to be laid and it will cost thirty per cent of the total cost to do that.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not admit your statement. There are the terminals and the sidings. We gave you the actual mileage where there is no track laid.

Mr. CARVELL. I am not including the 287 miles of sidings. There is also another point on which my hon. friend will probably bring us further information, and that is in regard to the item of 'engineering and expenses.' I find that under that head they have spent already $7,681,000, and that the estimate is given that it will cost $3,850,000, or just exactly half as much is to be expended as has been expended.

Mr. COCHRANE. We won't spend one dollar more than is necessary.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend will surely allow me to ask him a question. He states that they assume that they will be able to hand the road over by the 31st of December, 1913, in other words, in two years. The engineering end of this road has been in operation since 1905, that is, between six and seven years. Now, will the hon. gentleman tell us how his department figures that in two years we are going to require just half as much as we did in the last six years. The same thing applies to the headquarters expenditure, which in the last six years has amounted to $1,732,000, and they expect to spend in two years $1,260,000.

Mr COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman had better put in the right of way.

Mr. CARVELL. The right of way has not been settled in the same proportion in which the road has been built; yet I am satisfied that a good deal more than half of it has been settled. I am not finding any fault in regard to that. I think the Minister of Railways should not assume the attitude he does, because we have surely a right to ask for information. I admit that he is not in a position to give it to-night, but probably he will be able to do so when the Bill comes up for the third reading.

Mr. BORDEN. I would remind my hon. friend that the information he asks for can be easily obtained and will be readily given upon the estimates. It is not concerned with the passage of this Bill. We were asked to bring down a statement to corroborate the assertion of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, that the road was two-thirds or thereabouts completed. He has asked the engineer in charge of the work to make that statement, and it has been given, not only in general form, but in detail. So far as the expenditure of the money is concerned, that is a matter that can be dealt with on the estimates, when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will be prepared to give the fullest information. We are entitled to rely on the statement of the engineer, appointed not by this government, but by the late government. Therefore I trust that my hon. friend from Carleton will be content to have the information when the estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals are before the House.

Mr. MACLEAN. (Halifax). That may be all very well from the viewpoint of the Prime Minister, but it is not satisfactory to the opposition. The Minister of Railways persists in sitting in his seat like a bump on a log, absolutely refusing any information.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order !

Mr. MACLEAN. (Halifax). I did not intend to say that offensively, and if anybody on the other side thinks I did, I shall gladly withdraw it. But at least I wish to intimate to the Minister of Railways that he is not very courteous or free in giving information that is asked of him by the opposition. He is following the example of the autocratic gentleman who lives in Queen's Park, Toronto, and if he does not look out he will be the exact type of that gentleman.

Mr. COCHRANE. Thank you for that compliment.

Mr. MACLEAN. (Halifax). The Prime Minister says that the information contained in this statement is irrelevant to the Bill before the House. That is true, but I want to call his attention to the fact that pretty nearly every hon. gentleman on the other side who has spoken on this Bill has urged, as the ground for the dismissal of some of the commissioners, that the road has cost too much. In fact, after the statement of the minister the other night, the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) took the floor, and, with great indignation and in tones of contempt, declared most vehemently against the commissioners, who he thought were very lucky to secure a mere dismissal and in not having some proceedings, civil or criminal, taken against them. Now, in addition to what is asked for by the hon. member for Carleton, I would like the Minister of Railways when the Bill is next before the House, to state whether it was intended by this statement to lead the House to believe that the first seven years of interest after the construction of the eastern section which is being handed over to the Transcontinental Railway Commission, was to constitute a part of the capital on which the government was to charge interest against the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. LENNOX. The contract says that it does not.

Mr. MACLEAN. (Halifax). I think it is quite clear that it is not part of the capital on which the interest is to be calculated; but I understood, from some hon. gentlemen who spoke this evening, that that seven years' interest was to be added to the capital. If the Minister of Railways is satisfied that it is not, I am content with that.

Mr. MACDONALD. I called the attention of the Prime Minister to the question of the legality of the appointment of Mr. Macpherson. I am very much impressed with the view that his appointment could not legally be made in the way it was, and I had hoped that when he spoke he would have dealt with that. Unless he is in a position to discuss that now, I would like to hear about it on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. COCHRANE. With reference to the appointment of Mr. Macpherson, the law clerk of the Commission advised Mr. Leonard that he had the power to make the appointment. Mr. McIsaac, one of the commissioners, advised the same thing, and the Commission as a whole, in passing the estimates for the payment of Mr Macpherson, in that way confirmed it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not think that was good enough.

Bill reported.

NATIONAL MEANS OF COMMUNICATION.

Mr. BORDEN. Order No. 28, Public Bills and Orders, is a resolution standing in the name of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). Since the resolution was last discussed there has been no opportunity of calling it except on one occasion when the Postmaster General had to be absent. The hon. gentleman is desirous of not being hampered by having the resolution on the order paper where it cannot be discussed without the consent of the House. I, therefore, move that order No. 28 be called for the purpose of having the resolution withdrawn. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) desires to discuss some of the matters that are embraced within this resolution. A day or two ago when he proposed to do that, the point of order was raised, and it was considered that with the unanimous consent of the House he might go on. However, I think it will be better to proceed in the regular way. It is for that reason I move the resolution.

Mr. OLIVER. Under what circumstances will the discussion come on?

Mr. BORDEN. The discussion will come on at any time the member for Rouville is desirous of raising it, when we go into Supply as I understand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not understand that the member for Rouville would have the bringing up of the subject. I was debating the subject and was going to bring it up myself.

Motion agreed to.

Mr ARMSTRONG moved, seconded by Mr. Lennox, that order No. 28 be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA BOUNDARIES.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a resolution under the heading of government notices of motion in regard to the Manitoba Boundaries. Would it be possible to lay on the table the correspondence in connection with this matter, beginning with the conference that was held between the Premiers of Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and the Prime Minister of Canada, and covering the period from that time forward to the present?

Mr. BORDEN. I have already given instructions that the order of the House

which has already been made in that regard, be complied with before the resolution is brought on.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the order of business for to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. We expect to take up government Bills, beginning with the Grain Bill, and after that Supply, proceeding with the estimates of the Minister of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 20, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RESTAURANT COMMITTEE.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved that the name of Mr. W. S. Middlebro be substituted for that of Mr. A. C. Boyce on the Joint Committee on the Restaurant.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—Mr. Bennett, Simcoe.

Bill (No. 108) respecting The Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Baker.

Bill (No. 109) for the relief of Herbert Horsfall.—Mr. Kay.

Bill (No. 110) for the relief of Kenneth Molson.—Mr. Rhodes.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Before the orders of the day are called I rise to a question of privilege. Yesterday I asked the right hon. the Prime Minister as to whether or not an appointment had been made to the Supreme Court Bench of the province of Nova Scotia, and as to whether Mr. J. J. Ritchie had received the appointment. I ventured then to say that I hoped the report was true, but I see that 'Hansard' reports me as having said I hoped the report was not true. I desire to call the attention of the House to this fact, because the statement is so wholly at variance with my own statement that I do not wish it to go on record. I regard Mr. Ritchie as a gentleman of the highest qualifications, and I am satisfied that the government made a very wise choice in appointing him.

Mr. BORDEN. I distinctly understood my hon. friend to say just what he has intimated, that he hoped the report was true.

GOVERNMENT WORKS TOLLS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 103) to amend the Government Works Tolls Act.—Mr. Monk—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. MONK. I explained when introducing this Bill that its object was to correct a clerical error in the Revised Statutes of Canada. Under the Public Works Act (R.S. c. 39, s. 9, para. (b)) the Minister of Public Works has the management of works for facilitating the transmission of timber, and matters incident thereto. The Government Works Tolls Act (which it is now proposed to amend) gives the Minister of Inland Revenue authority respecting similar works. It is desired that the Minister of Public Works shall have the authority in both cases.

Bill reported.

COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK.

House in committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to ratify and confirm an agreement between the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Limited, and His Majesty, dated the 27th July, 1910, respecting the construction of a dry dock at the town of Collingwood, and to authorize the Governor in Council to pay an annual subsidy of three per cent. per annum for twenty years upon the sum of $306,965.18, being the cost of construction of the said dry dock.—Mr. Monk.

Mr. MONK. This resolution is presented to the House under the following circumstances:

On November 9, 1909, application was made by the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Limited, for a subsidy, under the Act of 1908, to encourage the construction of dry docks, and specification and plans were submitted for a dock of the following dimensions:

Length over all..	420 feet
Width at coping	105 "
Width at bottom..	100 "
Depth on sill, low water	16 "
Depth of dock proper	22 "

While the plans, specification and estimates for this dock were under consideration by the department, with the object of arriving at the total sum upon which subsidy should be granted, the Dry Docks Subsidies Act, chap. 24, of the Statutes of 1908, was repealed by chap. 17 of the Statutes of 1910, which was assented to on the 4th of May, 1910. A recommendation was sent to

council on the 4th May, and an order in council passed on the 11th May, 1910, authorizing the department to enter into an agreement with the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Limited, to grant a subsidy on Dry Dock No. 2, of 3 per cent on $306,965.18, for twenty years. The Dry Docks Subsidies Act, chap. 17, of the Statutes of 1910, provides for the payment of subsidy on three different classes of docks, of which the third class is limited to a cost of not more than $1,500,000 with a subsidy of 3 per cent for twenty years. A third class dock must be 400 feet in length, 65 feet wide and 18 feet over the sill at ordinary low water when constructed in non-tidal waters. The Collingwood Dry Dock No. 2 possessed the necessary length and width, but was only 16 feet on the sill at low water, so that it did not qualify under the new legislation. As, however, the consideration of this application, made under the 1908 Act, had been completed before the passing of the Act of 1910, containing the new conditions, and as the dock was, in addition, at that time partially constructed, it was considered only fair that the dock should be subsidized and that special legislation should be introduced at the next session of parliament to enable payment of the subsidy. Accordingly, on the 17th May, 1911, a resolution was moved by the honourable the Minister of Public Works, as follows:

Resolved, that it is expedient to ratify and confirm an agreement between the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Limited, and His Majesty, dated the 27th day of July, 1910, respecting the construction of a dry dock at the town of Collingwood, and to authorize the Governor in Council to pay an annual subsidy of three per cent. per annum for 20 years upon the sum of $306,965.18 being the cost of the construction of the dry dock, &c.

A draft Bill was also prepared, but was never introduced; the resolution still remaining on the order paper when parliament dissolved.

Under these circumstances the department is submitting the same resolution to the House. I do not think there is any doubt that the company is entitled to the subsidy under the circumstances.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. MONK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) to authorize the payment of a subsidy to the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Limited.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE GRAIN ACT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 32) respecting Grain.—Mr. Foster (North Toronto).

Mr. MONK.

On section 96—regulations as to binning and cleaning—

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I wish to add a clause as subsection 2 of which I gave notice. This, I think, should be changed in the latter half, after the words 'any terminal warehouseman neglecting to comply within thirty days.' That seems a long time to give, and it might be well to strike out the words 'within thirty days' and insert the words 'within a reasonable time.' Thirty days seems altogether too long, and in some cases would be. In other cases thirty days might be too short if the improvements to be made involve a good deal of altering and changing. I do not see any better way of arranging it, except to say within reasonable time.

Mr. OLIVER. I would suggest that it be made: 'within reasonable time not exceeding thirty days' because in the rush of the grain season, unless the alteration can be made within thirty days there is no use making it at all.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am quite willing to put that in. Then we will insert the word 'comply', 'within reasonable time not exceeding thirty days'. I move the adoption of the clause as amended.

Mr. OLIVER. The term used in the 'Hansard' report of the previous debate is 'punishable' not 'liable'.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The law clerk put in the other word as being a better legal term.

Mr. OLIVER. Before the minister leaves that page may I ask if he has come to any decision in regard to overages which is alluded to in subsection 7 of section 95?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The whole matter is under consideration. The overages for 1909-10 were considerable—more than considerable in fact. In 1910-11 the overages and shortages showed over the whole quantity of wheat which was passed through, probably 90,000,000 or 100,000,000, a balance of only about 35,000 bushels which is an almost infinitesimal percentage on the whole amount carried through. I am having the whole subject looked into now in view of establishing a basis as to what shall be done as between the shortages and overages. Of course we have a claim upon the elevator men for shortages, but they argue that if they make up the shortages they ought to be entitled to the overages. It is a perfectly allowable claim, I think that they should be entitled to the overages up to the amount that will balance the shortages. Over and above that there may be a question, but I am looking into the subject with my officers so as to come to a basis upon which this shall be regulated.

Mr. OLIVER. If you allow the elevators overages up to what would be a reasonable allowance for legitimate error in weighing, I think they could have no claim or right for anything over and above that, no matter what is done in regard to the shortages.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. Has the minister anything to inform the committee as to the effect of certificates on grain which passes through the States?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am also taking that matter up with various officers of our own, and of the United States Chambers of Commerce in the different ports. I am getting complete information as to what the custom is all the way through from the time the grain leaves our border until it takes a ship either at New York, Boston or Portland or at any of our own ports.

Mr. OLIVER. There will be no result from that investigation so far as the Act is concerned?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No. It will be a guidance for the future.

On section 104—offices in Winnipeg,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The next is section 104. I gave notice of that, and moved that a section follow to be denominated 104A. That section is to be found in 'Hansard.' It provides for an official Survey Board to be established for the district of Calgary in the western inspection division—for the manner in which that Survey Board shall be selected—and then applies the positions of other sections applicable thereto. The question raised the other day was as to whether it was wiser to allow the Survey Board to be appointed ultimately by the board upon competent persons being selected by the Board of Trade of Calgary. I think the hon. gentleman who raised the point favoured something like the plan that exists in the Survey Board towards the eastern end of the western inspection division. As I said then, that has worked out in practice to leave the work of the Survey Board completely with the members of it which were nominated by the Board of Trade of Winnipeg. The others having other business to attend to, and not being upon the grain exchange, find it inconvenient to attend and do not attend. In Calgary if you place two nominees from Manitoba, two from Saskatchewan and two from Alberta, the same thing would probably happen, and it would seem that if the board had the competency of the Survey Board within their own hands, there should be no difficulty in getting men eligible in Calgary, on the nomination of the Board of Trade, who would be perfectly fitted to act. There would be no objection, if it were thought best, to have the Minister of Agriculture of Alberta make the nomination. But even then, I think, it should be a person resident in Calgary. And, if it were not so nominated in the Bill, it seems to me you would have a supernumerary rather than a helpful member of the board. I think we should get all that is necessary, and in thoroughly workable form under the plan I have intimated here. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has any fixed convictions on this subject or not.

Mr. OLIVER. I have taken some interest in this provision since my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) brought it in the other day. Conditions in Calgary are different from those in Winnipeg. In Winnipeg, the grain trade interests a very large proportion of the business community, whereas the grain trade does not interest a large proportion of the business community in Calgary. Besides, Calgary, of course, is a much smaller place than Winnipeg. Therefore, we could not look for absolutely the same conditions surrounding the appointment of members of the Survey Board on the nomination of the Board of Trade of Calgary as in the case of those nominated by the Board of Trade of Winnipeg. For these reasons, I could think it desirable that the provincial governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan should have the authority to make nominations. I include Saskatchewan because it is expected that some Saskatchewan grain as well as Alberta grain will go through Calgary. I appreciate the desirability of the appointees being residents of Calgary; but I think that, perhaps, it might be wise not to require that by the terms of the Act. What I should like would be that the government of Alberta and the government of Saskatchewan should have the right to appoint two members each. It might be left to their good judgment whether they would appoint residents of Calgary or not. I have had discussion with parties well informed upon, and interested in, this matter, and they consider that six is not a sufficiently large board for Calgary. Under the provisions of the law no person is allowed to sit on a survey who is interested in the transaction under survey. With the small number of people interested in the grain trade in Calgary, and with a small board, it might be difficult to get a Survey Board in a position to act. Too many of the members of the small board might be interested in its transactions and, therefore, incapacitated from sitting. While it might seem that the large board is more cumbersome, it is not necessarily

more cumbersome. On the contrary, it may be more workable and more available for work, provided the members are conveniently resident in the city where the transaction under survey takes place.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I quite see the point that my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) makes. Part of it has weight, but he will excuse me if I say that the other has not quite so much weight. Calgary is not at present a grain centre such as Winnipeg, and it may be some little time before Calgary attains any such position. But all the aspirations and all the prospects with reference to the matter point to the belief that Calgary will, before very long, become a very important grain centre. And there will not be very much work to do until it has grown in importance, and it is very likely to grow in importance very quickly, depending upon the exits for grain which are available. It seems to me it would not be difficult to find in Calgary, where they have a population of 50,000 a large proportion of whom are business men, the material for a board of six. There is something, however, I think, in what my hon. friend says about responsibility. If one is appointed by the provincial government he is rather amenable to the responsible authority of that province. And if we include Alberta, Saskatchewan also should be included. There is no reason to include Manitoba, because Manitoba grain will probably not seek a market by way of the west. We must be sure to provide that a quorum is to be had, and non-resident members are a difficulty in that respect. If one happens to be interested in the transaction and, therefore, ineligible, and if there are two or three or four non-residents, the making of a quorum may be difficult. Perhaps it would answer if we make the board a board of eight and provide that the provincial government of Alberta and the provincial government of Saskatchewan shall each nominate one.

Mr. OLIVER. I should much prefer to have it two from each provincial government, but I would certainly rather have one than none.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Considering the number of the whole Survey Board, I should think that one from each province would be enough. I move the amendment of this section.

Mr. KNOWLES. Has the minister thought that in Calgary it may be difficult to find six people who are experienced in regard to the duties which will be put upon them under this Act?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have not thought so. If that were the condition, I should think it premature to erect a Survey Board there at all. They must have the six experts, but if they can find no people except those who are incompetent, those people will not be approved of, and so there will not be a Survey Board.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would not think that that was evidence of this being premature, because it is the interest of the grain trade which is dominant, and not that of the citizens of Calgary. The province of Alberta, with all due respect for it, is not a grain growing province such as Saskatchewan or Manitoba. Of course, it excels in other things, in which they do not excel. In line with what the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has said, and in addition to what I have said, we are to remember that the people of Calgary have not been trained in that kind of business. It is easy, of course, to criticise, but unquestionably it is more or less owing to the experiment of preparing for what we hope will be a great movement of our grain westward. I certainly do not wish to throw any obstacles in the way of that movement, but I doubt that you will find men who will sufficiently excel in the knowledge of the grain business to be appointed to this board.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I stand up for Calgary in that respect; I think there is enough both of ability and experience to be found in that city for the creation of this board.

Mr. KNOWLES. There is not an elevator in the place except those connected with the mill.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They might not be good judges of elevators but they might be good judges of grain, and that is what they are there for. I think my hon. friend's fears are leading away his judgment.

On section 115.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I gave notice of a new section to be substituted for this one:

All good grain that has an excessive moisture, being tough, damp or wet or otherwise unfit for warehousing, shall be entered on the inspecting officer's book as 'no grade' with his notations as to quality and condition.

All grain that is unsound, musty, dirty, smutty, sprouted or contains a large admixture of other kinds of grain, seeds or wild oats, or from any other cause is unfit to be classed under any of the recognized grades, shall be classed as 'rejected,' with the inspector's notations as to quality and condition.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a very radical change from the old clause, and I am not quite clear as to the reasons for the change, that is, good mixed grain, or mixed grain of good quality, is changed from low grade to rejected. I would like to know on what ground that change is made.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The reason for the change is two-fold. In the first place, the custom has been all along to grade the grain, and it has so been known and graded as is set forth in the substituted section. The first has reference entirely to moisture, that is the prime element in it.

Mr. OLIVER. That kind of grain is brought into the rejected class.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It was left out of the first class, and is put into the class of rejected.

Mr. OLIVER. On the face of it, it strikes me that the change is hardly justified. I am not an expert in grain, but I would like to know the reason why the change has been made.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It has always been graded that way, that is the general grade all the way through, and it is better to have the law put in consonance with the practice. But I believe the contention is that the practice is the correct way.

On section 125: security by license,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That has reference to the bond. We had some conversation about it. I have given it considerable thought, and I propose to amend it in this way: The clause, as it reads, provides for a penal sum of not less than $10,000, and not more than $50,000. These are two arbitrary sums. There does not seem to be any principle which underlies the fixing of these sums. If you have a small elevator of 25,000 or 30,000 bushels, although I believe the smallest at Fort William at the present time, is about 65,000 bushels, you can tax it $10,000 and if you have one of 7,000,000 bushels capacity you cannot have the bond larger than $50,000. That appears to be unfair, and I have been making some inquiry about it. I think it is undeniable that the bond imposed upon these terminal elevators, which have very responsible duties thrown upon them and are restricted by very close laws and regulations, the strictness of which has been conditioned by the necessity of preventing violations, should be adequate to the restrictions and responsibilities. In the state of Minnesota I find that they have a bond proportioned to the capacity of the elevator and, on inquiry, I also find that the country elevator system in Canada is run at the present time, where bonds are required, upon that principle. The bond is proportioned to the capacity of the elevator and in so far as I can learn, the system has worked well. So, I propose to apply the same principle to the terminal elevators. But, I do not seem to have the amendment in the form in which I arranged it, and therefore, we will let this section stand in the meantime.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 126, subsection 8: grades not to be mixed,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The section as at present reads:

> In no case, whether in a terminal elevator in the western inspection division or in a public elevator in the eastern inspection division, shall grain of different grades be mixed together while in store.

I propose to add the words 'or public' after 'terminal,' so that it will read:

> In no case, whether in a terminal or public elevator.. . . shall grain of different grades be mixed together while in store.

I think that covers the whole question.

Mr. OLIVER. That is all right.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is a public elevator?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). A public elevator is an elevator in which grain in inspected in, stored and inspected out again.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is a terminal elevator?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). A public elevator may not be a terminal elevator. A terminal elevator must be at a terminal point, whereas a public elevator may be outside of a terminal point. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) satisfied with this?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 132: no limiting of liability of warehouseman,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The section reads:

> No terminal warehouseman shall insert in any receipt issued by him any language in any wise limiting or modifying his liabilities or responsibility, except as in this part mentioned and except in so far as all parties concerned consent thereto.

I have on examination concluded that it is not right to leave these words in, and I propose to strike out all words after 'mentioned.' The warehouse receipt is a very important document, it embodies contracts and if you allow a plea to be put up that so and so has agreed to have it otherwise, it will lead to interminable confusion.

On section 151a,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I propose to add to 151 a subsection providing that seed elevators shall not be obliged to store grain for outsiders. It permits

them to do so but does not compel them. While thus protecting the operators of seed elevators, we require them to be licensed and to come under supervision.

On section 159,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It was proposed to add a subsection to subsection 4, which provided that the owner of the grain shall have an absolute right of direction of the shipment of that grain for 48 hours after he has placed it in the elevator. On consideration I have decided that this amendment, which was proposed by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), does not give to the owner of the grain any right which he does not now possess under subsection 4.

Mr. OLIVER. I was not present at the last discussion of this section. I quite realize the necessity of the section, but it is a most arbitrary provision and an arbitrary provision in any law is liable to abuse and abuses have arisen. I am inclined to think that the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Moosejaw would establish a principle that would be of some substantial advantage to the owner of the grain.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am not a lawyer, but it strikes me in looking at the English of the section that the proposed subsection gives no more right of detention of the grain than is given under subsection 4. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to providing for 48 hours of absolute detention if the committee think it best, so as to give an opportunity to the shipper of the grain to change his mind and send it somewhere else if he can make a better sale; but this would not very often happen, as we find by experience.

Mr. OLIVER. The implication in the section seems to be that the elevator man, being subject to the requirement, would be prevented from shipping the grain before forty-eight hours had elapsed. The principle, I think, is sufficiently important to warrant us in recognizing the proprietary rights of the owner of the grain for a short period after he puts his grain into the elevator, so that the elevator man shall not be at liberty to ship it out say an hour after he receives it. This point is perhaps more important in Alberta than in Manitoba or Saskatchewan, owing to the possibility of grain from Alberta being routed east or west. It is for that reason that I am somewhat stronger on the point than my hon. friend perhaps thinks I should be.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will make an amendment which will make it obligatory on the elevator man to allow forty-eight hours to pass before the shipment is made. The farmer, of course, can waive that at any time.

Mr. KNOWLES. If it is made obligatory on the elevator man to give forty-eight hours' notice before the grain goes out, this provides all the protection that is given absolutely by subsection 4 of section 159.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If section 164 is passed as amended, it accomplishes everything that is necessary.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would call the minister's attention to the fact that his amendment in section 164 does not provide for the shipper waiving his right so that the grain could be sent off the very day it was put in if he wanted that done.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will see that the waiver is put into section 164 in the same way that it is in section 159.

On section 169—special bins,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I propose to strike out the words 'to any buyer' which should not be in there.

Mr. OLIVER. I think there is a mix up about this section that perhaps is not covered by the amendment my hon. friend proposes unless he has some other amendment.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have given some attention to the section and it strikes me as being all right. The owner is not allowed—which is provided for in another part of the Act—and he is not allowed to allot special bins for other purposes than those which are stated in the provisions of this Bill as to flat warehouses. He is restricted in two things, the time and the purpose. The purpose of these provisions was to allow farmers to get grain out as sound and quickly as possible.

Mr. OLIVER. The special bin in a flat warehouse is only granted to farmers?

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

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure it is not intended to restrict a bin in a country elevator to farmers?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No it is not.

Mr. OLIVER. Yet that is what this section would do as amended. The provision of section 183 is made to apply to this section, and if that refers only to farmers in the case of a flat warehouse, it makes it apply also to farmers in the case of country elevators. I think under such circumstances it is an awkward construction, compelling a person who wants

information to go to some other part of the Act to get his information fixed. I would suggest that the minister draft this section in order that it should convey the exact idea which he desires to convey.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will strike out the words 'to any buyer' and I will consider the point raised by my hon. friend.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 191—dimensions of loading platforms.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This takes up the question of the loading platform which I promised to look into, to see if anything could be done to reconcile the warring factions. I now propose to insert the following after the word 'Board' in the 26th line, 'which shall be of such height, width and length as the board prescribes, provided that in no case shall the length exceed 100 feet nor the width 24 feet.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 207, special powers to board to order supply of cars,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is proposed to substitute for section 207 the section of which I gave notice, and which, I believe, has been printed. This amended section provides for all the cases of discretion permitted to the warehouse men, and now to the board under the Manitoba Grain Act, which is found in 'A' elevators that are in danger of collapse and in 'D' where there is a liability to heating, and also for the other two cases which were placed in Bill 96 which we passed in this House, which was passed also in the Senate, and is now in operation. It adds also subsection 'E' as follows:

(e) Whenever, after due examination, the board considers it necessary and advisable in order to relieve congestion and facilitate the despatch of grain.

I do not know that it is necessary to explain, after the discussions we have had upon the clause in the Bill which has become law, why this subsection (e) is added here. It would seem proper that the board, which has the whole range of the grain transport in its eye and under its management, should have this discretion vested in it. When, in any particular case it is represented that there is congestion, or the despatch of grain is hindered, the board may make due investigation, and if, after due consideration, it deems it necessary and advisable to relieve the congestion and facilitate the despatch of grain, it is given discretion and power to so order. The purpose is fully explained by the subsection itself. With reference to this matter many objections and representations have been made. One petition has been received from the Credit Men's Association or Business Men's Association, petitions which have been largely signed and numerous copies of which and signatures to which have come into the office, asking for the suspension of the car order provision. Now, the suspension of the car order provision is a very different thing from the granting of this discretionary power to the Board of Grain Commissioners, an extension of the discretionary powers which they, in the person of the Warehouse Commissioner, already have, and which we have extended by our legislation of a few days ago. The moment petitions were circulated and signed in favour of suspending the car order section of the Manitoba Grain Act the farmers and the shippers of grain, of course, were alarmed. They were in complete hostility to the suspension of the car order provisions, for they remembered the situation some years ago, and which was relieved for them by the enactments made in 1905. And they were properly apprehensive of having the provisions suspended or done away with even temporarily, for fear that the old conditions might be brought back.

Now on that apprehension, and with that view, numerous letters and petitions have been forwarded to the department praying that the car order provisions of the Manitoba Grain Act be not disturbed. These two different petitions have come in and have been considered. I made some remarks in reference to this the other day. Whilst there are very strong representations made that it would be more economical and more in accordance with the general purposes and operations of the railway companies in their transport system, to give them the fullest privilege and powers over the distribution of their cars; on the other hand the situation in the west is a peculiar situation. We do not propose for a moment to interfere with the present security of the farmer gained for him by that legislation. At the same time, conditions are various in the northwest, and changes take place from season to season; and with all due regard for those rights and their preservation, I think we will not make a mistake if we give to the Board of Grain Commissioners the restricted but added discretion that is provided for in subsection (e). If you examine the car order provisions and also the practical working out of the same, you can see they are not based on grounds of absolute equality of privilege. The provisions are such that every man who has half a carload of grain to ship, in conjunction with his neighbour who may have half a carload of grain to ship, has the privilege of call-

ing for one car, and for one car only until all other orders are filled. The large farmer who has many thousands of bushels of grain just as valuable to him in its way as the smaller crop is to the smaller farmer, has the privilege of calling for and placing on the order book one car, and until all orders are filled he gets no other. The elevator which is patronized by the buyer, and by the farmer as well to a very large extent, and which serves as both store house and forwarder for the farmers' grain, though it may contain 25,000 bushels or 100,000 bushels, has the privilege of calling for but one car on the order book, and until his turn comes again he gets no more as an elevator company or as an elevator man. The same is carried out all the way through. It is not, then as I say, based on grounds of equality of interest. I am not here to argue that it ought to be altogether based on the grounds of equality of interest in grain to be shipped; for I think if there is any one who needs to be protected, any one who needs to be cared for especially, even to the placing of restrictions upon others, it is the far distant and isolated and small farmer, who is often but a late comer into the northwest, who comes with his hands, and his team, and has little of this world's goods, who may need advances to be made to him to buy the utensils and stock with which to work, who has often to ask the country storekeeper for sufficient provisions and supplies to keep him until his grain crop matures and can be sold.

That person, I think, not only has a right to our sympathy, but he has a right to all the protection that we can possibly give him consistent with the fair rights of others. I do not need to go into an elaborate discussion of this matter to show to this committee that these rights of the small farmer are not only his best possession, are not only the ground for his privilege of ordering a car if he has a carload, but that they are also preserved to him by the facility with which he can get storage and sale of his grain when it is impossible for him to get a car. I have read a good deal in the newspapers, and I have stacks of letters in my department which show the difficulties, and troubles, and the almost absolute necessities of many of the class of people to whom I refer, when after the summer's toil, and the autumn's reaping and the late harvest and threshing of grain, they are able at last to bring their wagon loads, or their half-wagon loads, of grain to the country station, to find that they cannot get a car, to find that the whole elevator capacity is filled, and that there is no purchaser for their grain because the purchaser has neither car to take away the grain nor elevator in which to store it. Then again, we have the conditions that arise with regard to some sections of the country as to frosting, as to late harvest, as to the dampness which ensues, and the like of that. These are cases when those who have the direction of affairs should specially strive to relieve those persons and those sections of the overplus of their grain when it can be best saved, and often when it must be quickly saved in order to prevent it from being a total loss. We propose to have a Grain Commission which shall be able, efficient, honest and broad-minded, and to that Grain Commission I am going to ask this committee to give the discretions which are provided in this clause.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a very important amendment which my hon. friend proposes; it involves a very important principle, and is entitled to the serious consideration of the committee. The legislation contained in this particular part of the Grain Act is, it may be said, very remarkable legislation. It undertakes to deal with the property of one man in the interest of some other man. It is the extreme of what might be called socialistic legislation; I think, perhaps, the most extreme example of socialistic legislation that is on the statute book of any country. It is for the protection of the individual against corporations, or an aggregate of corporations.

It need not be supposed for a moment that such remarkable legislation would ever have appeared upon the statute-books, or having appeared, would have remained there, had there not been the very strongest reasons why, in the public interest, that legislation should be maintained. It has been on the statute-book for a number of years, it has been bitterly opposed from the very beginning on one side and determinedly supported on the other. There is no possibility of the two parties to this, what might be called, irrepressible conflict, coming to any amicable agreement. There is only one thing to do, and that is to take sides with one party or the other, either to maintain the position which has been maintained in the legislation that is now on the statute-book and stand for the right of the individual, or give up that legislation and permit the corporation to have its way. I have heard what my hon. friend has said with regard to the propriety of giving full authority to the Board of Grain Commissioners. On the same principle that my hon. friend has stated to the House it would be just as right to say that we only need one clause in this Act, namely, to give the Board of Grain Commissioners full authority to manage the grain trade of Canada. We are not going to do that and my hon. friend is not proposing to do it. Within the compass of a very long and complicated Act, an Act of very remarkable detail, he is laying down what shall be done in this, that and the

other circumstances and conditions. I will admit that this is a remarkable case, but the very fact that this legislation is remarkable is the very reason why the authority of this statute should be there to protect the right of the individual as the only means whereby his right can be efficiently protected and the only means by which he can have confidence in the protection of that right. It, of course, goes without saying that where it is attempted by legislation to interfere with the rights of property in such a remarkable manner as this Act does interfere with the rights of property and the course of trade and transportation, there can be no question but that there will be inequalities and, if you like, cases of injustice under its provisions. Many individual cases have occurred, and are occurring to-day in which it would have been much better if this Act had not been on the statute-book and transportation companies and grain dealers had their full liberty to transact their business as they might see fit. In many cases it would have been to the interest of the individual grain producer that that condition should have prevailed. That must be admitted and we cannot expect ever to have legislation of this detailed character that will not result in that way. At the same time from every part of the prairie country where people are raising grain there comes the same protest to-day as that which has come on every previous occasion against the abrogation of this, what they consider, safeguard of their right to a share in car distribution not according to the quantity of the grain, but according to priority of demand. I understand that during this present year, under the extraordinary circumstances, that have prevailed, there have been occasions when the warehouse commissioner has gone outside of the terms of the Act, and, in defiance of the Act, has ordered cars to certain places for the purpose of relieving the extraordinary conditions that prevailed there at the time. I am quite aware that the provision which my hon. friend proposes to insert in the Act, merely places, by authority of statute in the hands of the board, which is to be appointed, the right to do what has been done, under these urgent conditions without the sanction of law. I hold the view that although there is that precedent for this provision of the Act, it is still in the interest of the people who are the most intimately concerned that the Act should remain as it is. Even if relief, such as has been given during the past year, cannot be granted if the Act remains as it is, still the mind of the people of the west is that the Act should remain as it is and that there should not be that possibility of variation in its terms that my hon. friend suggests. There is a provision for variation in this section. It provides that in the case of an elevator in danger of collapsing or in the case of the grain in the elevator being in danger of heating, they shall have a right to a special order of cars. It would be quite right to add a provision as to a special order of cars in the case of distributing seed grain, but I must take exception and the very strongest exception, to any provision authorizing the ordering of cars to places where grain is damp and thereby liable to become damaged in accordance with the amendment made to the Manitoba Grain Act and to this further provision that cars may be ordered:

> Whenever, after due examination, the board considers it necessary and advisable in order to relieve congestion and facilitate the despatch of grain.

In the first case—that of sending cars specially to places where there is damaged grain—I consider that the provisions now in the section to deal with elevators in danger of collapse and elevators in which grain is in danger of heating go as far as it is safe for the Act to go. When we have provided, as we have provided in the case of the Manitoba Grain Act, that cars may be specially ordered to any locality where grain is damp, and liable thereby to become damaged, we have not dealt wisely with the condition as it actually prevails in this very season, because the condition prevails in so many localities and these localities are so widely separated that if special orders be given in the interest of each locality where grain is damaged it practically means that there is no special advantage to any locality and the matter is reduced down to the point of that locality which is the greatest favourite, or puts up the best story, getting the advantage, which is an entirely undesirable condition of affairs.

I will admit that under this provision it would be possible to give relief in a certain locality, but in such a year as this, where the damage is extended over a wide area, the provision is absolutely valueless, and inasmuch as it introduces the possibility of favouritism, I object most strongly to this provision being incorporated in the Bill. I agreed to its being adopted as a part of the Manitoba Grain Act for this season without having given the subject the fullest consideration; it was represented to be a matter of urgency and we allowed the Bill to go through; but on fuller consideration I am prepared to take the fullest responsibility for the stand I take that this provision should not be embodied in this Bill which is supposed to be a permanent statute. The provision now proposed throws this whole question, which is the most critical connected with the whole administration

of the Grain Act, absolutely on the discretion of the board. If we do this, without wishing to cast any reflection on the board, we have spent our time for nothing in providing the long and intricate list of regulations which comprise this Act. If you can afford to let the matter of car distribution go to the discretion of the board we may safely leave everything else to the same discretion. I would be bound to give the strongest opposition I could to the amendment now proposed, except that I would be willing to agree to an amendment that would allow of special orders of cars in the case of distribution of seed grain.

Mr. STAPLES. I know that I may be criticised for what I am about to say, by the advisers whom we have coming from the west so frequently. The same organization who are taking such strong exception to any change in the present Grain Act as regards distribution of cars, have always been very anxious that in constituting such a board as this, we should have an independent board. Where are they going to get their independence, if you surround them with legislation that prohibits them from moving one inch to the right or to the left except by special Act of parliament. Certain districts in the west are suffering because they cannot get their crops to market, and if an independent board has the right to go to that particular locality, and as this Act provides to investigate, to make a thorough investigation, then such a locality could get relief. And why should the board not be permitted to give them relief without coming here and asking parliament, which would take probably a whole session; the board should have that much independence, and if they are not anxious to relieve the people's sufferings to the greatest extent then they are not fit and proper persons to be on that board.

My hon. friend has no objection to the seed grain portion of the Bill but he objects with regard to the damp grain. The law before Bill (No. 96) provided relief for whom? For the elevator man whose elevator was collapsing, whose grain was rotting or spoiling, or heating. Was there any relief for the farmer who might have on his farm 5,000 to 10,000 bushels of grain heating or spoiling? Bill (No. 96) provides that such a man can get relief, the same relief as the elevator man. That portion of Bill (No. 96) which deals with damp wheat or wheat that is going wrong, should be incorporated in this Grain Act. I cannot see any objection to incorporating the whole of it. I shall certainly support the minister in the amendments he has proposed.

Mr. KNOWLES. So far the committee have been very harmonious. We have had division on only one matter, the name of the wheat, which was more a question of opinion than of principle, and I want to congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite that so far they have shown a desire to meet the wishes of the grain growers for whom this Bill is in the first instance framed. On this question, however, we seem to part. The question between the western members on the government side and those on this side is whether we are going to give effect to the opinion and desire expressed to us by the organized representatives of the grain growers who constitute the great majority of our electors and without question constitute the foundation of the whole country in the west at least, There is no question as to what the grain growers in the west want. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I am sure, have received representations from many constituents requesting that they should support the view expressed by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). I would not be outside the mark if I said that they had received no representations to the contrary. As far as we are in a position to know the wishes of our constituents at this distance we believe their desires to be that there should be no radical changes in these clauses in connection with the distribution of cars.

My hon. friend from Macdonald says he wants to give this board powers so that they will be able to turn a little to the right and to the left. I have no objection to giving them power to turn to the right, but I do not want to give them power to make a blunder some day and turn to the left. There might be some occasion when they would do good by exercising this discretion. There is no Cabinet minister or ex-Cabinet minister in Canada who will question this statement, that in the administration of the laws of parliament or the regulations of a department, there are cases in which it would be in the public interest to depart from the law or regulation. In the administration of the lands in the west I have known many a case in which the homestead regulations bore heavily on a man, but at the same time the parliament of Canada is governing, not one man simply, but seven or eight millions of people, and we must adopt legislation which in the long run and on the large scale is going to be for the advantage of the great masses of the people. Would it be to the advantage of the grain trade of the west and of the people of Canada generally to have this clause inserted in this Act? I submit that it would not. I submit that it would be a step in a backward direction. This protection was only put on our statute-book after years of agitation by our farmers for this car distribution. It is not wholly satisfactory but it

is in the right direction, and it would be a reactionary step to take away that protection.

Mr. STAPLES. The old Act made provision for the elevator man whose grain was spoiling. I suppose the hon. gentleman is in favour of that part of the old Act, as it stood. Is he opposed to giving the farmer whose grain may be spoiling on the farm the same relief?

Mr. KNOWLES. I am entirely in favour of giving the farmer the relief which my hon. friend thinks he refers to, but which he is mistaken about. Before I sit down I wish to read a few resolutions of the farmers, who are intelligent, and who know as well as my hon. friend does what relief they need. I will first read an official extract from the Grain Growers' Association of the province of Alberta, signed by the secretary, Edward J. Fream. He says:

It has been rumoured that section 207 of the Grain Bill will be considerably changed. This section is, we consider, one of the most important in the Act and one on which considerable time and attention should be bestowed before allowing any changes to be made. It gives a privilege to the farmer which is his only safeguard against the elevator interests, and while a determined onslaught has repeatedly been made upon this provision, yet the opponents of same have never yet been able to present any logical argument why a change should be made. Before this clause was added to the Grain Act the farmers were completely at the mercy of the interests, and if the clause is removed or in any way weakened by dangerous amendments which might be made to give two different meanings, conditions will be such that in a short time the farmers would find the car distribution and the general treatment they would receive from the railway companies and the elevator interests even more intolerable than they were before the clause was introduced into the Act.

I attach a great deal of importance to such an expression as this, as I am sure the minister will. It is my duty also to inform the House of the representations from the associations of farmers in my own constituency. Here is one from the Milden Grain Growers' Association, in the northern part of the Moosejaw district. I will not read the whole of the preamble:

Whereas many statements made in the said petition are untrue and misleading; and

Whereas any change made in the car distribution clauses of the Manitoba Grain Act, would be unfair and detrimental to both the large and small farming interests of this province; therefore

Resolved, that the Milden Grain Growers Association condemns the petition of the Canadian Credit Men's Association, and earnestly requests that no change be made in the aforesaid clauses of the Manitoba Grain Act; and

Further resolved, that the secretary of this association be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Hon. R. L. Borden, Premier of Canada, Hon. Geo. E. Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, and to Mr. Knowles, representative of this constituency.

C. MILLS, President.
E. W. HENRY, Secretary.

The following is from Boldenhurst, in the northern part of my riding and further west:

At a meeting of the Boldenhurst Branch of the Grain Growers' Association, the following motion was unanimously carried:—

It was moved by Wilbert Haggarty and seconded by James Parsons, that this association strongly disapproves of any change being made in the Manitoba Grain Act in regard to the distribution of cars.

GEO. E. DAW,
Secretary-treasurer,
Branch of G. G. A., Boldenhurst, Sask.

Another from Marquis, addressed to myself, is as follows:

Dear Sir,—Just a few lines asking your assistance in the present debate before the House on the present Grain Act, especially section 99. We, the members of the Marquis Association do respectively request that the present distribution of cars be not changed, as the smaller farmers would be much more handicapped than they are at the present time. Hoping this will receive your immediate attention.

Yours truly,
ALEX. HENRY, Sec.-treas.,
Marquis, Sask.

Another from Netherhill, as follows:

Therefore, be it resolved, that we the members of the Netherhill Branch of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, here assembled, do hereby protest against the change of clause 99 of the Manitoba Grain Act, whereby the farmer will be deprived of the privilege of an equal allotment of cars with the Elevator Company.

Another from Dinsmore, as follows:

Be it resolved, whereas the Credit Men's Association has sent out petitions calling for certain alterations in clause 99, sections a, b, c of the Manitoba Grain Act;

Be it further resolved, that this branch of the Grain Growers' Association consider this petition to be unfair and misleading and such as to cause serious loss and inconvenience to the farmers of western Canada;

Be it further resolved, that this branch of the Grain Growers' Association earnestly protest against any alteration whatever in the clauses of the Manitoba Grain Act referred to.

Another from the Cataraqui Grain Growers, as follows:

The attempts that are being made in different sections of the country to attribute the cause of the present grain blockade to that section of the Manitoba Grain Act which relates to the distribution of cars, we entirely disagree with, and further, firmly believe that

this section of the Act has been, since its inception, of vital importance to farmers in securing more fair and just treatment in marketing and selling their grain, and that any alteration to its present reading we strongly object to.

(Signed) JOS. A. MILNE,
Secretary.

A copy of this has been forwarded to Hon. Geo. E. Foster and Premier Borden.

I have received a communication from a constituent of mine who is a very representative man, Mr. A. Bryan, of Bridgeford, as follows:

Dear Sir,—I have addressed to the Hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce a strong protest against the petition that I understand has been presented to him by the Credit Men's Association of Winnipeg. The object of this is not to help the small farmers, as it is claimed to be, but to further the interests of the elevator people. The small farmer who has not a carload of grain to ship has not asked for it and does not want it. Most of these men here got some at least of their grain into the elevators, while quite a few small farmers who have just a carload to ship have not as yet been able to get a car.

The result of suspending clause 99 of the Manitoba Grain Act would be to compel these men to sell to the elevators. Now it is notorious in the west that the elevators rob the farmers all ends and sides. Not only is there a difference in price of between 5 and 10 cents per bushel between Port Arthur and street prices, but the wheat is knocked down a grade; it is docked extortionately and oftentimes proper weight is not given. On behalf of 200 farmers of the Bridgeford district I emphatically protest against it. Great consternation has been caused in regard to the said petition. and should it be regarded favourably by the government, it might cause considerable friction, even rioting, as the farmers are determined not to have their rights infringed upon.

And they trust, you, as their representative, will make a strong protest when the matter is brought up.

I will now read a telegram from a western farmer, than whom there is none better in Canada. I refer to Mr. Fred W. Green, secretary of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association. The message is as follows:

Moosejaw Sask., Feb., 9, 1912.

W. E. Knowles, M.P., Ottawa.

Received many letters this morning signed Credit Association. Petition under misapprehension. Asked to have names removed. Holders of petition refuse. Asking me what they can do. Farmers generally denouncing Credits. Mean underhand trick.

(Sgd.) FRED W. GREEN,
Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association.

Speaking for myself I have never had any other representation but one side of the question. I have had no constituent ask me to change to the other side. If the constituents of other hon. gentlemen have requested them to take the stand they took well and good, it is their business; but for myself there is no possible doubt in my mind as to the stand I must take viz: That this matter be not changed in the radical way in which the minister desires it should be changed.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I am rather ignorant about the matter. Would the hon. gentleman give me a specific case where the farmers will be damaged by the enforcement of the proposed amendment?

Mr. KNOWLES. In regard to this matter it is feared that a peril would be constantly hanging over the grain growers by reason of the power held by the three men who constitute that board. It is feared that from influences that were not in the interest of the country, the board might order a distribution of cars that would prejudice some and unduly favour others.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I would like to get an instance of that if I could.

Mr. KNOWLES. I could not do that because the board is not yet born, and I do not believe in original sin to that extent.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The farmers must have instances in view, I should think of what might happen.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Then I would like to have instances of that.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think I might answer that question in a brief way by saying that you place great power in the hands of three men. They will doubtless be respectable men, and men of ability, but I have not the least doubt also that they will be strong party men. It is possible they would be subject to influences that are not the highest and noblest—my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has been long enough in politics to know what I mean—and they might order a distribution of cars which would not be in the interest of the grain growers. Therefore, there is a feeling of danger which overshadows the hopes of our grain growers if that power is allowed to rest in the hands of the board. The member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) says why not give them the power to turn to the right or to the left. I stood up in this House when we were framing the section of the Bill providing that the board be given power to make regulations, and I said I could conceive that during the grain rush it might be necessary to make regulations without obtaining the consent of the minister or the consent of the Governor in Council. But the government would not give them even that little power. They said: 'Nothing. Every change in the regulations which this Board of Grain Commissioners make must be approved, not only by the minister but by the Gov-

ernor in Council. They take the stand that they want the board to possess such wide powers and yet they are tying their hands. So strictly I say that with regard to this very essential and vital matter in the operation of this Act there should be no taking away from the farmer the protection that he is enjoying the benefit of.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would ask the hon. gentleman before he sits down whether he is in favour, or his friends on that side, of the House of incorporating Bill (No. 96) as we passed it in reference to damp grain in this Act?

Mr. KNOWLES. I would have to read the Act over agin.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. This is the Bill that we inserted and it is now law:

Subsection 1 of section 99b of the Manitoba Grain Act, chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as the said subsection is enacted by section 41 of chapter 45 of the Statutes of 1908, is amended by inserting after the word 'collapse', in the third line thereof, the words 'to places where grain is damp and liable to become damaged, or for the purpose of distributing seed grain to any point in the western division.'

Are hon. gentleman opposite in favour of incorporating that Bill in the Act?

Mr. KNOWLES. If the hon. gentleman wants to make it permanent for all the year, and every season of the year, I say no, I am not in favour of it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. gentleman understands my meaning. I believe that the Act is a fair and legitimate one and I am in favour of it. I have received a number of letters and petitions from the farmers throughout my district asking me to exert to the utmost any influence I could, to prevent any change in the clause which refers to the distribution of cars. I received no petitions or letters to the contrary. I think there is something in the suggestion of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples), that the fears entertained as to what would occur under the operation of the clause are more imaginery than real. The member for South York (Mr. Maclean) asked for an instance of where this would do damage. As the law is not operative yet it is not possible to give an exact instance; but the reason, I understand, why the farmers in my district object to any change is that in 1902, 1906 and in 1908 there were certain amendments made to the clause referring to the distribution of cars, and all the time they have been asking to be put in a position which they believe to be in their interest. The farmers believed they were subject to the influence of certain interests—it may be railway interests, elevator interests or other interests —and, rightly or wrongly, they feel that the clause as we have it in the Manitoba Grain Act is in their interest. Now, in my opinion, if there was not some suspicion, justly entertained perhaps, that the interests were again operating in the belief that the matter had gone too far in favour of the farmers and against the railways and the elevators, they would not be sending us these petitions. This Bill, with the exception of clause (e), I am prepared to accept, and to defend before the farmers of my district. I believe it is in the interest not only of the farmers but of the country, that we should have Bill (No. 96) incorporated in this Act, and the other provisions of the amendment that the Minister of Trade and Commerce sees fit to introduce. But I must say—I cannot help saying—that I am a little afraid of clause (e). If it does not go any further than it says, well and good—and after all perhaps that is the only argument one has a right to make, that it means what it says—but I know that the arguments of the farmers will be that it is the thin edge of the wedge.

This subsection (e) reads:

When after due examination the board considers it necessary and desirable, in order to relieve congestion and facilitate the despatch of grain.

Now, if it always remained there, I believe the farmers would not so seriously object to this subsection. And I would not have it thought that I lack faith in the commission that is to be appointed or in the efficiency of this Bill as a working measure. We have been in committee on this Bill for some days, and, as my hon. friend was good enough to say—and we can all agree with him—this has been a very amicable committee and we have ground out what I believe will be a splendit Grain Bill in the interest of this country. But this is the one clause which the farmers in my constituency do not feel fully satisfied about. Perhaps, for the reasons I stated a while ago they may have good reasons to be fearful of something that might occur if such broad powers as are proposed under this subsection were given to this commission. To repeat what I said before so far as the other clauses are concerned, I am in full sympathy with them. My hon. friend from Edmonton, (Mr. Oliver) does not seem to be willing to go so far. But I am prepared to go upon the platform in my constituency, and support these clauses, as being in the best interests of the farmers, all except this one. I think it was the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples), who said that a farmer might have 5,000 bushels of grain in his granary spoiling, because of damp or of some other reason. Surely it would be of advantage to that farmer if the commission had the powers, although he had had his

car, to grant him the privilege of receiving another car. Still, so far as this subsection (e) is concerned, I do not feel that I am in a position to favour so broad an extension of the powers of the commission as this would seem to give. I am strongly in favour of the other clauses, but this subsection (e) I could hardly support without further light.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Keep an open mind.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes, I will keep an open mind.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I should like to endorse what has fallen from my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) as well as my hon. friends from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) as to the universality of opinion on this subject among the farmers so far as we can gather from the communications sent to us. Personally, I have for years laid well to heart the teaching of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) as to the importance of mixed farming. I am not immediately concerned with grain farming, preferring to deliver my grain on foot. I have no very strong opinion on this question nor any intimate knowledge of it. But I have an intimate knowledge of the university of opinion which prevails amongst those who do know about it. This is not a party question at all. I had a letter a few days ago from a man who, so far as I know, never gave anything but a Conservative vote in his life until the last election, when he had the good sense, according to my view, to vote for reciprocity, and he spoke about this provision as being the last straw that would break the camel's back. Similar expressions occur in other communications that I have received. That would appear to indicate that the men who are concerned, the men irrespective of party who are growing this grain, have been well served by the state of things as it is. I have not the remotest doubt that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) has brought to bear on this question what he brings to bear upon everything, a passionate desire to know the full details and to do what he believes to be best under the circumstances. I am sorry, on that account, that I have to differ from him on this question. But the representations are so unanimous from those who are concerned that I have no option. I agree with my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver).

Mr. MEIGHEN. The question before the committee is worthy of the most serious attention of which we are capable. I have no fault to find with the statements of fact as generally presented by hon. gentlemen opposite, namely, that there is a very unanimous sentiment in the west against any radical change in section 108 of the Act, and the general provisions referring to car distribution. At the same time, the reasons which I have received, and indeed the reasons so far as they have been presented to the House by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) do not appear to conflict with the principle or with the details of the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). The position taken by the organized farmers is that the ground gained some years ago—and largely, I believe, as a result of their own agitation—shall not now be lightly surrendered or lost. To my mind, this Bill does not go one step towards the surrendering any of that ground. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) seemed to try to get at the root of the principle involved, and I think, he saw it; but I think he shunned the logical result because he feared it might lose to him some political advantage that he seemed to think in sight.

Now, what is this clause? In former years in this country the rights of property were magnified, they were considered so sacred that public rights frequently were disregarded. And in no case did this idea of private rights predominate more than in the case of the railway companies. One of these rights was considered to be that of placing their rolling stock where they wished, and of carrying the grain as seemed to them most convenient. But parliament came to see in time that the public had a vested interest in this matter as well as the railway company, and parliament took upon itself to say by what rule the cars should be distributed. They declared that John Jones who orders first, and William Smith who orders next, and elevator 'B' that orders next shall receive cars in this order. That was ground gained so far as it went, and so far as it has gone it has worked out to the advantage of the western farmer. The railway has not been able to dictate, since that was enforced, what they should do with what they considered their own property rights. The amendments proposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) instead of being a surrender, in my opinion is an advance on this principle. It declares that the general rule laid down shall still be followed, that parliament having once assumed the right to say how this should be done in a general way, still stands to that right; but parliament declares not only for that right in itself, but also that the commission appointed under the authority of parliament, the representatives of the public interest and the public need, shall be able to

enforce that right. Hon. members opposite conceded the whole principle when they conceded Bill (No. 96), they conceded the force of the argument presented and the conditions that demand a change which have been brought forward by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

But now they recoil, and all they can advance to surround themselves is that they received certain resolutions. Why? Because the farmers have been taught to believe, whether rightly or wrongly, that there is going to be a surrender, there is going to be a step backward, and that all the ground gained back in 1907 is to be given up. That is not the case at all. The principle of the resolution read by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) shows that if they understood what is proposed to be done, there would be no opposition. What does Mr. Fream say? In the body of the memorial presented by him, this appears:

> While it may be possible to provide for permission being given to the commission after investigation to supply cars for seed grain, or upon petition of farmers for the removal of wet or damaged grain, or where there was suffering through a shortage of fuel or food supplies, yet if there is any chance of the rights of the farmers being infringed by ambiguous or vaguely worded amendments introduced into the Bill, it will be better for our interests as producers for the clause to remain as it now stands.

Now Mr. Fream states the whole thing; in other words, he says that the better way is to leave the law as it stands and to follow the general rule just as it was, but, if, to the advantage of the farmer, it can be shown that it should bend in individual cases, that is all the bettter, provided the clause is clearly and not vaguely worded. That indicates the stand taken by the western farmer.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does not the hon. gentleman think that clause (e) goes further?

Mr. MEIGHEN. It goes no further in principle at all. But the commissioners would require to be convinced that the farmers' interest was served by a divergence. You can never, by an individual statement of contingencies, state them all. There may be something which we do not conceive in this committee, and to make it advisable that the strict provisions of 198 should be made to bend in the interest of a certain community, clause (e) is neither more nor less than saying that if we have not succeeded in stating what classes and contingencies may occur, then the clause shall give the commission power to go beyond. Now the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) says that if you give the commission this power, you might just as well burn the Grain Act, and he says we are appointing a commission who shall superintend the grain trade of this country. Now what is the logical position of the member for Edmonton? What is the principle of the Grain Act? It provides a machinery that shall take care of the distribution and the outlet of the western grain, the grading of it, and so forth; it provides machinery for handling the grain trade of this country. Then it appoints a commission to superintend that machinery, and it says to them: There is the machinery for you, take and operate it, and in operating it, we lay down certain general rules that you must follow. That is the Grain Act. This does not violate the principle in any degree. The general rules are laid down, but to get certain individual instances the commissioners are given power to acquiese in a public demand and in the public interest. Now why does the hon. member for Edmonton argue that this goes too far? He says it is right to take this clause providing for a rotary distribution of cars as a general rule. We lay that down, and I approve of it.

Now he says: You give the Grain Commissioners power in one case to diverge from it, that is, in a case where it is requisite to do so for the distribution of seed grain. That is all right, he says, to give them the power to diverge when it is requisite to do so. That is not violating the principle of the Act or of the constitution; but you are violating both, he says; and you are burning the Act, if you give them power to deal with cases of damp, wet wheat. The hon. member for Edmonton must see that there is no difference of principle at all. Some days ago all the members opposite were prepared to agree, by acceding to Bill (No. 96), that it was quite in accord with the spirit of the Grain Act to give the commissioners discretionary power, not only in the case of its requirement for distribution of seed, but also in the case of its requirement for allowing an outlet for damp grain likely to be endangered; and all along they have been prepared, not only to give that discretionary power in these two cases, but to give discretionary power when the grain was damp and in danger of being damaged in the elevators. So that on both sides of this parliament we have for years recognized that it was in the interest of the people to give the Grain Commissioners, or those who have preceded them in practically the same duties, power to make this provision suit in any individual cases in the public interest. That is all we are doing now. We are extending their discretion, but their discretion must always be exercised in the public interest and as demanded by individual contingencies? There is no principle at stake, there is no ground to be surren-

dered, it is a public tribunal that is going to have charge of it.

Mr. OLIVER. How do the words in this section limit the action of the commissioners to individual contingencies? I mean in contingencies as relating to individuals.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is the whole purport of each clause of the amendment. What is the first?

(c) for the purpose of distributing seed grain lapse;

(b) to places where grain is damp and thereby liable to become damaged;

(c) for the purpose of distributing seed grain to any point in the western division;

(d) in cases where the operator of any country elevator reports in writing, under oath, that some portion of the grain in such elevator is heated, and that in order to preserve such grain it is necessary to ship such heated grain to the terminal elevator for treatment; provided, however, that no relief shall be granted in such last mentioned cases as long as the warehouseman has sufficient room in his building for the re-handling of such grain;

(e) whenever, after due examination the board considers it necessary and advisable in order to relieve congestion and facilitate the dispatch of grain.

Individual cases must be thoroughly examined first, and cause must be shown to convince the board that it is necessary and advisable in order to relieve the congestion, and to facilitate the dispatch of grain. So the whole section is built upon the idea that individual contingencies demand the exercise of this discretionary power of the board. Therefore, I think if hon. gentlemen will keep in mind just the actual circumstances as they will present themselves, and will let this go through, I think less than one year will serve to dispel any fear that may be at present abroad in western Canada concerning this requirement.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

PATENTS OF THOMAS D. RAMBAUT.

Further consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill (No. 84) respecting certain patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—Mr. Ames.

On section 2—power to receive petitions and make orders.

Mr. CARVELL. Mr. Chairman, before this section is adopted I want to direct the attention of the committee to something that perhaps is not very apparent on the face of the Bill as it stands. The committee will remember that when this was up, I think a week ago to-night, I asked the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, (Mr. Ames) who has charge of this Bill, if he knew whether these patents, as originally issued, came under the provisions of section 44 of the Patent Act. The hon. gentleman stated that he was not in a position to give me that information. I wrote to Mr. Lynch, chief of the patent office, and, a few days ago, received this communication:

Ottawa, Feb. 16, 1912.

My dear Mr. Carvell,

In reply to your question over the telephone this afternoon, relative to a number of patents granted to E. W. Cooke and assigned to one Rambaut, I beg to say that none of the patents have been under section 44 of the Patent Act (compulsory license system).

Yours very sincerely,
(Sgd.) W. J. LYNCH
Chief of Patent Office.

F. B. Carvell, Esq., M.P.
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Just consider for a moment what the promoters of this Bill are asking parliament to do for them. By section 38 of the Patent Act, which has been the law of the land for many years, it is provided that in order to hold a patent, the patentee, either directly or through some other person, must actually commence the manufacture of the patented article in Canada within two years of the granting of the patent. He must do more than that; he must have the article ready to be sold to any person who applies for it at a reasonable price and continually be in that position, or, to read the section, it is as follows:

Such patent, and all the rights and privileges thereby granted shall cease and determine, and the patent shall be null and void at the end of two years from the date thereof, unless the patentee or his legal representatives, within that period or an authorized extension thereof, commence, and after such commencement, continuously carry on in Canada the construction or manufacture of the invention patented, in such a manner that any person desiring to use it may obtain it or cause it to be made for him at a reasonable price at some manufactory or establishment for making or constructing it in Canada.

That was found, in some instances, to work a hardship. I could give an illustration wherein it would work a hardship. A man might invent a complicated piece of machinery—we will say a certain kind of steam engine, or machinery for the making of some particular, specified article. Take, for instance, a printing press, or anything that you could imagine of which there are not many sales in Canada. It might cost a large amount of money to equip the factory and put it in a position to manufac-

ture this and possibly, when you equipped the factory and had manufactured one or two articles, it might be a number of years before you found sale for more than those two articles. The result would be an enormous loss. In that case many people have failed to keep their patents alive by manufacturing them simply because the initial expenditures in getting ready to manufacture and being in a position to keep on manufacturing the patented article have been so great that they did not feel that they could afford to undertake it. Therefore, in 1903, parliament attempted to get around that difficulty by passing section 44 of the Patent Act as it now stands, and which was codified in the revision of 1906. It is the law of the land to-day. Section 44 provides, speaking generally, that if, in the judgment of the commissioner of patents, an article patented comes within the class I have described, something which it would not be fair or reasonable to expect the patentee to be manufacturing all the time and to be in a position to sell to any person who wants it, then the commissioner of patents has the right to give him a license so that he will not be compelled to manufacture, but he must hold himself in readiness to lease to any other person who wants to manufacture the article at any time, and if they cannot agree upon the royalty to be paid for the right then the commissioner of patents is appointed arbitrator in the matter.

But when this man Rambaut, or his predecessor in title, applied for his patents and his patents were issued, they were not brought within the conditions of section 44 of the Act of 1903, and section 44 was the law of the land, then as it is to-day. Anyone can readily understand why these patents were not brought under the provisions of section 44. They did not apply to a complicated piece of machinery, they were not regarding an article which might never be sold to customers because it was not like a complicated steam engine. They had reference to a method of making a certain kind of food—you might call it dessicated food—something that would be sold, if sold at all, to thousands and tens of thousands of people. If the invention had any use whatever it would be that an industry would be established or the patent would be sold to other people who would be producing all over the country the article covered by it. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, when this measure was before the committee on a former occasion, took the ground that if we refused this patent we would possibly be preventing the establishment of an industry in Canada. I want to point out to the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, and the members of this committee that if we pass this Bill as it is drawn, and if we ratify section 2, we are defeating the very object that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, claimed to have in view when he asked us in the committee last week to pass this Bill for him. He said: Refuse to pass this Bill and you will probably prevent the establishment of an industry in Canada. I say that if you pass this Bill as it stands to-night, without any question whatever, you will prevent the establishment of an industry in Canada. You will be giving the owner of this patent the right to hold his patent for the remainder of the term of 18 years, which I think would be about 13 years longer, and he may never expend a dollar in Canada either directly or indirectly. He will never have to expend a dollar upon any manufacturing establishment, he will never have to employ a man, until the expiration of 13 years, and still his patent will be perfectly good. All he has to do is to hold himself in readiness to say: I will give any man the right to manufacture this article providing he pays me my royalty. I am satisfied that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, cannot gainsay one statement I have made, because I have given you the law on the matter and I do submit that this Bill should not be passed. If we have to renew this man's patents, surely this committee ought only to renew them like an ordinary patent under section 1. We should not give this man something which he did not have when he got his original patent. They are asking the parliament of Canada not only to give him something which he had lost by this negligence, but they are asking parliament to give him something which he never thought of holding when he got the patent. The most that can be said is that he had a perfect right, if the commissioner of patents had thought proper, to have had the patent brought under the provisions of section 44, but, because it did not come under the provisions of section 44 I think it is only fair to assume that the commissioner of patents did not consider that it was a case that should have come under the provisions of that section. I have no knowledge of that myself and all I can say is that it looks that way to me. Now, they are asking parliament to put this man in a position that the commissioner of patents would not put him in. Therefore, I do submit that section 2 should be defeated because it is bad enough to give an American who has no interest in Canada the right to continue this monopoly and this sort of business, but it is going too far when parliament is asked to continue a monopoly under which the beneficiary will never be compelled to spend a dollar or employ a man in Canada.

Mr. AMES. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) a week ago and also to-night has endeavoured to create

the feeling that this Bill should not pass because the patentee is an American.

Mr. CARVELL. I never made such a statement at any time.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That was the inference.

Mr. CARVELL. I did not say so.

Mr. AMES. I leave it to the judgment of the House if the whole tenor of the hon. gentleman's remarks was not to the effect that he would like to stir up prejudice against the applicant in this case because he was an American and a stranger. Our Canadian patent laws make absolutely no discrimination against members of any nationality, a German, an Englishman, an American, has the same rights to patent as a Canadian. That argument of my hon. friends the House will dispose of once and for all as unworthy of its consideration.

I differ from my hon. friend's interpretation of a portion of the Patent Act. Under the original patent the patentee had the right to proceed under section 38 or section 44. Section 38 makes the patent conditional upon his manufacturing in Canada within two years.

Mr. CARVELL. I spoke to Mr. Lynch and I have his letter stating that this applicant did not come under section 44. If Mr. Lynch has misinformed me, I have misinformed the House.

Mr. AMES. I shall make the matter clear. Section 38 provides that the patent is conditional upon manufacturing within two years and not importing after that time. Section 44 declares the conditions which may be substituted for section 38 in the judgment of the officers. Under that section the patentee may give a license to others to manufacture. Clause 2 of the present Bill does not ask parliament to give this man the rights he originally had in their entirety. This clause simply says that he has the right of patent and the Commissioner of Patents, an official of the government, shall determine whether he can make out a sufficient case to have it declared that he shall have the privileges of section 44. If the Commissioner of Patents is of opinion that it is not advisable to give him the rights under section 44 the commissioner will say so. Inasmuch as the patentee, in the first place, had rights under both section 38 and 44, and purely through a misunderstanding he lost his rights and as this House has affirmed in the second reading that the principle is sound, it only remains for us to settle the terms on which the restoration of rights shall be made. My contention is that he should be given full rights, namely

to act either conditionally under section 38, or section 44, at the discretion of the commissioner. He now asks for two years more within which to commence manufacture. If the House says that he shall not have this privilege then I hope that the House will hold to that precedent and deal in the same way with everyone else who comes here and asks for the restoration of a patent. This Bill asks that he be put back in the place he was in originally, the place he lost through no fault of his own.

The House has repeatedly granted relief to applicants who have forfeited certain rights. In 1909 the House passed five Bills of this character, introduced in every case by supporters of the government and in only one instance did the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) object. Last session, a number of others were passed, several of the applicants being Americans. While hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House they agreed to Bills of this character, four or five of them every session. All these patents were restored although the fees had not been paid and they were restored for six years. In this case all fees had been paid for six years and it will be still another year before the time elapses so far as fees are concerned. These parties did not manufacture, that is all they failed to do.

They ask the opportunity within the next two years of establishing a manufactory here. If that opportunity is given them they will establish it, I thoroughly believe. If they are deprived of the opportunity, that industry will not come to Canada. It is not to be expected that an industry of this character will come to Canada if it is not protected in its patent rights. I do not think people will invest money in an industry requiring any expenditure of capital if they can have no security that the man next door will not immediately imitate their process. They must be protected for a certain length of time. Now, this patent has lapsed, and parliament is asked to restore it. I do not know why exception should be taken to that request in this particular case. We have already passed three Bills of the same character, two of which have passed the Senate; but for some reason this particular Bill has been selected, and every possible objection is made to it.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman say that the Bill that passed here the other night is at all of the same character as this Bill?

Mr. AMES. Yes, very much indeed. On two of the Bills the fees have not been paid, so nothing had been done. In this case the fees have been paid for six

years, from 1907 to 1913. The one requirement of manufacture was not complied with, but the parties interested will be very glad to comply with it if they are given another opportunity. I have not gone into the special reasons why Mr. Rambaut did not originally comply with all the provisions of the Patent Act. These were all given to the House a week ago. Inasmuch as the second reading, which involves the principle, has passed, and inasmuch as the Bill has unanimously passed the Private Bills Committee, and inasmuch as the preamble and the first clause, the essential parts of the Bill, have passed, I can only say that if the House desires to restore the Rambaut patent to the position it originally occupied, it will pass clause 2. But if the House decides that a man who allows his patent to lapse, and who comes here to have it reinstated, shall not have the privileges he first had, it will strike out clause 2, and he will have to be content with clause 1.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend misapprehends the whole purport of the Bill which he is asking parliament to pass. In the first place, I want to disavow the idea that an American, a Frenchman, or a Chinaman has not the right to come to Canada to get a patent. The Patent Act allows any foreigner to patent his invention the same as a native. But what I contend is that we ought not to give an outsider, no matter where he comes from, rights which we ought not to give to one of our own people. My hon. friend either begs the question or does not know what he is talking about. He says that if we want to place this applicant in the same position that he was in before his patent expired, we must give him clause 2 of this Bill. I tell my hon. friend that he is wrong, and every other lawyer in this House who looks into the matter carefully will tell him the same thing. He says that under the original patent he had two options: One was to manufacture within two years, under section 38, and the other was not to manufacture within two years, but to license to somebody else to manufacture, under section 44. My hon. friend needs only to read the provisions of section 44 to see that he is in error. Under section 44 a patent is granted automatically. Section 38 provides for the manufacture for two years, and, thereafter the patentee must keep on manufacturing so that any person can buy the article at a reasonable price, otherwise the patent is void. That is all that any man gets under the Patent Act. If Rambaut or his predecessor wanted more than that when he filed his petition in the Patent Office in 1907, he would have been compelled to apply to be brought within the provisions of section 44 at the time he filed his petition or within six months thereafter.

Mr. AMES. In this case he asked for three months.

Mr. CARVELL. But you have not done it for five years.

Mr. AMES. Does my hon. friend allege that on the 7th of May, 1907, when this man took out these letters patent, he had not the two options?

Mr. CARVELL. He had until the 7th of September, 1907, and that date went by.

Mr. AMES. What this Bill asks is that he be put back where he was on the 7th of May, 1907.

Mr. CARVELL. Why should he be?

Mr. AMES. Why should he not be?

Mr. CARVELL. He allowed the 7th of September, 1907, to go by, and put it on the 27th of September, 1907, and there is no power on earth that can give him the right to come under section 44. Therefore, the argument of my hon. friend is fallacious.

Mr. AMES. I understand that he took out his patent on the 7th of May, 1907. If within six months thereafter he had applied to come under clause 44, he might have done so.

Therefore for six months at least we had the advantage we speak of here. Clause 2 of this Bill says: that notwithstanding anything in the Patent Act, or in the patents mentioned in the preamble, the commissioner of patents may within three months give the patentee the right to exercise the title which he had for six months following 7th of May, 1907. If he does not exercise it within six months he never can exercise it at all; he cannot exercise it during the whole year as the hon. member alleges. We are, therefore, only giving him, as far as time is concerned, the right to exercise the title which he had under sections 38 and 44 of the Patent Act.

Mr. CARVELL. He would not have the right to come under section 44 within the six months unless he had the right to apply, and the commissioner would have power to say whether he should come in.

Mr. AMES. It is the same in both cases. That is exactly the case here.

Mr. CARVELL. But that right has gone four years ago.

Mr. AMES. It is exactly the same in both cases. He has the right to apply and if the commissioner will not accept his application that is the end of it.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend is entirely out of court so far as section 44 is

concerned. If this man had gone back to the patent office he could not have got the right. How does he propose to get it? He sleeps until he is out of court entirely and his patent is no good. Then he comes back to parliament and says: 'I have been remiss in my duty and have not done that which the law required me to do and I want you not only to put me back in the position I was in two years ago, but to put me in the position I would have been in if I had applied four years ago. My hon. friend is not serious in trying to make this committee believe the man is not asking something which he has no right to ask. My hon. friend says we will be preventing the establishment of a manufactory in Canada, and that if we do not put this Bill through, nobody will have the right to manufacture here the article covered by the patent.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would my hon. friend meet the argument from this point: Is not this man Rambaut's right to be restored to his original position just on the same footing as that he has a right to be restored to the patent? That is to say he claims the right to get back his patent on the ground of an error. If that is good is he not also entitled to get back his option?

Mr. CARVELL. No, the only thing he would have a right to do would be to ask us to replace him in the position which he occupied the day his patent was voided or ceased to be of any value. Now, his patent ceased to be of any value on the 7th day of May, 1907, or on the 7th day of May, 1909. Therefore, on the 7th day of May, or we will say on the 6th day of May, 1909, he did not posses the right of applying to the commissioner on patents under section 44 for the right to manufacture. I do not think we ought to put him in a better position than he was in on the 7th of May, 1907. But if section 2 of this Bill be passed we are placing him in the position he occupied four years ago, we are placing a premium on the man's own negligence. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) stated that if you do not recognize this as the man's patent you may forever prevent the establishment of the industry in Canada. Does he not understand that if the patent has expired every man in Canada has a right to start this industry? It is a monopoly my hon. friend is trying to create, and if this Bill be not passed that monopoly is abolished. My hon. friend is interested in mergers, therefore his mind is running in the direction of monopolies. My hon. friend says that within the last few years many patents have been revived, but can he point to an instance where a patent has been revived giving back to the man something he did not possess at the time the patent was void? The Wadge case has been referred to as an illustration. In that case the patent became void because Wadge had not paid the $15. A patent is given to a man in order to protect the genius of his brain and he has two years in which to commence the manufacture of that article in Canada. If he chooses to do so he can pay $60 and he gets an 18 year certificate If he only pays $20 he gets six years protection. In the case of Wadge it was a matter of paying only $15 or $20 because he was manufacturing the article, had been doing so for many years, and had a big business in Winnipeg. This man Rambaut has never spent a dollar in Canada on the manufacture of the article for which he desires to revive the patent.

Mr. BURNHAM. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has said that he dealt with the legal part of the question and that was the main thing. I think that is a very grave error. The principle that underlies the Patent Act is, as he has said, the protection of the genius of the patentee. Therefore, saving all just exceptions, he is entitled, according to all the merits of the case, and the principle I am enunciating, to a patent for the length of time allowed by the Act, ignoring and waiving all technicalities. If we insist upon a technicality we stand in the way of the workingman, or a man who, possibly, has not a large amount of money, and, therefore, possesses comparatively little influence, and has no other asset than his brains. On that account he is, therefore, very likely to get scant consideration, because as we know, and I am not now speaking invidiously, the most influential man is the man who has money, and the least influential is the man who has none. A man who has position is much better situated than the man who has none.

Now, the man who has brains, provided, as I say, there has been no wanton neglect on his part and no acquirement of rights by somebody else, is entitled to every conceivable form of protection. Therefore, instead of saying that this principle of interference is wrong, we should declare it to be right; for the Patent Act is for the protection of such a man and not for the spoliation of him. Therefore, if such a man should come to this House and say: I have lost my right under section so and so, by no fault of my own that is by no deliberate, wilful fault of my own—but by inadvertence, we should say to him: Prove to us that we are not doing anybody else any hurt and we will restore you to your position. To take advantage of the technicalities to stand in his way is to remove the incentive under which the poor man of brains now works and slaves for years knowing that he will have the sympathy of the public in his

efforts. Therefore, we should be extremely careful, I submit, in laying down any such principle of non-interference if the merits of the case, not the technicalities, clearly warrant it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am sorry the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) thought it necessary to introduce party feeling into a question of this kind. His evident purpose was to arouse his partisans to support his case, whether the law or the practice would sustain him or not.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes, I am in order. It would be a pity if private rights of this character should be subject in this House to party sentiment or party bigotry; and I think that for a member of the age and experience in this House of the hon. member for St. Antoine to introduce such an idea into the discussion of such a Bill as this is rather a pity. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) wanted us to disregard entirely the limitation of the statutes. There are limitations in this statute. There is what is well known in this country as the statute of limitations, dealing with the question of debts. An hon. member on the other side, let us say, loaned his neighbour $1,000 in cash, taking the man's note for it, and put the note in his safe. Through some misunderstanding, he has allowed more than six years to go by before trying to collect the debt. And when he asks for the money, the debtor, dishonest man as he is, says: You cannot collect the money because it is more than six years since I got it, and I will not give it to you.

Mr. BURNHAM. Is there anything in that to prevent the statute of limitations from running?

Mr. McKENZIE. There are so many that it would take too long—as time is short—to tell them to my hon. friend.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does not the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) think that the debtor ought to be paid the $1,000 notwithstanding the lapse of time?

Mr. McKENZIE. Certainly. But the statute of limitations is there, and the creditor cannot collect. There is a statute of limitations here and one is no more insuperable than the other. Suppose that the creditor in this case were to come to this House and say: This dishonest man is depriving me of $1,000; he has built a house with it and is living in the house; and I want you to remove the statute of limitations in this case so that I may collect my $1,000, he would have no chance of succeeding; in fact, I do not think there is an hon. member of this House who would introduce the Bill. Everybody would say: Such a request is an absurdity; this is the law of the land, and you have to take your medicine. That being our attitude in one case, why should the hon. gentleman propose that we should set aside so lightly the limitations in this case? Whatever the genius of this man's brain has made is now the property of the country. The hon. gentleman must know that. His rights under the statutes have lapsed, the limitation clause of the statute having done its work.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). What was the attitude of the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) toward the previous Bill? ?

Mr. McKENZIE. Here comes the hon. member from Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) again with his party ideas. I would vote for this Bill if I thought it right; I voted for one introduced by just as keen a Tory as my hon. friend from St. Antoine. I did not know until to-night that it made any difference to which party the member belonged who introduced such a Bill, nor can I conceive such an idea now. The hon. member for St. Antoine said that this Bill is necessary to correct an error. I submit to him that mistakes of law are not regarded as errors. The law is not an exact science, and, therefore, a mistake of opinion in the law as between one lawyer and another, one court and another, is not an error and never was so regarded. And if this gentleman who had this patent, by reason of an opinion he got from a lawyer, refused to stand by his rights, that was not an error; it was a construction of the law which is not regard it as an error. If you pay money under a mistake as to the facts, you can get it back, but if you pay it under a mistake in the law you cannot get it back, because the courts do not regard a mistake of law as an error. If this man, having taken an opinion in law, slept on his rights, he cannot wake up now and come here and plead that as an error. We have not been told by the hon. member for St. Antoine what the cause of this was.

Mr. AMES. That was all explained on the reading of the preamble a week ago, if the hon. member had been here.

Mr. McKENZIE. I was here. But the hon. gentleman did not say in his explanation where the mistake of law was. He told us there was a dispute between the heirs of one Cooke, and the person now holding this right. He did not explain how it was, or how it was contended that Cooke had not got a proper title. If the hon. member comes to me as one member of the committee and tells me that he wants to perfect a title which he has received, I will vote with him, but I do not

feel that I am called on to support a man who slept on his rights, because he got some mistaken idea of the law and now comes to parliament to put him back, and give him what is to-day the property of the country to which he has no right. I have not heard any satisfactory explanation of what the difficulty was that prevented him from completing his title.

Mr. TURRIFF. It seems to me that if the hon. member (Mr. Ames), would amend this legislation to put the man who had the patent in exactly the same position as he was in when he lost his patent rights through not carrying out the terms on which those rights were granted —manufacturing the article in question in Canada within a given time—if he would amend it so as to give this man exactly what he lost when his patent became void, then I do not think there would be any objection on the part of anybody in this House to reinstate his patent.

Mr. AMES. I have been asking that he be given all that he had when he took out his patent. If hon. gentlemen think that is too much, will they pass the Bill if we strike out clause 2, and leave him in the position he was when his patent lapsed?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE GRAIN ACT.

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

On section 207,—distribution of cars,

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The question the committee is dealing with known as the car distribution clause, contains one of the most important questions, if it is not the most important, which this House has to deal with in considering this Bill. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) admitted this afternoon that so far as he knew, the producers of grain in western Canada were in favour of leaving the clauses exactly as they stand at the present time. I must say that if I have any knowledge of the district which I represent, I believe that the grain producers there—and I have representations to substantiate what I say—are absolutely in favour of no change being made in the present clause. I am prepared to act on the advice of men who know more about this question than I do, to act, as it were, on the advice of my masters in this matter. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie apparently is not so anxious to act on the advice of his masters. It seems to me that he is going very far afield to get some reason for bolstering up the case that has been made out by the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the introduction of these suggested amendments. Absolutely the only ground, or the only document that he could find to support his contention that these amendments would be a good thing for the producers, was the memorandum sent, I believe, to each of the members of parliament by Mr. Fream, president or secretary of the United Farmers of Alberta. Now, I say with all due respect to Mr. Fream, that I do not believe he is so well qualified to express an opinion on this subject, even if he were in favour of these amendments, as many men from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, men who have been dealing with and shipping grain, and who have had some experience of the shortage of cars and the working of these clauses since 1902. We know that these car distribution clauses were only put into the Manitoba Grain Act after a tremendous struggle on the part of the farmers. First of all, the Bill was introduced in 1902, then amended in 1905, and subsequently was put into its present condition in 1908. In my short experience of the past ten years I know that there has been no question more discussed among the farmers' organizations, and even among business men, than the question of car distribution. The main clause at present is to this effect, that an applicant may order a car or cars. Now since 1908, among the grain producers of the western country, I have heard no objection taken to that clause except it be this, as mentioned by the Minister of Trade and Commerce this afternoon, that it did not give the large farmer, the man who had 10,000 or 20,000 bushels of grain, the advantage he was entitled to, because he could only get car for car with the smaller farmer, or if he ordered at the same time as the small farmer, he would have to wait his turn till the next car. Now what does Mr. Fream say? The member for Portage la Prairie attempted to twist the representations of Mr. Fream into an argument in favour of these amendments suggested by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I submit that Mr. Fream's document does not bear any such interpretation. It means that he is absolutely opposed to any amendments unless they are so framed as to protect the interests of the producer, and he says that he does not believe that is possible. I will read two or three sentences from his memorandum to support my contention.

It has been rumored that section 207 of the Grain Bill will be considerably changed. This section is, we consider, one of the most important in the Act and one on which considerable time and attention should be bestowed before allowing any change to be made. It gives a privilege to the farmer which is his only safeguard against the ele-

vator interests, and while a determined onslaught has repeatedly been made upon this provision, yet the opponents of same have never yet been able to present any logical argument why a change should be made. Before this clause was added to the Grain Act the farmers were completely at the mercy of the interests, and if the clause is removed or in any way weakened by dangerous amendments which might be made to give two different meanings, conditions will be such that in a short time the farmers will find the car distribution and the general treatment they would receive from the railway companies and the elevator interests even more intolerable than they were before the clause was introduced into the Act.

That is his opinion, he is opposed to any amendment being made to the clauses as they stand at the present time. Then he goes on and says:

While it may be possible to provide for permission being given to the commission after investigation to supply cars for seed grain, or upon petition of farmers for the removal of wet or damaged grain or where there was suffering through shortage of fuel or food supplies, yet if there is any chance of the rights of the farmers being infringed by ambiguous or vaguely worded amendments introduced into the Bill, it will be better for our interests as producers for the clause to remain as it now stands.

He turns that to his own advantage. He says it might be possible to provide for specific cases which cases he refers to. He does not say anything about it being possible to provide by subsection (e), which has been introduced by the minister, placing the whole matter of car distribution absolutely in the hands of the commission. As was very truly said by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), this afternoon, if you introduce subsection (e) into this Bill you might just as well do away with the car distribution clause altogether, because it puts the whole matter of car distribution entirely in the hands of the commission. Of all the representations that I have seen and of all the representations that have come to the notice of any member of this House, the only one that can be twisted around in any shape or form to bolster up the amendment introduced by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is this document from Mr. Fream, and I submit that, by any ordinary rules of interpretation applied to the English language, he is not in favour of the amendment at all but is absolutely opposed to it. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), says that the commission must have the largest amount of discretion. I am not sure that I am exactly quoting his words but he advocated leaving to the commission a large amount of discretion. I am thoroughly in accord with that remark of the hon. gentleman in so far as he would go with regard to matters of detail, but this matter of the distribution of cars is not a matter of detail, and I submit in all fairness to the minister, to my hon. friend for Portage la Prairie, and to every member of this House, that the matter of car distribution, having been enacted into law in 1902, amended by the Act of 1906, and placed in its final form in 1908, being perhaps the most important section in the Grain Bill, should not be left to the discretion of any commission no matter how honourable, how independent, or how clever the men who constitute that commission may be. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie and other hon. members have said: You supported Bill (No. 96) which has just passed the Senate. I was favourably disposed to Bill (No. 96), for this reason—and I believe it was supported by members on both sides of the House for the same reason—that it was designed to meet the emergency of car shortage, and grain blockade which exists in western Canada, and has existed for some months past. We supported it for that reason, and because we believed that possibly we might get some relief out of it. At the same time that Bill has been passed only as a matter of experiment. I do not think the Bill has received the Royal Assent as yet, but immediately it does the Bill can go into operation. We will be able to experiment in the main provisions of the Bill, and see if this method of giving additional powers to the Grain Commissioner, as he is at the present time constituted, or to the Grain Commision as it will be constituted, will benefit the farmers of western Canada and lessen the grain blockade. If it is, I am prepared to support an amendment of that kind at an early future period, but we should experiment with the idea before we enact it permanently. If this Bill (No. 96) does prove a success—the next session of parliament will begin this coming fall—we can very well have an amendment to the Grain Bill if we are of opinion that such an amendment will meet any emergency that may occur during the coming fall in just as expeditious a manner as Bill (No. 96) has been passed by the House of Commons and the Senate. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee at length in dealing with this question and in reading petitions from farmers and farmers' organizations, but I merely wish to refer to three or four of these petitions. I have received a large number of petitions and letters from farmers throughout western Canada and Grain Growers' Associations all asking that the car distribution clauses remain in exactly the position they are today. I have not received a solitary representation from any farmer or grain growers'

organization asking me to support any amendment that may be introduced. It may be said by my hon. friends that the farmers do not understand what this amendment means. I am not prepared to say that that may not be the reason in some cases. At the same time, as I said at the outset, I believe that the people of western Canada who have been shipping grain for twenty-five or thirty years and who have gone through the whole history of the development of the Grain Act and the question of car distribution, are in a far better position to express their opinion on these matters than any member of the Canadian Credit Men's Association located with headquarters in the city of Winnipeg can be. Let me refer to two or three representations that have been made to me. They do not differ to any extent from the representations that have been referred to by other members but they come from my own district and for that reason I wish to bring them to the attention of the committee. Here is a resolution passed by the Grain Growers' Association of Craik, Saskatchewan:

We the directors and members of the Craik Grain Growers' Association, and business men of the town of Craik, protest against any alteration in the Manitoba Grain Act, re distribution of cars as provided in section 99, clauses (a) (b) and (c) and that the present method of distribution of cars to the farmer has not been the cause of the blockade in wheat and the business of the country at a standstill as the petition circulated by the Canadian Credit Men's Association of Winnipeg has stated, and we further protest against the distribution of cars to be left to the railway commission.

I do not know where they got that idea about the commission but they certainly protest against it being left in the hands of the Railway Commission.

That petition is not only signed by farmers, but by a large number of business men in the town of Craik.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The Credit Men's petition asked that it should be left to the Railway Commission.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I did not understand that. I have not seen the Credit Men's petition. Then, there is a resolution passed by the Grain Growers' Association of Grand Coulee instructing the secretary to

——write the government at Ottawa informing them that the feeling of the local branch of the Grain Growers' Association is very much opposed to any change in the car order book and wish it to remain as it exists at present.

There is also a resolution passed by the Wilcox Grain Growers' Association as follows:

Resolved, by the Wilcox Grain Growers' Association that we strongly condemn the petition circulated by some of the merchants regarding the temporary suspension of that part of the Manitoba Grain Act relating to car distribution as we consider it injurious to our rights and chances of getting cars and we request our merchants to abstain from sending the petition to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

I have a letter accompanying the petition in which they claim that the men who went about getting the Canadian Credit Men's petition signed were reporting to the farmers that it would enable them to get more cars. That may have been perfectly true and they may have been sincere in their representations, but they go on to say that farmers who signed it in that district are of opinion that they made a mistake and they wish their names removed. You can understand how these men, with their present car shortage, would naturally grasp at anything that even appeared to be a straw to help them out of their difficulties. I have here a resolution passed by the Farmers' Co-operative Company with head office in Regina protesting strongly against any change being made in the car distribution clauses. Here is the last one that I will refer to, a resolution passed by the Rouleau Grain Growers' Association. The town of Rouleau is quite prosperous and the country surrounding is inhabited by probably one of the best farming communities we have in the southern part of Saskatchewan. The amount of grain produced there is tremendous considering the population and extent of country. They have had a very serious car shortage. The resolution reads as follows:

Information has been received that an attempt is being made by the elevator interests and the business men of our western towns to have the distribution clause of the Manitoba Grain Act temporarily suspended;

Whereas the distribution clause of the said Grain Act is the only safeguard the farmers have against the elevator combine by assuring them cars to load their grain over the loading platform and shipping it independent of the elevators;

Whereas it has been proved by past experience that without the protection of the said distribution clause that we farmers will be debarred from shipping our own grain thereby being compelled to sell to the elevators;

Whereas the farmers will be at the mercy of the elevator combine by having to accept light weights and heavy dockage;

Whereas when such circumstances exist the elevators make too great a spread between street and track prices;

Whereas the elevators make a practice under such circumstances of compelling farmers to accept grades below the actual grade of the grain, thereby causing heavy loss to the farmers;

Whereas the car shortage is not caused by the loading of cars over the platform but by the inability of the railway companies to transport cars after they are loaded:

Therefore be it resolved that we the undersigned grain growers of the Rouleau district are strongly opposed to the suspension of the said distribution clause, and we earnestly request that the distribution clause be not suspended, and, furthermore, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Right Hon. R. L. Borden.

That resolution gets at the whole situation. We know that before the present car distribution clauses were placed in the Grain Act giving the farmer the right to order a car equally with an elevator company, the farmer was at the mercy of the elevator combine or the elevators. Now the farmer goes to the elevator and says: What grade will you give for this grain? The elevator man says perhaps No. 3 Northern. The farmer says I can get better than that, he can immediately order a car get the car and ship over the loading platform. The clause suggested by the minister will open the way to abuses. I do not object to the amendment with respect to the distribution of seed grain. I brought up the question of excepting the seed grain elevator from some of the provisions with respect to country elevators, and I do not object to that because I believe it is of great importance that in the spring when seed grain is required men engaged exclusively in the handling of seed grain should be able to get a car and ship the seed grain into any part of the country. The amendment to which I object is clause (e) which gives power to the proposed Grain Commission to interfere with the distribution of cars whenever, after due examination, the board considers it necessary and advisable in order to relieve congestion and facilitate the distribution of grain. There is no doubt in my mind that that would entirely nullify the present distribution of cars under the Act if the commission so desired. The main clause and also 207 of this Act have worked out satisfactorily in western Canada. I have heard no objection to it. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) will say I am in favour of allowing elevators to get their bad grain out, but I would not support a clause to enable the farmer to get his bad grain out. I am not a farmer like my hon. friend from Macdonald, but I am prepared to leave the matter in the hands of the farmers of western Canada who know whether this is in their interest or not. I doubt if any hon. member has any representations from farmers asking for amendments in connection with the car distribution clauses. These clauses were gained by the people of western Canada only after a struggle, and I submit that we should not interfere with this clause unless we are absolutely certain that the amendment proposed will work out as satisfactorily as the present car distribution clauses have done.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). It is not often that I find myself thinking on the same lines as my good free trade friend from Regina. I am not a lawyer, but I do not like the look of this clause subsection (e). It opens the whole question of the distribution of cars in western Canada and places the whole power of distribution in the hands of the commission. Under this clause the commission could send all the cars to any point they like in western Canada. We must have some hard and fast rule in connection with the sending out of cars for the grain in western Canada. This is too wide a power to put in the hands of any man or any set of men appointed by this parliament. My good friend from Portage la Prairie cited the cases of damp grain and seed grain and said that by adopting this clause we admit the principle of allowing these cars to be sent out in that way. The Act specifically defines what they can do in these cases. Subsection (e) opens the door wide and allows them to do as they like, and I am not in favour of that kind of thing. The clause is altogether too wide for me. If the minister wants to have this clause inserted he should hold the power in his own hands, let the government be responsible and not leave it with three men who may be appointed to run the car situation in western Canada.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), said that he did not think the farmers, in expressing an opinion on the change in the Act, understood the clause being placed in it. The clause of the Credit Men's Association petition is practically the same thing only it leaves the matter to the Railway Commission, and not to the Grain Commission but it is along the same line of suspension of the Grain Act. That clause reads:

Your petitioners therefore pray that the clause in the Manitoba Grain Act regulating the distribution of cars for grain shipment at country elevator points be temporarily suspended and that the control and distribution of cars at such points be placed under the sole direction of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada with instructions to the commissioners that absolute impartiality be shown and an equitable distribution be made based on the necessities of the extraordinary situation prevailing and so as to enable all of the producers to stand on the same footing in respect of the shipment of their crops, and that the necessities of the farmers as a whole, large and small, in each locality affected shall be the basis to govern the said commission in the distribution of cars.

This petition was sent to me and at the bottom was the following:

We, the undersigned farmers, members of the Raymond Agricultural Society, hereby declare ourselves in opposition to the above set forth petition for reasons set forth in the enclosed statement.

The 'enclosed statement' was an article written by a farmer in the Raymond district who outlined some reasons why the Manitoba Grain Act should not be suspended and some of these reasons state very clearly the view of the farmers on this subject.

I do not intend to read the whole article, but there are two or three clauses that I consider important:

Under the suspension of this rule, farmers would be compelled to sell almost exclusively to elevator and mill buyers, from the fact that they would get all or nearly all of the cars. We are proud of the fact that the majority of the farmers of this great country are prepared to, and can, ship by car lots, if prices do not hold up to the market level, at local points, so that under the present rule in the Act we are not depending upon local markets. Low grade wheat brings better prices by shipping to points where needed for feed than can be had on the local markets.

Practically every petition which I have received from my constituency is opposed to any change in the Manitoba Grain Act or to any suspension of the car distribution clause, with the one exception of a letter from a large milling company in the city of Lethbridge, which asks me to support the proposed change in the car distribution clause in the interest of the small farmer; but I have had no petition from any small farmer, asking for any change in the Act. This petition from Raymond is practically from small farmers, and they are all opposed to any change. I have a letter from Robert E. Reardon, a farmer in the district of High River, Alberta, in which he says:

With regard to the car distribution, the trouble is not with the Manitoba Grain Act, as that is the only salvation we have, but with the Canadian Pacific railway with its lack of motive power and other equipment, together with late threshing. I have been able to get one car to ship grain since December 21, and there are now 144 orders on order book for cars at High River. It would pay into the hands of the interests O. K. to have the car order book thrown out, and I hope you will oppose any such scheme.

I have a resolution from the United Farmers, of Gleichen, Alberta, an important centre of an irrigated district, where farming is done on a small scale. This resolution, which is signed by W. D. Tregs, secretary, and J. E. Ostrander, president, says with regard to the suspension of the car distribution clause:

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Whereas we, the members of the United Farmers of Alberta, Gleichen, Union No. 96, believe that the railroads of the country can not handle cars grain-loaded by the elevator interests with any greater dispatch than those loaded by farmers; and

Whereas we believe that such a move would only end in forcing farmers to sell their grain to the elevator interests at any price which they might wish to establish which would undoubtedly end in the farmers of the country being forced to sell for greatly reduced prices; therefore,

Be it resolved that we are unalterably opposed to any change or suggestion of any clause in said Act relating to the distribution of cars.

Now, I think this committee would desire to have placed before it the opinion of the organized farmers of the west, and I have before me a statement which was presented to the Minister of Trade and Commerce by the Grain Growers' delegation, and which proves, I think conclusively, that the suspension of the Manitoba Grain Act would not relieve the car shortage, as they claim the shortage is not due to the present provisions of that Act. This statement says:

In view of the claims set forth by representatives of the railway that car distribution clause of the Grain Act handicaps them in the free movement of railway equipment and is partly responsible for the congestion that now exists in the movement of grain from the western provinces. We wish to make the following statement:—

The clause relating to car distribution for shipment of grain was first placed in the Manitoba Grain Act in 1902, amended in 1906, and again in 1908 Not. till the latter amendment became effective did the growers of grain receive the full benefit of that provision of the Act. About one-third of the crops of 1908 and 1909 were loaded in cars by farmers over the loading platforms. That quantity is reported by Mr. Peters of the Canadian Pacific railway as being reduced to 20 or 23 per cent for the first four months of the 1911 crop. That statement may be correct, as at any points where farmers use the loading platform freely the spread between street and track prices that used to be excessive, is reduced to a minimum, consequently growers use the elevators instead of the platform.

	Grain cars.
In the four months ending 31st December, 1907, the railroads submitted for inspection..	35,827
Same period, 1909..	69,748
Same period, 1911..	83,001

That is to say, the movement in 1909 was 33,921 cars more than 1907, and the movement in 1911, 13,253 more than 1909; in other words, the efficiency of the railroads for moving western grain for inspection was increased in the four months of each year under review 93 per cent in the two years 1907 to 1909, and only 19 per cent in 1909 to 1911. The Grand Trunk Pacific, which was not hauling grain to the lake terminals in 1909, is responsible

for 7,587 cars, or 9 per cent of the inspection of 1911, so that as a matter of fact the Canadian Pacific railway and Canadian Northern railway increased their efficiency only 10 per cent between 1909 and 1911, as compared to 93 per cent, as between 1907 and 1909, notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian Pacific railway operated a double track road as far west as Portage la Prairie and part of the time to Brandon in 1911.

The above refers to inspection. Deliveries at the lake terminals make a worse showing, the report of the inspection department showing as follows for the four months ending 31st December, 1909, and 1911:

Bushels inspected.

1909.. .. .. 66,470,904 or 84%
1911.. 96,766,136

Delivered terminals.

1909.. .. .. 66,460,904 or 84%
1911.. .. .. 76,766,136 or 79%

These figures indicate that the railroads delivered at terminals 5 per cent less of the inspected cars in 1911 that in 1909, and that they made the most progress in moving the crop in the years farmers availed themselves most of the privilege of the loading platform. Railway representatives point to the fact that a car can be loaded in an hour or so at elevators, while it takes 24 hours or more to load a car over the platform. That statement may be true and would be an advantage to the movement of cars were an engine ready to pull a car away from the elevator as soon as loaded, but that rarely happens. It is a common occurrence to have cars placed at loading platform and elevators at the same time pulled out of the station yards together after standing there loaded for some days.

We attach hereto a statement showing the car number, point of shipment, name of shipper, date of inspection, date unloaded at terminal of 882 cars booked by a commission firm in December and first week in January, selecting out cars twenty days and over in transit. It will be noted that cars were shipped from districts scattered over Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and is a fair representation of the movement of cars in the period the statement covers. The list shows that out of 882 cars, 297 had not reached inspection and 654 were not unloaded at terminals on the 26th of January.

It is quite apparent that loaded cars take an average of twenty days or over en route from point of shipment in the west to the lake front allowing ten days for returning, makes 30 days for the round trip. But assuming that less time is required in the early part of the season and allowing an average of 25 days for the whole season and that farmers took one day longer than the elevators take loading each car of the 23 per cent loaded over the platform, it would affect the movement of equipment to the extent of adding one day to 25 on 23 per cent of the cars—a trifling matter when compared to the benefit farmers derive from the privilege of loading their own cars.

Assuming that it takes 30 days for a car to make the round trip from the western wheat fields to the lake front, a car would make four trips between 1st of September and 31st of December. To deliver the 66,500 unloaded at the terminals during that period of 1911 would require 16,600, and the railroads represent they have 40,000 cars moving the crop. If that be true their cars only make about a trip and a half in the four months.

The facts stated above conclusively demonstrate that the congestion in trafic is not in a slight degree due to the distribution clause of the Grain Act and is wholly attributed to the inability of the railroad to keep their cars moving to destination after they are loaded or billed.

I will quote a few cases in which the cars have been out over eighty days, giving the shipping point, the name of the shipper, the date shipped, and the number of days in transit:

Saskatoon—G. Drabble; Oct. 13; 107 days.
Blucher—Jas. Anderson; Oct. 23; 97 days.
Adanac—Geo. Sim; Oct. 23; 97 days.
Webb—H. C. Thierman; Oct. 28; 91 days.
Anglia—L. P. James; November 1; 87 days.
Liberty—M. A. Tannahill; Oct. 20; 99 days.
Keppel—B. J. Brandrith; Oct. 30; 89 days.
Gull Lake—O. E. Clark; Nov. 2; 85 days.

Now I have given the opinion of the grain growers in opposition to the change in the car distribution clause of the Manitoba Grain Act, and I would urge the Minister of Trade and Commerce to seriously consider the position of the western farmers not only individually but speaking collectively through their association against any change in the Act. They prefer to have it remain as it is. They had this clause inserted in the Grain Act some years ago, and think that it should remain there without any change whatever. The opinion of the farmers in my constituency is against any change, and I am bound to support that view because the farmers know more of what is necessary for their welfare than men who are not engaged in agriculture in western Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am not going to delay the House by reading a lot of resolutions, although I have received many petitions from my constituency, each and every one of them asking that no change whatever should be made in the car distribution clause of the Act. This is the first controversial matter apparently that we have had in connection with this Bill, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been most fair and reasonable all through. But the farmers are now asking to have matters left as they are. I do not think the Minister, after the interviews he has had with the members of the Grain Growers' Association of the west, would gainsay the fact that these men understand wheat growing and the handling of the western wheat crop as well as any other class of men in existence. The farmers of the three prairie provinces are absolutely a unit in asking that no change should be made in this clause. Who have we on the other side? We have the millers, the elevator men, the grain exchange men, the railroad men,

the Credit Men's Association—we have the corporate interests on one side asking for a change in the interests of the farmer. Why should they speak for the farmer? Cannot the farmer speak for himself?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would the hon. gentleman tell us who these people have approached and asked for the change? I have never seen any of them.

Mr. STAPLES. Nor I.

Mr. TURRIFF. Railroad men have been advocating that change to me half a dozen times. Grain exchange men here advocated a change upon a dozen occasions.

Mr. STAPLES. What change?

Mr. TURRIFF. They have represented that the present system of car distribution is not right, and that it should be done away with or changed.

Mr. STAPLES. They did not ask for this particular change, did they?

Mr. TURRIFF. They did not ask for this particular change but they asked that the clause be changed, although the farmers are urging that it be left alone. This matter particularly affects the farmers and why do these interests come to individual members and ask that a change be made on the ground that it will help the small farmer who has not a fair deal under the present system of distribution of cars? I am not going to say that the present system of distribution may not work a hardship in the case of individual farmers, but the present law is what the farmers as a whole have fought and worked for, for years. All they are asking now is that it be left alone. They are afraid that if any change is made, if any power is granted to anybody else to interfere with the present system of car distribution they will be the sufferers in the end. I absolutely concur in that view. Surely when the men who are chiefly interested in this matter are asking that the clause should stand as it is at present the least that can be done is to comply with their wishes? Suppose this power is given to a commission—and I am not going to make any reflections on any possible commission that may be appointed because I believe the Minister of Trade and Commerce will appoint the best men he can find—what relief is going to be given in a season when there is a general blockade all over the country, by changing the system? If there should be demands coming in from 500 or 1,000 points, as there are at the present moment, it would be simply a matter of discriminating as to which point you should relieve. Why not leave this matter alone, and then if some of the farmers suffer in consequence it will simply be because their wishes were complied with and the responsibility will rest with them. The farmers through their association understand the subjects in my judgment just as well as any of these interests that are asking for the change. The grain growers associations throughout the west have proven within the last few years that they understand all questions in relation to the growing of wheat. So that I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to withdraw clause (e). It has been claimed in this discussion that we have adopted this principle in supporting Bill (No. 96). I was in favour of that Bill and supported it with an accurate knowledge of what was doing, knowing that we gave the power in the meantime to deal with the present condition of affairs under which hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat are stacked up on the prairie like coal, but knowing also that the moment the Bill we are now dealing with became law, the other measure would be repealed and be no longer of any effect. It is not fair for any one to advance the argument that because we decided to pass that Bill in order to remedy an exceptional condition of affairs existing at this present moment, that we were binding ourselves to relax the present system of car distribution for all time to come.

I had no such thought in my mind; and had I supposed that by passing that Bill, we should be held to be committing ourselves to the support of this amendement, I would not have voted for it. But it was nothing of the kind. We have now a state of affairs in which the farmers ask for one thing and the interests which are generally supposed to be opposed to the farmers, are asking for something else. The question is, are we going to do what the farmers want done in connection with their own wheat, or are we going to do what somebody else wants done in connection with their wheat?

Mr. WARNOCK. I cannot let this occasion pass without uttering a word of protest against the proposed change affecting section 207 of the Bill. I would not be doing my duty to my constituents were I to remain silent. Like many other hon. members on both sides of the House, I have received a large number of letters, telegrams and resolutions from farmers in Alberta, protesting against any amendment or suspension of this provision of the Manitoba Grain Act. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) speaking this afternoon, referred to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and said that that hon. member saw the principle, but that he also saw a chance to make political capital. Now, I have here the report of the proceedings of a meeting of the United Farmers' Association, of High River, a short time ago. This will

throw some light on the opinion of this Manitoba Grain Act, held by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). It says:

The meeting was called at the instance of Mr. Reardon, secretary of the local branch of the United Farmers' Association, who felt that something should be done to show how the farmers of High River viewed the proposed change. In the absence of the president, Mr. R. A. Wallace was appointed chairman, and speaking of the situation he failed to see how the proposed change of the interests would relieve the grain blockage. At the present time he said the terminal elevators were crowded and it was impossible to relieve the blockade at this end. He viewed this as a step on the part of the interests to have obliterated from the statutes the only clause whereby the farmers had any protectection. On this same point he had heard the former Minister of the Interior——

That is the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver).

——say that the farmers would be extremely foolish to relinquish that one clause for which they had fought so long to obtain from the government, and he urged the local union to go on record as being opposed to any change in that particular clause referred to.

So, the hon. member for Edmonton was opposed to any change in that clause as far back as last summer, while the government of which he was a member was yet in power. So, when the hon. member for Portage la Prairie hinted this afternoon that the hon. member for Edmonton saw the opportunity to make some political capital out of the proposed amendment, I think he was making a rather unfair statement.

There is another matter here, to which I would call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. This was stated by some speakers at that meeting:

It was further learned that there are farmers who have shipped cars of wheat when the only grain they grow was oats; and others who have not threshed a bushel of oats or wheat, had made car shipments from High River. Intimation was made by some one present that the law would be enforced hereinafter with regard to false entries for cars.

I understand from this report that some farmers are unprincipled enough to order cars sent ostensibly for their own use and then hand these cars over to the elevators. I do not know whether there is any law to deal with that matter, but I think it should be looked into, and, if there is such a law, the law should be enforced. I do not propose to read any of these resolutions and telegrams that I have received. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster, North Toronto), will accept my statement that I have them. But, as there has been some difference of opinion as to the point of view of the farmer and grain grower delegates who were here a short time ago, I desire to read a memorandum handed to me by Mr. Fream, secretary of the United Farmers of Alberta, before he left for the west, giving an amendment which, I think, we would be prepared to accept:

Provided further that the board may, upon application of not less than three farmers in any new district, after investigation, order a limited number of cars to be supplied contrary to the provisions of this part, to meet cases of actual necessity only arising through shortage of food and fuel supply, such order to state the reason for same and to make regulations governing the prices to be paid for street grain while such order is in force.

I think that under the circumstances and in view of the protests we have had, the Minister of Trade and Commerce would be well advised to allow section 207 of the Bill to pass without further amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have only a word to add to what I have already stated. By what I have said, I still abide; and it has reference mainly to one or two hon. gentlemen who stated that the farmers in presenting their petitions are represented by me as not understanding the proposed amendment. In so far as I made any remarks in that connection, I simply said and simply meant that what the farmers' petitions so far had opposed was something entirely different from the proposed amendment, and no hon. member has presented, or, I believe, can present, a petition which in any way conflicts with the proposed amendment. I want to make that as clear as it is possible for me to make it. I am sure that no communications in my possession conflict with it. The farmers of my constituency are just as competent to understand this amendment as any other persons, and will understand it when they read it; and I think that the fair-minded ones among them will appreciate one and all of these provisions.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Does the hon. gentleman not think that any requests that no change be made in the present clause conflict with the changes proposed to be made?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have none that simply say that they want no change and stop there. They want no change along lines suggested in this association's petition. The hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) points out that the association's petition in so far as it asks that the distribution of cars under the Act be entirely placed with the Railway Commission, is in principle the same as the proposed amendment. Consequently the Credit Men's Association move along the line of these amendments and they are resisted by the

farmers, so it is said that the farmers would resist these amendments. Now, if I can see the point at all, it is that that which is asked for by the Credit Men's petition is diametrically the opposite to that. I know no more about it than the hon. member for Cape Breton; I never heard of them except that I got a petition with the name on it 'The Canadian Credit Association, Limited'; and I thought at the time I would like to see some of those credit men myself.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). It is a very strong organization in Winnipeg.

Mr. MEIGHEN. This association asks that the clause be suspended, and it is against the suspension of the clause that the farmers' petition. What would be the result of suspending the clause? It would mean that we would be destitute of any rule of distribution. But now we say to the Railway Commission: We feel that in your hands you are in control of the distribution, we give you carte blanche. The farmers might protest if parliament sets up no rule by which they can be governed. But this clause retains the car distribution rule, and says that rule shall be followed unless individual instances and circumstances are such as to demand a deflection from it. Hon. gentlemen admit that time and again instances arise where a deflection is in the interest of the farmers themselves.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Does the hon. gentleman consider that subsection (e) as proposed by the minister, simply deals with specific cases, where a car shortage would happen?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Absolutely deals with that, and with specific cases only. Hon. gentlemen have repeated, man after man of them, that cases frequently arise, and cases of enormous consequence, in which it is in the interest of the farmers that a deflection be made from the strict line of the rule, and cases that arise are right in line with (a) (b) (c) and (d). They are all agreed on that. But they say, when we come to (e), we are throwing our heads against a wall. What is (e)? It simply states another case, and it puts the burden of proof on the community that sets up the case, and that community has to show, to the satisfaction of the commission, that there exists a state of affairs among them, that will be assisted in granting a deflection from the rule.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is the only difficulty I see about it. Who is to settle that question of fact?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The commission. It has to be shown to the commission that it is necessary and advisable in order to relieve congestion and facilitate the dispatch of grain, and the commission must be convinced by proof in the individual case, or there cannot be a deflection. If it is proved by investigation, as it is bound to be, that the congestion will be relieved, and the dispatch of grain facilitated, then how can you say that in such cases, the farmer himself would not be benefited? How can you hurt the farmer, if you are going to relieve congestion and facilitate the dispatch of grain?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). It is not clear to me what is the meaning of the term, 'due examination.' It might mean anything.

Mr. MEIGHEN. 'Due examination' means just what it means in courts of law, where it has appeared doubtless time and again in the practice of the hon. gentleman, who has asked the question: 'Due examination' means an examination adequate to the condition and to the circumstances in order to get at a correct result; and that is what the commission is for. That is one of their functions, one of the purposes of their creation. Why be frightened at a bogey? Let us get the whole benefit of the Act. You will find cases in western Canada, in the congested parts, say, in Manitoba, where car after car is tied up, where the farmers are taking six, eight, or ten days to load; and at the same time, perhaps, in the northern part, or in the newer part, in some other territory, the farmers are suffering, and their grain is rotting, because they cannot get cars. They are being held up at one end, selfishly, perhaps, and the other end is suffering. If such a case is made out, then who will say that the farmer is not going to get the benefit? Who can picture a case where congestion will be relieved, and the dispatch of grain facilitated, and the farmer not get the benefit of it?

Mr. McKENZIE. Could not that special condition be met without interfering with the order of routine? As I understand it, the man who books for a car first, gets it in the order of booking. Supposing, without interfering with the order of booking in a specific case of that kind, you could get more cars, could you switch the Act in that way, so that the company would be compelled to furnish more cars, without interfering with the booking?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am glad my hon. friend drew attention to that point. In the first place, I do not contend that, as a general rule, giving power to the commission to order the distribution of cars to meet an individual exigency is going at once to relieve the car congestion, not at all; but I believe in individual instances it would. Other things will relieve it far more; there are other obstacles in market-

ing our grain much more formidable. But the retaining of this clause, and the insertion of the latter clause, to my mind, give the commission this power, that they can say to the railway company what they cannot say to-day: There is at a certain point an especial congestion bringing in its wake an exceeding amount of trouble, and we demand of you relief, that you send an additional force of cars to that point. This gives them that power. So I think the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) will see that there is a very important assistance being given by that clause. I do not know what the authority of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is. I do know, however, that he is a very apt pupil of two gentlemen in western Canada, when he makes a statement that some sinister interests in Winnipeg, the Grain Exchange and the elevator interests, are on one side of the battle, and the farmers on the other side are down here with their bayonets outside parliament endeavouring to get this measure through. I know nothing of that. The hon. gentleman has not said that in so many words, but he has re-echoed statements sent through the west that some sinister influences are behind these amendments. I know of no such interests or influences. I have received petitions against the Credit Men's Association amendments, I have also received requests in their favour. I give them all as mature consideration as I can. But I do think that in addition it is my duty to think the matter out in the light of what is presented to me, and to give the utmost respect to what they present. It seems to me that the power given that commission to go to the office of a railway company and say: Here, there is an especial congestion at Weyburn in Saskatchewan, there is special distress at another point, and we demand that you make special efforts to relieve it, and that twenty cars be within ten days at those points—in legislating to give them that power we are affording practical relief in many cases to the very unfortunate conditions which we find obtaining at the present time. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite. I know the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) understands the matter of shipping grain better than I do. But I do believe that I understand the plain English of this clause, and that an important reform will be effected by it if we will only open our eyes to the occasion.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask the hon. member if he considers that in the terms of this Act there is any such authority as he has just stated, that this commission has the right to go to the office of a railway company and order cars wherever they please?

Mr. MEIGHEN. If the hon. gentleman will read the clause he will see that it reads in this way:

Strike out clause 207 and substitute the following:—

The board may, in its discretion, order cars to be supplied contrary to the provisions of this part.

And then it goes on and names the instances. Notwithstanding anything in that part they can go to the railway company and order the cars.

Mr. OLIVER. There is nothing in any part of this Act to give the authority which my hon. friend deliberately stated to the committee was contained in the Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What does that give?

Mr. OLIVER. It certainly does not give any such authority. It gives authority to the commission to order a distribution of cars, but it does not give authority over the railway companies to compel them to furnish cars. I think the minister will bear me out in that interpretation.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. gentleman will recognize that it is only in so far as the cars available can be distributed that we can interfere.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely; then my hon. friend should not have made the very bold and bald statement which he did.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That very bold and bald statement, if you term it such, is still strictly correct. The commission can go to the railway company and say that it shall take certain cars away from a certain point which does not need them so badly and send them to such another point. That power is certainly embodied in that clause. I have not consulted the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I really think that power is certainly embodied there. Let me put it again. Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has within itself power of distribution of 10,000 cars. We cannot make such orders and expect to have them fulfilled as would require 11,000 cars to be supplied, but we can give such orders as, within the scope of the cars available to the company, will force it to send certain cars to a certain place and certain cars to another place.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to know from the minister where that authority is contained in this Bill and how far the authority of the Bill goes in that regard.

Mr. CRUISE. Mr. Chairman, I think I would not be doing my duty to the constituency which I have the honour to represent if I did not put myself on record

as being opposed to any change in the car distribution clause of the Grain Act. Like a great many hon. members on both sides of the House, I have received personal letters from different electors in my constituency protesting against any change in these clauses. I have also been favoured with resolutions from pretty nearly every Grain Growers' Association in my constituency adverse to this proposed change. Several of these Grain Growers' Associations have also written me stating that they have had large petitions signed and forwarded to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), protesting against any change. As farmers we regard any change in this clause with a great amount of suspicion, I believe I am justified in making this statement. I have been growing wheat now for about eighteen years, and I can remember that about ten years ago the bankers, the railway companies and the elevator people combined together and refused to give the farmers cars to load their grain. The result was that the farmers were forced to ship their grain through the elevators or sell it to the elevators. This enabled the elevator men to lower the price of grain, and the result was that the spread between the street and track price was about seven cents a bushel. You can readily see the loss that the farmers sustained as a result of that most unsatisfactory condition of affairs. The farmers succeeded in getting placed in the Act the present car distribution clauses and the result has been that within the past three or four years the spread between street and track has not exceeded two or three cents a bushel. Therefore, the farmers realize that they have derived great benefit from the car distribution clause as it is at present embodied in the Act. I, therefore, am strongly opposed to any change. It has been stated here that no person has asked for any change in this clause. If the privileged classes have not been asking for any change certainly the farmers have not asked for any, and, that being so, why make a change? This clause 207 gives the commission all the power that is necessary. It gives the commission power to have cars provided if there is an elevator in danger of collapse or if there is any grain heating in the elevator. They can cause cars to be sent to different points to relieve such a situation as that. If power were given to the elevators to distribute seed grain I think that is all that is necessary and that is all the farmers are asking for. I want to congratulate the Minister of Trade and Commerce upon the fair stand which he has taken all the way through in connection with this grain Bill and also members on both sides of the House. I may say that while I know a little about growing wheat, I know very little about making laws with regard to shipping and selling wheat. I attended the committee meetings very regularly, and I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I derived a great deal of benefit from them. I would ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the interest of the producers of this country, to comply with their request and make no change in the Act. If the farmers came down to Toronto, that beautiful city that runs the whole country, and insisted on having anything to say to the manufacturers about the distribution of the cars upon which they load their machinery, the manufacturers would say to them: What business is it of yours? Go home to the west and mind your own affairs. I do not mean to say that it is none of their business, but the view I take of it is that this is purely and simply a farmer's question, and, therefore, the manufacturers of Toronto or anywhere else should not say how our grain should be loaded and shipped. I repeat there should be no change made in the present Grain Act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, in common with every other hon. member from the west, I have received petitions and letters protesting against a change being made in this car distribution provision of the grain Act. The farmers in the district which I represent are not suffering in the same way that they are in other sections of western Canada, but at the same time they view with a great deal of alarm any change being made in the Act which has been a great benefit to them in this matter of car distribution. The car distribution clause in the Manitoba Grain Act has had the effect of increasing the price paid to them by the big elevator men and has redounded to the great benefit of the farmers in the matter of selling their grain. I have letters to show where farmers have taken grain to the elevators and been offered a certain price for it, and not being satisfied with the price, and having decided to ship the grain to a commission house, rather than have the grain shipped out the elevator man has come to the rescue and paid the difference in price, that has amounted in some cases to seven or eight cents a bushel. Therefore, the farmers view with a great deal of alarm any interference with this clause which permits them to order cars, turn about with the elevators, and in that way get the advantage of shipping their grain to a commission house or wherever they wish to send it. I am very pleased to see the stand which the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) has taken on this question.

The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) two years ago made a memorable speech which was of great benefit in my constitu-

ency in the last election. I had occasion to use that speech more than once. It showed the breadth of view of the hon. gentleman who, I am glad to see, retains that same breadth of view, and is not governed by partisan motives in discussing this Bill, viewing the question altogether from the standpoint of his constituency. Everything has been said that can be said for and against this Bill. I want to place myself on record as in favour of the car distribution clauses in the Manitoba Grain Act being left as they are.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have no fault to find with the discussion on this section. I do not think it has been a partisan discussion; it has been a discussion of men with different views, looking at it from different standpoints. It may be that as we are all human, some of us have the fear or the desire of our constituents behind us, but after all the discussion has been very fair, based on the view of each individual member, as to how it would affect the whole. I want to find a little fault with the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). I think it would have been just as well if he had not given a little support to the theory that there is an irrepressible and persistent conflict between farmers and railroads. It is not necessary that it should be so.

Mr. OLIVER. I have scriptural authority for the position that there is always a difference of opinion between the buyer and the seller.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am not finding fault with the hon. gentleman for holding his opinion. Anything which tends to accentuate and perpetuate the idea that two great sections of the community shall and must be eternally in conflict with each other, is not in line with the principles of human progress. There may be differences between them, but we all feel that as we get to know each other better wars will cease. After all, broadly speaking, is not the interest of the railways of that great western country absolutely bound up with the prosperity of the farmer, and is not the best interest of the farmer absolutely bound up with his relations to the great transport interests?

Mr. OLIVER. If the relations are properly adjusted, yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, and I hope that we are on the way to a proper adjustment of these relations. I have every sympathy with the farmers, and the early settlers of that country, and with those who are there now, because I know they have had a hard struggle, a hard struggle with corporate and railway interests, but I believe that both parties now understand each other better, and I am bound from my experience of the last three or four weeks to say that I do not find the railway or transport interests animated with the desire to antagonize the farmer, but rather with the desire that the farmers' prosperity may be as great as possible, so I hope we are coming to the time when these suspicions of ill-treatment will gradually pass away and men will argue upon the present, and not from a recollection of the ills and errors of former times. It seems to me that a great deal of what has been received by myself, and by members on both sides of the House arises out of the old days, and the fear that if any change is made at all the conditions of the past will be brought back again and that the old struggle will have to be renewed. A member says: I must go by what my farmers tell me. But does the farmer necessarily know better about everything connected with the grain trade than we? He knows more about wheat farming and raising and may know a great deal more about wheat selling, but the farmer is localized, necessarily localized. The farmer looks out from his own locality and does not always view this great system of machinery for transporting produce across this great country, he does not see it as a whole and understand its workings. He sees his own side, he knows the difficulties of transport but it is quite possible for us to say that whilst he knows many things much better than we, and knows the local conditions better, we having a view of the whole system and studying the whole system, may see things a little differently from him, and may possibly say that by adopting what he believes to be in the interest of western Canada we may be acting against his interest. Is that not possible? I think it is and so I think a great deal of petitioning and letter writing arises out of this idea. A petition is being circulated asking for the suspension of all the clauses in the Grain Act which have to do with the distribution of cars. They may say: This will bring us back to the old position, we cannot tolerate that, we will send in letters and protests. You may say that the grain growers represent all farmers in that country. That is more than I think can be true. What member can say that the farmers as a unit absolutely desire this or that in the great northwest?

The Grain Growers Association has been a useful and very active organization; it has done a great deal of good and a mighty sight of keen work but that that Grain Growers' Association, which comprises only a small percentage of the great farming population in the northwest, voices absolutely the whole opinion of all the farmers of the northwest on this or

any other question I am not prepared to say.

Now, the Grain Growers' Association are militant; they are on the watch. The very moment this Credit Men's Association petition was scattered through the country, their notices went out. Here is something that is going to rob us of our car distribution clauses; that we must not allow; be active and be alive, and flood your members and the ministers with petitions against it. But does that prove to you or to me that the farmers would object, if they knew just what was proposed and the spirit in which it was proposed—that it was not by a lot of men caballing against their interests, but by legislators using the best opportunities they had for information, and doing what they considered best in the premises to alleviate slightly the conditions of congestion and hardship, when those conditions arose, and when after examination they proved them to be conditions which ought to be alleviated? If we could sit down alongside of each one of them and tell them exactly what it was proposed and meant to do, does anybody believe that the farmers of the Northwest would be dead against making any letter or syllable or word of alteration in these car clauses? I do not think so. Now, I have approached this question as a novice and a tyro, knowing almost nothing about it; but I have given some hard work and close attention to it, and to my mind it is a most interesting and absorbing question. I do not look on this as a matter which is before us now and may pass away in a few weeks or a few months. I look on this questioin of grain production and grain carriage in our vast Northwest, only the fringes of which have been developed so far, as one of the most absorbing, one of the most important, and one of the most vital questions we have to deal with in this parliament, and one upon which very great interests in this country are dependent. I have approached this question without the least idea of party interest or party advantage. I want to see the best solution for the best outcome of that great problem, and it will take us this year and several years after this, if we put our whole purpose and our whole effort to it, to have it practically and finally and satisfactorily solved. This little clause which I am introducing is not a violation of legislation which exists in the Manitoba Grain Act, nor a violation of legislation which we have adopted in this parliament this year. It is simply a further application of a discretion by a responsible body which is upon the scene of action, which knows and ought to know—and if it does not know it will not be doing its duty as a commission—the ins and outs of the whole business in that great Northwest—a discretion by which, when a call comes from a lamed section, from a hurt portion, from a diseased part of that great organism in the Northwest, they will be able in some little measure to apply the humanitarian principle, and send help sharply and quickly, even though some in better positions have to be delayed for a little time in the beginning. If a man is drowning in the river every other man who has the heart and soul of a man in him is willing to go to the help of the man who is in trouble, even though it takes from him hours of his good time, and robs him of some of his profits. It is humanitarian. When this matter came up, and those five delegates, who you say represented the united farmers of the west, were in my office, and I put to them the proposition: here is damp grain, liable to damage and utter loss, held to the amount of ten or twelve or fifteen million bushels, by less fortunate men than you, who got your crops, or some of them out, and that is a call, I think, upon our humanity; not a man of them offered a word against it, but every man of them said: Yes, there will be no objection among the farmers to that; it is only common humanity. That arises from the fact that you are close to them, and you can tell them just what you mean to do, and they can sit down and talk it over with you. I think the case was well put when it was said: if you can relieve the district where want and distress are imminent without much disorganizing the general plan for the healthy sections, is it not in the interest of the farmers of the whole country that you should have some power to do it? Some one makes the suggestion, let the Governor in Council do that. Great goodness! the Governor in Council sitting here in Ottawa, consisting of fifteen laymen, perhaps half of them distributed over this country at any given time, knowing absolutely nothing about railway grain transport, with the exception of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and some others of us, who have travelled on passes in private cars, but having no grasp at all on the situation in the Northwest, stretching from the lakes to the rocky mountains. How can they do it? There is nobody that can do it sympathetically and well, and with a knowledge of the circumstances, but the three men who are devoted to that, who are the priests that minister at the altars of the great grain business in the Northwest, and who know just what is necessary for healing and for comfort. Now, that is all that this provision does; why should we object to it? Why should we suppose that these men are going to run amuck? Why should we suppose that they will throw everything into confusion? It will not be to their interest to do it; it

will not be in accordance with their sympathies to do it; it will not be in accordance with the spirit of the Grain Act to do it. Their discretions are to be used within the purposes and lines of the Grain Act itself, and the Grain Act, if it means anything, means the relief of congestion and the quick despatch of grain. Whenever congestion is relieved and grain is made to travel quickly, that is for the benefit of the farmer behind, who has more grain to take the place of that which is moved out, and which is waiting, and anxiously waiting for the time when that will be moved out. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), laid much stress on this, and he is right to a certain extent, that the commission, after due examination, and finding that, in their judgment, it is advisable and necessary that the call for help in some parts shall be heeded at once, when they do that, may draw away from the general distribution some cars that are necessary to relieve that congested part. So they may to a certain extent.

But they certainly have this power as well: They have the power and the right to go to the railway companies and say: 'We want some extra cars put in there,' and they may get them. But suppose the railway company turns on them and says: 'We have no extra cars. All our cars are filling in the programme to hundreds of stations and hundreds of districts all over that Northwest, each man having his car ordered, each elevator has a car order, we are filling in all those with every car that we have.' Well, then if you have no more extra cars draw away a little portion from every one of those places and help the portion which is in dire distress. You will do the least possible harm to the others and you will do the greater possible good to those that are in distress. My heart is no more soft than the hearts of other members around this table, but I have letters in my office which would almost make a man's heart bleed. I have one letter in my office of a man living out some 18 miles from his station, a newcomer who was in debt for everything that he had been using, and his implements as well, who had got his grain at last harvested and threshed out lately but who had no order in for a car that could possibly get to him for months may be in the state of shortage and congestion there. Teaming in with his two teams a portion of his grain, what did he find? He had no cars. The car track buyer was there, but there was no car that the track buyer had into which he could put this man's grain if he had bought it. The man on the street was there, or thereabouts, but the man on the street could not buy his grain. He had no place to put it if he bought it; the elevator was chuck full and had not been emptied for a long time. That man tried in vain to sell his grain or to store it, but there was no storing place for it. He took his grain back to his own farm again and kept it there. Others piled their grain out behind somebody's shed and covered it over, may be with some straw; they cannot sell it. Now it does seem to me that talk as we like about elevators and about our corporations, that if that elevator could have been emptied of its 50,000 or 60,000 bushels of grain there would have been a chance for that man with his wagonloads of grain to have sold it, because there would have been a place to store it if it had been sold. It seems to me that taking all these things into consideration it is not so serious a matter we are discussing that it will break up the whole car order system, and that if you do this you might as well burn the Grain Act. These assertions do not tally with the facts, and it seems to me that, looking at it from the point of view of those who are trying to do the best they can for that great interest, we have got to use our own judgment, getting at the view of the people interested as far as we can, and by using that judgment in this way, and giving this discretion to the Board of Commissioners, we are putting a piece of machinery there for use in individual cases of hardship involving sometimes total loss which means very much to those who have to bear that loss; we are putting a piece of machinery there which will enable a live and competent man to relieve distress, to aid in the despatch of grain and so to lighten the whole position. I would read something from a letter addressed to me by Mr. Fream, in order to show the way in which he approaches this matter.

It has been rumored that section 207 of the Grain Bill will be considerably changed. This section is, we consider, one of the most important in the Act and one on which considerable time and attention should be bestowed before allowing any changes to be made.

That is Mr. Fream's position. That is a reasonable position. That is what we have been doing here, bestowing time and attention upon this Act because of its importance, and before making any change in it He goes on to say:

It gives a privilege to the farmer which is his only safeguard against the elevator interests, and while a determined onslaught has repeatedly been made upon this provision yet the opponents of same have never yet been able to present any logical argument why a change should be made. Before this clause was added to the Grain Act the farmers were completely at the mercy of the interests, and if the clause is removed——

We none of us think of removing it.

or in any way weakened by dangerous amendments which might be made to give two different meanings——

We are not weakening it, we are strengthening it. We are not putting dangerous amendments there which might have two different meanings. We are putting a plain definite amendment, as plain as the English language can make it, and for purposes which are clearly to be understood. If that is done, he goes on to say:

Conditions will be such that in a short time the farmers would find the car distribution and the general treatment they would receive from the railway companies and the elevator interests even more intolerable than they were before the clause was introduced into the Act.

I would be disposed to agree with Mr. Fream as to the probable results providing things were done to weaken the clauses, or amendments were placed there that were dangerous, or had a double meaning, or if the purpose of these amendments were to do away with the efficacy of the Grain Act in its distribution clauses. To my mind it is to strengthen those rather than to weaken them. If I thought the clause would weaken them I would drop it at once. Believing that it would strengthen them and would be worked out to the good of the transportation of the farmers' grain in the west, I submit it to the committee and ask for its passage.

Mr. WHITE (Alberta). Mr. Chairman, although there has been a good deal said on this question by western members who object, as I do myself, to any changes being made in this clause, there is one point that I do not think has been brought out, although it is one that the farmers of the west most strongly object to. It is the question of prices. As a great many of the members from the west know, in a great many places—certainly in the case of the majority of towns along the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern where there is only one elevator. Now, we have found from experience that when a farmer brings his grain to the elevator there is no competition whatever. He looks at the market quotations at Winnipeg and finds possibly that oats are 35 cents a bushel here, but the local elevator only offers him 20 cents. He knows the cost of transportation, which is a matter of about eight cents, and if he finds he can make three or four cents a bushel on his grain he orders a car and ships that grain to Winnipeg. Now, if you make a change whereby the farmer is not able to do that, if you deprive him of the privilege of disposing of his grain outside he is compelled to sell to the local elevators at whatever price the elevator

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

operator demands. In my own section of the country that is the objection which has been taken to making any change in this clause, rather than on the car question. I know where a certain price was offered for grain at an elevator, but the farmer was not satisfied, and knowing the Winnipeg price he loaded a car, and the same elevator man offered him 12 cents more for the grain so loaded. That is why the farmers are so much alarmed about the proposed change. It is not a question of cars or car shortage, but simply that they fear the change will place them in the hands of their own local dealer. They cannot draw the grain to the next elevator, which is probably 10 or 15 miles away, they simply have to sell to him if this clause goes through.

So, you place the farmer at once at the mercy of the local dealer; and I think that is the reason the farmers are objecting so much. I have known small farmers not having enough grain to make a carload, and two of them clubbing together to ship a car. I am very much opposed to the proposed change. In Alberta and the far west, there is no doubt about it, if this change is made, the farmers will have to take whatever price is offered by the local elevator where there is no competition; and even where there are two or three, they will combine and pay only a certain price. And the farmer will make five or six or even ten cents a bushel in loading cars for the Winnipeg market.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I would like to make my position perfectly clear in this matter. This amendment covers the whole of clause 207 of the Bill. There are five subsections in the amendment. The first, (a), is in connection with an elevator collapsing; (b), is in connection with the relief of damp grain; (c), is in connection with seed grain (d), is in connection with heating grain. All these I favour. But subsection (e), in my humble opinion, goes a little too far. I would not give that power to the commission. If I were voting on this section separately, I would certainly vote against the insertion of this subsection (e), of the amendment. If I have to vote on the whole five at once, I will have to vote for the amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The natural way is to take it clause by clause.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). If it is taken clause by clause I will vote for the first four and against the fifth. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) has brought to the attention of the committee the conditions in western Canada in connection with the grain blockade. We all know the conditions there. I had a letter the other day from a man who went from my part of the constituency in the province of Manitoba, who tells me that he draws

his grain to the elevator, a distance of forty miles, and then must bribe the elevator people to take the grain off his hands before they will take it. I say these conditions should not be allowed to exist. But this Grain Bill does not cover these conditions. We are allowing the railway companies to build branch line after branch line, and that is the reason, largely, for the congestion. The hopper is too large for the spout. We have to get a new outlet for the grain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. To the south.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). No, not to the south—not by a long way. My hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. Douglas), said that my speech of two years ago did him a lot of good in his campaign——

Mr. OLIVER. I also found it very helpful.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). You did not use it fairly then. I stand by that speech just as on the day I made it. And I stood by it through my campaign, and it was on account of that speech that I was able to win out against my opponent—and I could do it again to-morrow. I simply arose to explain my position in connection with this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to say just a word with regard to the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster, North Toronto). It seems to me that in referring to the words of Mr. Fream, who said that the present law on this subject should not be weakened in any way, I understood him to say that it will not be weakened by this amendment. As I understand the law now, the farmers themselves have the control of placing cars according to the order in which they have been called for. When you give another body power to do away with the distribution of cars, you are taking away from the farmers the protection they have under the present law. The burden is upon my hon. friend (Mr. Foster, North Toronto), to show that the present law has worked unfairly, that it has caused dissatisfaction, and hardship. Else why make the change? If the law has worked well—and every hon. gentleman I have heard speak on the subject admits that it works fairly well—I do not see why any change should be made. As to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe), I think he can make his mind easy, for we can take a vote upon the different clauses of the amendment. And, feeling as I do, being in accord with my hon. friend, if there is no other way to take the vote, I will move as an amendment to the amendment that subsection (e) be struck out. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will move that himself. If he does, I shall have much pleasure in seconding it.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to delay the committee, but this is perhaps a more important portion of the Bill than the committee has pet appreciated. I should judge from the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he has not yet fully appreciated the importance of the section, or the relationship that must of necessity exist between the farmer on the one hand, and those who buy and transport his grain on the other. It is not throwing any suspicion upon the grain dealer or railway company to say that in the buying and handling of grain their interests are not the interests of the farmers. It is an absolute necessity of the case, just as it is that two and two make four, that the farmer, and the railway company and grain dealers are in opposition to each other, and that opposition is apt to be a very strenuous one.

I do not wish to introduce controversial matter into the discussion, but if my hon. friend is not aware of the facts, it is his misfortune. The fact is that there is necessarily and actually a very bitter feeling and always has been—I do not know what it will be in the future, but it exists to-day—between the two opposing interests. It is no aspersion upon either of them to say that there is such a feeling, and it is not a proper appreciation of the facts to suggest that by any legislation we can do away with that condition. It is a natural condition, it is not an improper condition, except as it may be strained to improper limits. My hon. friend will be the greatest legislator that ever graced this parliament or any other, if he can bring those two interests into amicable conjunction. I want to impress upon the minister that this matter is one the importance of which cannot be exaggerated, that the action taken to-night is going to have far reaching consequences, and the responsibility thereof must rest upon my hon. friend and his colleagues. I want to allude to the argument made by the minister as to the urgency of the provision of subsection (e). He painted a picture of the deplorable loss to be suffered by reason of damp grain; and the necessity of rushing cars to the relief of the locality suffering from that condition. But my hon. friend does not appreciate the fact that subsection (e) has no necessary application to that condition. On the face of it, it applies to the locality and the condition where the grain is abundant, and may be as good as it is abundant. It applies to the condition of congestion, and gives authority to the commission to relieve that congestion. He sketched the condition to which clause (b) would be applicable; but I say that is not the condition that clause (e) is intended to pro-

vide for. From the wording of that clause it applies rather to a condition where the grain is merely abundant, and may be just as good as it is abundant. In such a case the board has the authority of this parliament to suspend the provisions of the Act in regard to car distribution, both at that point where it must go for cars, and at this point to which it will send cars. That is a radical change in the provision regarding car distribution. There can be no misapprehension in regard to the construction to be given those words. The member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) was insistent that it was right and proper to give authority to the board to order cars forward in special cases. There is no special case in subsection (e). Subsection (e) does not provide for a special case, it provides for a general condition. Take the condition that exists in the west to-day, a general condition of congestion, and the board has the right under that section to order any distribution of cars it pleases in any part of the west.

Mr. BURNHAM. Is not that just what we are driving at, the very thing you have enunciated?

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad that my hon. friend appreciates the meaning of the section, but it is not the meaning which we wish to have attached to the legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman mean that under the authority of this clause a general order could be made to the railway companies?

Mr. OLIVER. Surely.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I think the hon. gentleman who sits behind him will tell him that no such order could be made. The Supreme Court has ruled over and over again in cases much less decisive that no general order could be made under the authority of that clause. It would have to be an order of cars to a special point.

Mr. OLIVER. I am saying that under the condition that exists in the northwest to-day the Grain Commission, under the terms of that order, would have full authority to send cars wherever they pleased and whenever they pleased. To-day, if that section were in force, the provisions in regard to car order booking would be to all intents and purposes suspended throughout the northwest. Those are the actual facts of the case. I do not suggest that the Minister of Trade and Commerce understands it in that way, but I am giving him my understanding of it, with a knowledge of the conditions.

There is another point. As the law stands at present the farmer who has grain to ship knows what his rights are, he knows what he may expect. But if you introduce the provision of clause (e), or even the provision of (b), but especially (e), then the farmer does not know where he stands in regard to his car order. As long as the law stands as it is he gets his order in his turn with his neighbours, but give the commission the discretion that you are proposing to them there—they take the cars from here and send them there—and he is out of his calculations entirely as the result of this legislation. I do not want to delay the committee, I do not want to hold back the passage of this legislation, but I want to emphasize to the minister that he is dealing with that part of the Bill that is most far-reaching, that touches most closely the people who are most affected by the Bill, and that in my humble judgment, and I give it for what it is worth, this section will not be limited to the degree that he believes it will be, that it will go so far beyond that limit that it will have the effect, to all intents and purposes, of destroying the value of the car-distribution provision in the Grain Act as it stands at the present time.

With regard to the provisions in Bill (No. 96) as to forwarding cars for the relief of localities where there is damaged grain, if there were a few isolated localities where the grain was damaged, it would be possible, as it would be right, to provide that this Grain Commission be given authority to specially forward cars to these localities. It was such a condition, no doubt, that the delegates had in mind when they discussed the matter with the minister, but, to-day, with the condition that prevails throughout the prairie provinces, with respect to damaged grain here, there and yonder in a hundred different localities, there is no advantage in giving the right to the commission to send cars to one place or to another place. There are not cars enough available, there is no possibility of them meeting the requirements by any orders they may give, and it just reduces the matter to the point that they will send the cars wherever the loudest noise is made, or wherever the biggest pull exists, which is a most objectionable condition of affairs. That is a feature of the case that did not strike me at the time the Bill was going through the House, but it is the absolute condition, and it may be just as well to be understood in that way.

Mr. BURNHAM. Is not that the condition prevailing in railway circles in Ontario now?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say, I am sure; but that is the condition that prevails in the west. The condition of damage is so widespread, that there is no possibility of meeting that condition by any special orders that might be given and to

give authority to issue special orders under such conditions is simply to give authority to abrogate the advantages of the Bill for the man who wants to use those advantages. We have given the privilege of loading platforms to the farmers in the west. They tried to get them for a long time. They were successful in getting them at last. They have handled a large part of their grain over those loading platforms. Those loading platforms are a cause of offence to the elevator man, to the local grain dealer, and to the railway company, and there is no doubt that: do away with the car distribution clause and the loading platforms might just as well disappear from the scene.

The question has been asked: Who are the men who are demanding changes in this Act, with regard to car distribution? There was some question about it put forward. There is no question about it. Three years ago, when the Grain Act was under amendment, notice was sent by the then Minister of Trade and Commerce to all parties interested, to come and be heard, in regard to these amendments. The matter was public, everybody was admitted and we found there the railway man, the grain dealer, the one side, even the banker, lined up on the one side, every one of them demanding the abrogation of the section of the Act relating to car distribution, and the farmer on the other. There is no secret about who is on the one side, and who is on the other. There is no blame to either party, because they are on the respective sides, but there never has been any mistake about it, or misunderstanding that on the one side is the producer, and on the other are the interests that necessarily handle his product. There is just the same necessary conflict of interest between these two sections of the community as there was between the buyer and the seller in the days of King Solomon, and has been every day since.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to ask the minister whether he proposes having a vote taken upon each clause? The reason I ask it is that members of the committee might not entertain the same view of this clause as they do of others. I think there is quite a consensus of opinion in favour of the other clauses, but there is a very strong objection to clause (e). That objection has been expressed very strongly on this side of the House, and if my hon. friend will not allow the vote to be taken on the different clauses, I would move that the proposed new section be amended by striking out clause (e).

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have no objection to taking them paragraph by paragraph.

Subsection (b) agreed to on division.

Subsection (e) agreed to, yeas 44, nays 29.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not vote because I am paired with the member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler).

Mr. ROSS. I did not vote because I am paired with Mr. Foster.

On section 208—inspection divisions.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The object of the amendment to section 208 is to perfect the erection of Calgary into an inspection division. It follows the provisions with respect to Winnipeg making such changes as are necessary to apply similar conditions to Calgary.

Mr. OLIVER. On the 3rd reading I shall move an amendment to section 246.

On section 13—acquiring of terminal elevators.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do I understand that this section would allow the board to declare that elevators not only upon the Great Lakes, at Fort William and Port Arthur, but also upon the eastern side of the lakes and at Atlantic ports, terminal elevators, that these elevators being so declared the government has power to either construct elevators or to take over existing elevators? I am not able to see why the provision should not be general, why elevators might not be taken over and operated by the government to as much advantage on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and on the St. Lawrence as at Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This gives power to the Governor in Council to construct, acquire, lease or expropriate any terminal elevator, if parliament has granted the money for such purpose; and a terminal elevator is an elevator which exists at what has been declared by the board to be a terminal point. The only terminal point at the present time is Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see why that should be so. I do not see why the board should have the power to limit and fix what shall be terminal points. Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John, Tiffin, Port McNichol, Vancouver and Victoria, are just as much terminal points as Port Arthur and Fort William. It may be that in connection with the administration of the Grain Act the board might very well be given the power to declare a certain point to be a terminal point; but why this board should have the power to say in effect that the government may construct or take over an elevator at Fort William and Port Arthur, but shall have no right to construct or take over an elevator at any other point which, in reality, is just

as much a terminal point as Fort William or Port Arthur, I fail to understand. I would suggest to my hon. friend whether or not this provision might not well be broadened out. The grain does not stop at Fort William and Port Arthur. It moves forward to the Atlantic ports, and on to the English markets, and there is just as much, or almost as much, reason for the government owning and controlling elevators at Atlantic ports and also at the eastern ports on the Great Lakes as at Port Arthur and Fort William. But what I do decidedly object to is that this board shall have the power to decide at what points the government shall take over or construct elevators, and own and manage them.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Certainly, the board should not have that power. It has not the power to establish inspection divisions, except with the approval of the Governor in Council, and it ought not to have the still greater power of saying which should be a terminal point, without the approval of the Governor in Council.

Therefore, I move that subsection (y) of section 2 be amended by striking out the word 'board' and substituting therefor the words 'Governor in Council.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. The idea that the hon. member for St. John has in mind would be met if the word 'public' were inserted either before or after the word 'terminal' in section 13. That would be an elevator that actually did all the work of a terminal elevator, but had not the standing of a terminal elevator for the purpose of issuing warehouse receipts; that is, to do in the eastern terminal elevators just what the hon. member for St. John had in mind.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not propose to widen it in that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we ought to discuss the whole question of elevators under section 13. Speaking for the port of St. John, there is the most urgent necessity for additional elevator accommodation for the shipment of grain at that port.

The elevator at St. John was constructed by the Canadian Pacific Company, with some assistance from the city, and the provincial government. It was large enough when it was built, and for some years afterwards, but the business has developed so rapidly, that that elevator is wholly incapable of accommodating the business, and the result is there is great congestion. During the present year the business to that port has already very considerably exceeded the business of last year which was very large indeed. Last year I think the exports from St. John reached the very handsome total of about $25,000,000, and up to the present time they are about $2,000,000 ahead of what they were last year. It seems to me that when we are considering the question of giving the government authority to either expropriate existing elevators or to build new ones, we ought to have some statement from the government as to what is their intention. I have no doubt myself that we have been altogether lacking in the past in the matter of making sufficient provision in the way of elevator accommodation east of the Great Lakes. It is true that during recent years great additional elevator accommodation has been provided at Tiffin and Victoria Harbour. In that respect both the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk railways are doing their duty. There is, however, only accommodation for a few million bushels east of the Great Lakes, while in the city of Buffalo there is elevator accommodation for pretty well on to 50,000,000 bushels which is far and away ahead of anything we have in Canada. By reason of this enormous accommodation, vast quantities of Canadian grain go to Buffalo which ought to be carried to Canadian ports east of the Great Lakes, and the business of transporting that grain is lost to Canada. It seems to me the government must increase the accomodation upon the eastern shores of the Great Lakes, upon the St. Lawrence and upon our Atlantic seaboard. No doubt the same remark will apply to the Pacific coast.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Where does the grain come from that reaches St. John by rail?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some by all rail. Some comes, strange to say, from the American west, although we get more package freight for them.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It only gets to St. John by rail.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. At the present time the Canadian Pacific is bringing a good deal of grain by the all rail route north of lake Superior. There is this curious fact in connection with the trade of St. John, that while our whole export trade up to the present time exceeds that of last year by more than $2,000,000, that increase is almost entirely in American products. The increase of Canadian products carried to the port has only amounted to two or three hundred thousand dollars, while the increase in American products amounts to very nearly $2,000,000. I think the total Canadian products carried to St. John have amounted up to the present time to something over $7,000,000, and the total of American products between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend has given us some interesting information with reference to the increase in the trade of the port of St. John which we are all glad to know. But I think he is mixing up two different things. The Dominion parliament and the Dominion government have the right to build elevators in St. John now if they choose to. The purposes of this Act are special purposes looking to the regulation of the grain trade from the west, and specially at the great terminal points. Certain abuses have existed and it was contended that the control and supervision of the government at those points was not sufficient to protect the grain shippers and the grain exporters and the clause under discussion is meant to in some way cope with that difficulty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the government acquiring the elevators?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is the principle involved in clause 13. We take the power to lease or construct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it intended to do it?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes. There will be a grant of money asked for during the present session for the purpose of doing it, but I am not in a position to say how large the amount of money will be.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). I agree to a great extent with the hon. member for St. John as to the desirability of including in this policy the eastern elevators as well as those in the west. It would be quite easy to include within the scope of the Bill these eastern terminal elevators. The capacity of those at Midland and Port McNicoll only amounts to about 5,000,000 bushels, but elevators now are being built on a new principle. The Grand Trunk elevator at Midland and that of the Canadian Pacific at Port McNicoll are to-day so well equipped that it simply means the addition of more tanks to increase the capacity from one and a quarter to two and a half million bushels; and I am told some of them might be increased beyond that. It is simply a question of motive power. If the government can see their way to do this to embrace in the Bill the eastern elevators it would be most desirable and I hope the minister will be able to make the necessary provision in this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The proviso is in the Bill and the powers are given, in the definition of 'Terminal Elevator' as my hon. friend will see:

'Terminal elevator' includes every elevator or warehouse which receives or ships grain, and is located at any point declared by the Governor in Council to be a terminal point.

This links up with section 13, under which the Governor in Council has power to—

—construct, acquire, lease or expropriate for His Majesty any terminal elevator if parliament has granted the money for such purpose.

So all powers needed are contained in the Bill. I do not wish it to be understood that the government is proposing to undertake the building of all the elevators east and west. It certainly is not proposing to do anything of the kind. And, for the present, it has no plans to construct, lease and operate terminal elevators at any other place than Fort William. The time may come when that policy will be extended to Prince Rupert, Vancouver or some other point on the Pacific, to Hudson Bay or to other places which the Governor in Council, after due consideration, deems it necessary to control in this way. But I do not want the committee to think for a moment that the government proposes to take in charge the building of these elevators. Something is to be left to private and corporate activity, and I think a great deal must be left to that in the future.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I may be allowed a question, is it not because of the fact that it has been left to private and corporate enterprise at Fort William and Port Arthur that difficulty has arisen?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There are great difficulties between a point like Fort William and Port Arthur and many of the other points mentioned, as the hon. gentleman will see if he thinks of it for a moment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what respect?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The head of the Lakes is the point at which nearly all the grain that passes out centres within a small radius and passes through, and it is there that the particular difficulties are to be met with of which complaint has been made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Are not Halifax and St. John two points at which all the grain concentrates that goes to Europe?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, it does not all go through Halifax and St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the winter season?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No. As a matter of fact, the same causes of difficulty that have operated and led to dissatisfaction at Fort William and Port Arthur have not operated and have not been complained of in the eastern elevators.

These elevators are under supervision and will be kept under supervision, and, as is necessary, they will be kept under stricter and stricter supervision. But at the present time there is no grievance, no cause why these should be taken up all of a sudden and put in the same position as the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. A certain amount of grain goes out through St. John, and I hope that in future more of it will go out that way. Precautions have been taken which, in the course of the trade, I think, have allowed to rise only one or two cases in which a grievance has existed in shipping grain from Halifax or St. John. Grain is shipped from Montreal, and the elevators there are under supervision in the same way. The supervision and power of the government follows the grain from Winnipeg to all these different places to the time of its transhipment across the ocean. These elevators are carefully looked after, and, if it becomes necessary, as the traffic increases, that they be more carefully looked after, and supervision added to and strengthened, it will be the duty of the government, as it was the purpose of the government, to see that this is done.

Mr. OLIVER. Do I understand the minister to say that he will be prepared to make a statement at some stage of the Bill in regard to the government ownership of terminals?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have made a pretty full statement; but if that does not satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), when we come to some other portion of the Bill that matter can be taken up and he can put the questions which he thinks are necessary.

Mr. OLIVER. In the lack of fuller information, it will be necessary, on the third reading to move the amendment of this section.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think we have had a pretty good siege of it today. I would like to have finished the thing, as leaving it over means that it will probably take an hour or two longer.

Mr. OLIVER. Can the minister say without inconvenience, what sections of the Bill still stand?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, sections 3, 121, 122, 124 and 125. These are the sections that remain, and there may be another section to be added.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—CORRECTION—MR. PELLETIER.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I would like to make a statement. My attention has been called to the fact that at first sight there appears to be a slight contradiction between one part of my speech delivered in this House on the 22nd of January last and another part of my remarks. In looking into the question, I see that something has been omitted and I wish to have the matter put right. I wish to state that on page 1,695 of 'Hansard,' line 9, after the words 'and religious point of view' the following should be inserted:

'This is the condition of affairs which existed before the 2nd April, 1908. The Ne Temere decree now forbids, from a Catholic religious point of view only, mixed marriages before a non-Catholic clergyman, but this is a matter which affects only Catholics and their conscience. It has no civil effect and does not affect those who are non-Catholics. As the 'Tablet' puts it, the Catholic church has no power to change the civil law of marriage. The impediments to marriage which were in force on the first of August, 1866, continue to exist, but those created after do not come under article 125 of our Civil Code which speaks only of impediments hitherto existing.'

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What business will be taken up on Thursday?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). After the softening influences of Ash Wednesday have been experienced by us all, I think it is the intention to take up the Post Office Bill and probably the Tariff Commission Bill, and to give a step forward to the Manitoba Boundaries Bill.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 22, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—ST. DAMIEN STATION.

Mr. LAVALLEE:

1. Has the Transcontinental Railway Commission in its possession, signed by Robert Martin and Louis Hurtubise, a plan of the line of the Transcontinental railway in residence 12, division 3, district B?

2. If so, does the said plan mention any important changes from the first plan in the localization of the station near the highway leading to St. Damien?

3. Has the commission any letters or letter from the engineer of district B to Lt.-Colonel Talbot, of St. Michel, county of Bellechasse, on this subject? If so, what are the contents of said letters or letter?

4. Did the chairman or commission address any letters or letter to said Colonel Talbot on the subject referred to?

5. If so, has the commission any copy or record of such letters or letter?

6. If so, will the Government furnish the House with a copy of such correspondence?

7. Did the said engineer referred to in question 3 above, address any letter or letters to the said chairman of the commission on the above subject?

8. If so, what are the contents of said letter or letters and the date or dates of the same?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The following information is supplied by the National Transcontinental Railway Commission:

1. Yes.

2. The plan does note changes.

3. Yes. It is not advisable to summarize contents of letters. They can be produced on order of the House.

4. No record of any on file.

5 and 6. Answered by Number 4.

7 and 8. Answered by Number 3.

AMERICAN FIRMS SHIPPING TO CANADA.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What are the names of the American companies shipping goods into Canada?

2. What is the value of the goods shipped by each company?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1 and 2. It is not considered advisable to disclose the individual transactions of exporters shipping goods to Canada. The information asked for is not compiled in the Department of Customs.

TUBERCULOSIS IN ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE.

Mr. DEMERS:

Is the government in possession of information enabling it to give the proportion of deaths caused by tuberculosis in the county of St. Jean and Iberville compared with other causes of death in the county? If so, what is the proportion?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. The following are the latest mortality returns for the counties of St. Jean and Iberville, being for the year 1907, and are taken from the report of the recorder of vital statistics of the province of Quebec:

Counties	Total deaths From all causes.	From Tuberculosis.
St. Jean	137	10
Iberville	83	9
	220	19

Total of 220 from all causes—19 from tuberculosis, which represents one death from tuberculosis in every 8·63 from all causes.

FRASERVILLE WHARF.

* Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is there in the Railway Department any letters, communications, reports or other documents by which it is sought to show that if the Department of Public Works, is constructing a new wharf in deep water at Fraserville, River du Loup, P.Q., or if an extension be made to the present wharf, there would be saved, it is said, an expense of several thousand dollars to the Intercolonial railway, in discharging at River du Loup, Fraserville, all the coal which the Intercolonial railway requires for the eastern division, and which is now discharged at the wharfs at Lévis?

2. If so, does the Railway Department intend to bring pressure on the hon. Minister of Public Works, with the view to proceed as soon as possible with the construction of this wharf or the extension of the one now existing at Fraserville, River du Loup, P.Q., in order to save thousands of dollars, as alleged, uselessly spent each year in continuing the present system of discharging coal at Lévis?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. There are letters, and other papers in the Department of Railways, showing that lumber and coal might be delivered to the Intercolonial railway at Riviére du Loup if improvements were made at the wharf there.

2. An item of $70,000 has been placed in the estimates for 1912-13 by the Minister of Public Works in connection with the improvements referred to.

CEMENT IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. ROBB:

1. What is the quantity and value of cement imported into Canada during the years 1910 and 1911?

2. What quantity of such imports were entered by or imported for account of the Canada Cement Company?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. The quantity and value of Portland cement imported into Canada during the fiscal years ended March 31st, 1910 and 1911, respectively, was as follows:

	Cwt.	Value.
1910	490,809	$158,487
1911	1,283,121	494,081

2. Individual imports are not separately tabulated in the customs returns.

EXPORTS OF CREAM.

Mr. ROBB:

1. What quantity of cream was exported from Canada to the United States during the six months ending January 1, 1912?
2. What was the value of said cream?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. The quantity of cream exported from Canada to the United States during the six months ending January 31, 1912, amounted to 459,219 gallons.
2. The value of said cream was $412,161.

SOREL WHARF—TIMBER SUPPLY.

Mr. LAVALLEE:

1. Is it within the knowledge of the government that one of the suppliers of timber, Mr. Ambroise Larivière, of St. Ours, has not been paid in full for the timber which he delivered and furnished for the construction of the government wharf at Sorel?
2. Has the government been informed by a letter from Mr. A. Larivière that the contractors for the wharf still owe him $5,614, and that he has much difficulty in getting them to pay him?

Mr. MONK:

1 and 2. In 1909, Mr. Lariviére wrote that he had a claim of $4,066.42, but nothing has been heard for nearly three years from Mr. Lariviére the department is not aware whether the contractor has paid the amount or not. Mr. Lavallée, M.P., was informed on the 12th inst., that an amount of $5,220.20 was still due the contractor. It is suggested, if Mr. Lariviére still has a claim that he submit same at once.

J. E. LAFORCE.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Is J. E. Laforce, farmer, of the county of Rimouski, employed in the House of Commons or in the Senate?
2. If so, since what date and at what salary?

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister):

1. There is no person named J. E. Laforce employed either in the service of the House of Commons or of the Senate.
2. Answered by number one.

WELLAND CANAL—AMERICAN FREIGHT.

*Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

What quantities of American ore, coal and wheat passed through the St. Lawrence canals last season, whether in British or American bottoms?

Mr. REID (Grenville).

Mr. COCHRANE:

Articles.	Canals.	Canadian or British Bottoms.	United States Bottoms.
Ore ... tons.	St. Lawrence.	Nil.	Nil.
Coal..... "	" ..	375,239	381,235
Wheat... bush.	" ..	488,366	1,235,434

ALDERSHOT CARETAKER.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Is there a caretaker in charge of the militia camp, including rifle ranges, grounds and buildings, at Aldershot, near Kentville, Nova Scotia?
2. If not, how long have the premises been without a caretaker?
3. In the absence of a caretaker, what precautions are taken to preserve the caretaker's house, and any other buildings on the grounds, as well as other valuable properties, including rifle ranges, targets, pine, and other timber?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1. Mr. Howard Robinson, of Lakeville, Nova Scotia, is appointed caretaker.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

TWINE MATERIALS, IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What quantity of unbarked marlin was imported during the last fiscal year, and how much duty was collected on same?
2. What quantity of cotton seine twine was imported during the last fiscal year?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Unbarked marlin is not separately tabulated in the Customs Statistical Returns, being subject to duty the same as cordage.
2. Cotton seine twine for the fisheries is not separately tabulated in the Customs Statistical Returns, being included in the item of twine, lines, rope and nets for the fisheries, the value of which admitted free for the year ended 31st March, 1911, was $1,099,481.

SOULANGES CANAL PATRONAGE.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals established a line of demarcation for the distribution of patronage between the counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, on the Soulanges canal?
2. Has the government exclusively referred to Dr. Lortie, ex-member for the first of these counties, the using of patronage without distinction on the canal?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.
2. No.

VAUDREUIL POSTMASTER.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Is it true that the dismissal of Mr. J. B. Adolphe Valois, postmaster at Vaudreuil station, has been determined on?
2. If so, for what reasons, and by whose request?
3. Will this postmaster have the benefit of an inquiry?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. No decision has been given in this case.
2. See answer to No. 1.
3. Yes.

VAL DES EBOULIS POSTMASTER.

Mr. BOYER:

1. For what reason has William Robert, postmaster at Val des Eboulis, been dismissed?
2. Who requested this change, and will an inquiry be held in his case?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Mr. Wm. Robert was appointed postmaster by the late Postmaster General on the 4th October last, removing Pierre Quesnel, the former postmaster, from office. Mr. Robert's appointment has, therefore, been cancelled, and Eugene Quesnel, son of the late postmaster, appointed to the office.
2. (a) The change was recommended by Mr. DeLery MacDonald. (b) Further inquiry is not necessary. The facts are known to the department.

STANISLAS HOULE.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Has a person named Stanislas Houle been employed in any way on the Soulanges canal?
2. If so, does the government know that this man is said to have been dismissed from service for insubordination and other causes?
3. Will the government, being informed of these alleged facts, continue keeping him in the position to which he has just been appointed?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes, as painter.
2. Yes; he was dismissed by the late overseer on a charge of insubordination, which he denied, and the charges were not proven.
3. He is now at work employed from month to month temporarily, when there is work for him to do.

DESIRE LAUZON.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Does the government require references as to the financial position and habits of those whom it employs?
2. Did the government require such references as to Desiré Lauzon, who has just been appointed coal heaver on the Soulanges canal in place of Jean Baptiste Denis?
3. If so, what are the references, and who furnished them?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The Department of Railways and Canals endeavours to insure that its appointees are men of good character and habits, particularly in cases of those on whom financial responsibility devolves.
2. Yes; Desiré Lauzon was not employed as coal heaver, he was appointed as lamp cleaner on the Soulanges canal.
3. That he was a man of good character and habits; references were furnished by the parish priest of St. Justin, who highly recommended him.

MANITOBA BOUNDARY EXTENSION.

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

Resolved, that it is expedient, (a) to extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba northward to the sixtieth parallel of latitude and northeastward to the shores of Hudson Bay, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the legislative assembly of Manitoba and by parliament;

(b) to authorize the Governor in Council, inasmuch as the province was not in debt at the time of its establishment, to pay to the said province an annual sum of $381,584.19, being the equivalent of interest at five per cent on $7,631,683.85, the difference between a principal sum of $8,107,500 and $475,816.15 heretofore advanced by the government to the province for provincial purposes; such annual sum to be paid as and from the first day of July, 1908, but subject, however, as to payments due upon the coming into force of any Act founded upon these resolutions, to the deduction of certain sums received by the said province by way of interest on capital allowance in lieu of debt;

(c) to authorize the Governor in Council to pay to the said province, in lieu of ownership of public lands, an annual sum based upon the population of the said province as ascertained by each quinquennial census thereof, such annual sum to commence with $562,500 (less certain deductions in respect of what are known as swamp lands and university lands) and not to exceed the annual sum of $1,125,000 (less equivalent deductions); the same to be paid as from the first day of July, 1908, but subject, however, as to payments due at the time of the passing of any Act founded upon these resolutions, to a deduction of the aggregate of certain sums received by the pro-

vince on and after July 1, 1908, on account of indemnity in lieu of public lands;

(d) to authorize the Governor in Council to pay the said province one-half on July 1, 1912, and one-half on July 1, 1913, the sum of $201,723.57 towards the construction of public buildings.

He said: His Royal Highness, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of the resolution, has been pleased to give his assent thereto.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would observe to my right hon. friend that it will be impossible to take up the discussion of this resolution without having information of the negotiations which have taken place with the government of Manitoba up to the present time. The motion was made some time ago, I think in the month of December, asking for all correspondence in connection with this matter. That correspondence has not been brought down, and my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will agree with me that we should have an opportunity of reading it before the debate is proceeded with.

Mr. BORDEN. I think the return is ready, and will be brought down to-day.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT—AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act by providing for the employment in the office of the Auditor General, for a period not exceeding two years, of such temporary clerks as may be necessary in connection with the audit and payment of fees and expenses under the Dominion Elections Act.

Motion agreed to.

LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE STATION.

Mr. MONK. I beg to state for the information of the House, that in deference to the wishes expressed by members, we have had a long distance telephone station for their convenience installed at the end of the corridor near this chamber.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 104) to amend the Civil Service Act—Mr. Borden.

Bill (No. 76) to amend The National Transcontinental Railway Act—Mr. Cochrane.

Bill (No. 103) to amend the Government Works Tolls Act—Mr. Monk.

Mr. BORDEN.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 60) to amend the Civil Service Act—Mr. Borden.

Mr. BORDEN. I suggested the other day that the Bill should remain in committee, but I have no further observations to make regarding it, and if there is no further discussion the measure can be reported.

Bill reported.

APPOINTMENT OF A TARIFF COMMISSION.

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

On section 5, subsection 7—inquiries to be in Ottawa, but power to hold them elsewhere.

Mr. KYTE. I desire to point out what I conceive to be a defect in the machinery provided for the purpose of obtaining information of parties who may be prepared to give testimony before the commission. I pointed out before that this clause provides for the examination of such persons only, who have been summoned for the purpose of giving evidence. I think this clause should go further and provide for the examination of any person who is willing to go before the commission to represent any interest in Canada, whether he has been summoned or not. With that view, I propose that section 5, subsection 1, be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words:—

And they shall hear the evidence of persons who appear before them for the purpose of making a voluntary statement and who have not been so summoned.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think it should be borne in mind that this commission is to be used for the purpose of obtaining information, and to be used intelligently, under the direction of the government. The amendment would very seriously interfere with the action of the commission in that respect. Under section 4 it is provided that the commission is to act under the direction of the Minister of Finance; and it has been previously pointed out that it will be asked to report upon certain matters in the order of their urgency as it appears to the government. In order to take up its work intelligently, the commission must be at liberty to direct its own operations, to summon witneses if they wish, or to allow parties to be heard. I think that if my hon. friend (Mr. Kyte) will look at the provision of the Act creating the Railway Commission, he will find that no one has the right to come and ask that the commission take up a certain matter. That

is for the commission to decide. Otherwise the commission, instead of working intelligently, would be at the beck and call of every one who wished to have his particular matter taken up, even though entirely out of its order; and the result would be that instead of intelligent action on the part of the commission, more or less confusion would ensue. I think it may be safely left to the commission appointed by the government, the commissioners, we may assume, will be men of intelligence—to adopt their own methods of obtaining evidence, either by summoning witnesses, or by affording opportunity for parties who wish to be heard to come forward and testify. The last clause of the last subsection of section 5, appears to cover the point raised by my hon. friend.

> The commissioners shall hold their sessions and conduct their proceedings in such manner as may seem to them most convenient for the speedy and efficient discharge of their duties.

In pursuing a certain inquiry it is open to the commission to say that all parties who desire to do so may appear, or they may subpœna witnesses on their own initiative. I have no reason to doubt that they will hear interested parties who desire to be heard on any particular inquiry, but the initiative should be with them, in order, that, as I have said, they may conduct their work with the greatest efficiency and intelligence. But to adopt the amendment of my hon. friend would mean that the work of the commission might be very greatly embarrassed, and we should not be able to accomplish through the commission what we hope to accomplish, namely to obtain information connected with tariff matters required from time to time by the government.

If I may hark back to the discussion of last evening, I would like to add that the time when we shall need the reports of the commission most will be between sessions. It is almost impossible for a government or a minister to consider such important matters as the tariff, and especially tariff changes, during a busy session. The time when such matters should be most particularly considered is between sessions. That is a little apart from the amendment, but I thought it desirable to point it out as it was overlooked by me in dealing with the matter before.

I have no reason to doubt that in practice what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) desired will be carried out, but carried out in such order as the commission may deem proper, for the best accomplishment of their work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not seem to me that the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Kyte) is at all objectionable from the standpoint taken by the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds). The hon. minister said that the effect might be to interfere with the orderly conduct of the affairs of the commission. But as I read it, it would not compel them to hear evidence at any particular time, but they might appoint such time as would be convenient for them to hear witnesses who might desire to give their testimony. It seems to me the Minister of Finance forgets one very important object of the commission. He deals with the subject as if their whole duty would be to carry on investigations into specific applications for tariff changes. But, as he knows, the most important work this commission would have to do, would be to consider tariff matters, the cost of raw material, the cost of goods imported into Canada, the cost of manufacture in Canada, and so on, with a view to making general tariff revisions from time to time. Surely that is a matter in respect of which anybody in this country who wishes to be heard ought to have a right to go before the commission and give his testimony with facts in support of the views he may have upon tariff matters. Surely, this board ought not to be allowed to say whom they will call and what opinions they will give and make a report based upon those opinions only. This commission is to have very general powers, and its report must necessarily have great effect upon public opinion and upon parliament. If ever there was a commission in regard to which the public ought to have the right, by representatives or otherwise, to express their views, this is that commission. The hon. minister refers to the railway commission and says that people cannot go before that commission of their own motion. I have not the law before me, but I happen to know that the Board of Railway Commissioners have regarded it as a part of their duty to allow every man to come before them who desires to be heard, whether that particular person may have been summoned or not. They do not require a person to be subpœnaed, but allow people to go voluntarily and state their grievances, and they give what relief they find possible.

This commission is of enormous importance as regards tariff matters, it is a matter of great public interest; and it seems to me its duties can only be satisfactorily discharged if people should have an opportunity of coming voluntarily before it, and giving it such facts as they are able to supply.

Mr. BLAIN. In my opinion, if the committee were to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), it would be almost impossible for the commission to conduct any inquiry in this country without persons coming before the commission, and interfering with the examination of witnesses, and asking the commission to hear any person who

might offer himself. It might be very well if, after the commission has been at work for some time, there comes a complaint from any portion of the country that the commission had refused, on application, to hear the views of certain persons; then I think perhaps this amendment would be in order, and might be adopted by both sides of the House. This commission is experimental; this is the first time in the history of Canada that we have had a commission of this kind, and I think it would be in the public interest that hon. gentlemen opposite should give it a fair trial. Surely the Finance Minister and the government will make every effort to investigate every tariff question thoroughly; the government will be more anxious than any one else that such should be done. Any person who has a statement to make to the government can come before the government at any time, and make an appointment with the Minister of Finance with respect to tariff matters, and it will be the duty of the minister to hear that complaint, no matter from what part of Canada it may come. I cannot see that this amendment would be good. I think the commission would be quite willing to hear any person, and the government would naturally be anxious that every person should be heard who desired to be heard, no matter from what part of the country he may come. Suppose a day was fixed by the commission for sitting in Toronto to hear a certain matter; under the Bill as it now stands, certain persons would be summoned, and men will understand that they are to come and give evidence. If this amendment were adopted, any persons would have a right to come in and demand that the commission should hear them. If next week, or ten days after, the commission should have an appointment at Hamilton on their route, it would be absolutely impossible for them, under the operation of this amendment, to meet their appointment, or to carry out any general investigation of tariff matters, beginning at one city and going on to another, because the public would crowd in and interfere with their arrangements. It would be the next thing to impossible to give everybody who wished an opportunity of being heard before the commission on any fixed date. Surely this is asking the government to throw the door open too wide. I repeat that if, in the future, it is found that the commissioners are unwilling to hear complaints, and if a complaint is made to the House, I am sure that the government will be quite ready to amend the Act, or make some regulation by which everybody may have an opportunity to state his grievance. For my part I think the amendment is out of order, and I would like to ask the chairman whether it is or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the case of members of the government who have been acting as commissioners with respect to tariff matters, and who, when they come to any city, have invited all persons who desire to appear before them and give evidence, has the hon. gentleman ever heard of any inconvenience arising by reason of the public crowding in?

Mr. BLAIN. I cannot say offhand. I do know, however, that the other day we heard a gentleman, who was a member of a former government and a member of this government, saying that he had been one of a committee that had traversed the country to hear complaints, and that when he came back he did not know any more about the matter than before he went away.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably he had not studied the evidence.

Mr. BLAIN. I think my hon. friend will agree that he was a gentleman who would have studied the evidence pretty carefully. I do not think that the mover of this amendment should introduce it at this stage, at the very inception of the Tariff Commission. I think it would be in the interest of the public if he would give the commission opportunity of getting into operation; and then, if he finds them failing in the discharge of their duty, an amendment of this kind might be proper.

Mr. KYTE. Notwithstanding the appeal of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), I am still of the opinion that the amendment which I have proposed is an eminently proper one. My hon. friend states two objections. One is that it might lead to parties coming in and interfering with the commission, interfering with the line of conduct which they have laid down to guide them in particular instances. I understand that this commission will be in the nature of a court, it will have power to regulate the attendance of witnesses and the hearing of testimony, and like any other court, it would have a right to restrict the number of witnesses who might appear for the purpose of giving testimony upon a particular point.

Mr. BLAIN. Not according to my hon. friend's amendment.

Mr. KYTE. I think so. I think the commissioners, being gentlemen of common sense and familiar with the manner in which inquiries of this kind are carried on, would see to it that no undue advantage was taken of the commission by any persons, and that no waste of time

should occur by going over the same class of evidence the second time.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How could they so regulate proceedings if the amendment were adopted?

Mr. KYTE. If my amendment is not carried, people may not appear, as a right, before the commission at all. So far there are two evils, I think the amendment is in the direction of the lesser evil.

Mr. BLAIN. Has my hon. friend in his mind that the commission will be unwilling to hear complaints?

Mr. KYTE. I would be sorry to come to that conclusion; but I must confess, in view of certain statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that I am afraid there will not be too great an eagerness on the part of the commission to hear certain representations that might be offered. My hon. friend also objected to my amendment because it would be throwing the door open too wide. That is exactly the difficulty hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have; they don't want to open the door wide enough to allow all persons in this community to represent their views on tariff questions.

Mr. BLAIN. What class of persons has my hon. friend in mind that the commission would be unwilling to hear?

Mr. KYTE. My amendment covers all classes in the community, and in that respect it is not too wide. I can imagine circumstances under which the commissioners might go to certain places for the purpose of taking testimony, and when they might or might not desire to hear certain persons who wished to be heard. I suppose that the commission, before leaving Ottawa, will map out a certain itinerary, will select certain places where they will go to hear testimony. They will go down to Halifax, for instance, and certain persons there will be notified of their coming, and may be summoned to appear before the commission. Certain other persons who would like to put their views before the commission on tariff matters might not be able to appear before the commission.

It will be impossible that the commission should have in mind every interest in a large community that might desire to go before the commission and present their views. No harm can possibly come to the operation of this Act if the amendment is accepted. It will relieve the commission of the charge that might hereafter be made against them of having purposely omitted to notify certain persons or certain interests in the community that they are visiting for the purpose of taking testimony. The regulation of the conduct of the commission will be entirely in their own hands and, as I stated in the beginning, no disorder would be felt from this because the commission will have absolute power to make regulations for their conduct and for carrying out the course which they have laid down for themselves. Therefore, the objection of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), I think, should not prevail because this commission will have power to prevent any unnecessary interference with the business that would properly come before them.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) intend to put it beyond the control of the commission entirely as to the number of persons who shall give evidence or the kind of evidence that shall be given to the commission, because that is the effect of his amendment. There might be a hundred persons who were determined that they should be heard by this commission; the amendment says that they shall be heard and the commission have no power to say that they shall not, or to judge of the kind of evidence that shall be given, but these people simply come there, a hundred in number, and say: We must be heard, irrespective of whether the evidence shall be advisable or pertinent to the question at issue. Does the hon. gentleman want to put the commission in the position that these people shall have the absolute right to come before them and say: We are going to give this evidence; we do not care what anybody does or whether it is relevant to the question or not. That is the effect of the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman. The commission have absolute authority to receive the evidence of anybody who has been subpœnaed both under section 5 and subsection 8 of section 5. If that authority is given to the commission surely they would not prevent evidence being given which was pertinent or proper. If they would I would say that the commission would be no use whatever and would not be doing their duty. I cannot believe that my hon. friend would be willing to force the commission into the position which I have described.

Mr. NESBITT. I am very much surprised to hear the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) even suggesting that the amendment of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) should be refused. There has been a suspicion throughout the discussion of this Bill that the commission was appointed for a purpose. If there is anything in the world that would make the public believe that it was appointed for the purpose of serving the high tariff party, the action of the Minister of Finance would confirm them in that belief. The hon. gentleman who just sat down (Mr. Middlebro) and the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) talked about people going

and crowding the court room and demanding to be heard. I would like to know what country we are living in. Is this a free country? Are we going to appoint an autocratic commission in a democratic country or are the people of this country going to say that they have the right to be heard on a matter of public interest? Does the minister refuse to accept the amendment of my hon. friend which proposes that anybody in this country who desires to go before the Tariff Commission shall be heard? The Minister of Finance said that it was not so with reference to the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission pride themselves on the fact that anybody in this country, from end to end of it can be heard.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). This amendment says that they 'shall' hear evidence. Are the Railway Commission really compelled to hear evidence as this amendment proposes?

Mr. NESBITT. They do hear it anyway.

Mr. WHITE. (Leeds). Are they compelled to do it?

Mr. NESBITT. This commission should be compelled to do it. Who are they anyway? Do they own the country, or do the people of the country own the commission? Why should we not say that they shall, I would like to know? If there is anything in the world that would cause the people to be dissatisfied with this commission and with its star chamber proceedings, it is the stand which the Minister of Finance takes this afternoon. Why should anybody in this country be refused the right to be heard by this commission? They talk about court rooms being crowded. That is all nonsense. Everybody knows that the commission will be the judge as to the method and as to the time at which they shall be heard. My hon. friend talks about fair play for the commission; there is no man who is going to be so unreasonable that he will not be willing to wait until the time comes for him to be heard, but he wants to be heard and he will see that he does get the right to be heard whether it is now or hereafter. Why should he not? Every man in this country is interested in this Tariff Commission, everybody who buys anything is interested in the tariff, and everybody has the right to be heard. I think the Minister of Finance is standing in his own light in refusing this amendment. I see no reason why he should not do so, and I hope that he will reconsider his decision. What are the people of this country, that they should be dictated to by a Tariff Commission, as to whether they shall be heard or shall not be heard, on a question that so vitally affects them as the tariff? Why, the thing is ridiculous.

Mr. MEIGHEN. One of the reasons, it seems to me, why power should still reside in the commission to hear or reject evidence, is just because it frequently happens before commissions, in courts of law, and in parliament also, that much that is offered to be said is irrelevant to the question at issue. If the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), should carry, the commission would be robbed of every power which every commission in existence now has, and which the courts of law have as well. The very power which, the hon. gentleman says, resides in the commission is to be taken away by the amendment. Any man, any crank, any enthusiast, any set of people, individually or collectively, could go before the commission and be heard for as long, or as short a time as, in their own individual notions they desired. It would really appear to me that the purpose of the hon. gentleman, in wishing to proceed with the amendment, is to defeat the objects of the commission. If the amendment read with the word 'may' instead of the word 'shall' then the commission would still have power to regulate their own proceedings, but if the amendment read 'may' I do not see that the Bill, as it now stands, would be affected in any way, because under two clauses of the Bill, the commissioners have power to hear any one. So, it is evident that the word 'shall' in the amendment alters the effect of the Bill and it would have the effect of destroying the usefulness of the measure altogether. I know of no way, if the amendment were to carry, in which the commission would have power to reject irrelevant testimony or to determine the time or place at which they would sit. It would have the effect of striking out every other clause in the Bill. I am sure that the hon. member for Richmond, on reconsideration, will see that the purpose which he wishes to be served will be destroyed by the introduction of this amendment. The hon. member for Oxford, (Mr. Nesbitt) it seems to me, inadvertently, stumbled on an objection to the amendment. The Railway Commission of Canada to-day is popular because it has adopted the policy of hearing testimony relative to any issue that is within its jurisdiction. But, the Railway Act, which constitutes the Railway Commission, will be searched in vain for a clause which compels the Railway Commission to hear anybody and everybody who presents himself or any subject that he might choose to talk about.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It does not give a procedure to enable anybody to get before that commission.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Certainly.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). This Bill does not.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is nothing in this Bill to prevent anybody getting before it; the commission is there to hear evidence.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Is there anything in the Bill now before the committee to provide a method by which a person may appear before the Tariff Commission if he wants to? I do not think there is a clause in the Bill to give any person the right of appearing before the commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not think there is any clause in the Railway Act giving any person the right to appear before the Railway Commission in so many words, there is no such procedure for getting before the Railway Commission.

Mr. GERMAN. The procedure for getting before the Railway Commission is well defined.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have often had appearances made and all I had to do was to write to the secretary of the Railway Commission and ask to be heard, and the secretary replied appointing a day and a place. That can be done under this Act in just the same way.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Referring to the illustration of my hon. friend I have never heard of any restriction in the number of witnesses that might be summoned in a case in a court of law. If they have relevant testimony to give, the court must hear them. The illustration of my hon. friend fails altogether and rather goes to prove the other side of the case, when he brings in a court of law. When the Tariff Commission of the late government visited my town in 1896, they put a notice in the newspapers that they were to hold a meeting in a certain place at a certain hour, and invited people to go and give their views on all questions under investigation. There was no trouble, the manufacturers and the consumers, any one who had anything to say, went before the commission and had a right to be heard. If, as has been intimated, the commissioners are to be in sympathy with the views of the government, and if the views of the government are in favour of a high tariff, then, if the commissioners wished simply to procure evidence to support the views of one side, they may invite to any sitting as witnesses only those whose views they knew to be in sympathy with what they desired.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I have not any doubt that the commission will be glad to hear the views of all classes of the community. I agree with my hon. friend that the effect of this amendment would be really to change the purpose that we have in view. It says that they 'shall' hear the evidence of persons who appear before them. That is to say, the control of the proceedings before the commission is taken away from the commissioners themselves, and any one who desires may appear before them and keep appearing as long as he chooses, with the result that it would be possible to block the operations of the commission and destroy their usefulness.

Mr. NESBITT. Does the minister think that the ordinary public would insist on continuing to appear before the commission in any numbers?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No, but we are making a law now, and it is not advisable to insert a clause which is mandatory and which may destroy the purpose we have in view and take the control of the procedure before the commission out of the hands of the commissioners.

Mr. NESBITT. Why refuse the people's right there?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). There is nothing in this Bill that will prevent the commissioners from taking evidence either on oath or in any other way. That is provided under section 5.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How would it do to say:

The commissioners shall also give reasonable opportunity to persons who may not have been so summoned to appear before them, and give evidence on any matter referring to an inquiry then being made by the commissioners.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I will consider that, if this section is allowed to stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is free from the objections which have been heard, it only imposes on the commissioners the duty of giving a reasonable opportunity.

Mr. EDWARDS. Who will define what 'reasonable' means?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is in the judgment of the commissioners.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then why not leave it all to the commissioners?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That is what we have done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As the law now stands it would be an impertinence for any one to come before the commissioners without having been summoned. It would be regarded as impertinent and people would not go. The result would be that when the commission would go into a town, they would issue subpœnas to people to come before them; that nobody who had not been summoned would think of going before them.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It would be necessary to change the preceding section if we adopt the amendment suggested by the

hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I do not see any objection to this amendment because the intention of the Bill is that the commissioners shall, in the exercise of their discretion, obtain all evidence pertinent or relevant to the inquiry they are conducting in order that their findings may be as accurate as possible. If the section is allowed to stand I shall consider the amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE. In subsection 1 of section 5, there is an ambiguity, I am afraid, in the last line and a half. The section reads:

> The commissioners shall have the power of summoning before them any witnesses, and of requiring them to give evidence on oath, or on solemn affirmation if they are persons entitled to affirm in civil matters, and orally or in writing, and to produce such documents and things as the commissioners deem requisite.

That section would serve its purpose better if it stopped with the word 'requisite,' But it goes on:

> Requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to examine.

That might refer to their original appointment as a commission or to their appointment to inquire into some specific matters.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think that probably the point is well taken, and that the last part of the section would be implied.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The amendment probably enlarges the powers of the commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would it not be clearer if it were worded:

> As the commissioners deem requisite for the full investigation of the matters then under inquiry.

Mr. MACDONALD. 'Matters into which they are appointed to examine,' is not good drafting at all.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think it will be better to put a full stop after 'requisite' as suggested by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). I am inclined to think as it stands it is not at all objectionable.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Did the minister hear the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I did. That was practically my own suggestion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is just changing the wording, that is all.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

Mr. MACDONALD. I want to point out that the last words of this section as it is drafted, relate to the production of documents merely, and not the giving of evidence. The commissioners have the power to cause the production of such documents and things as they deem requisite. It is documents that are requisite and not the evidence.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). There seems no reason why the scope of the section should be narrowed, and if we stop at the word 'requisite' and strike out 'to the full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to examine.' I think the subsection then will meet the case. Anything more after that would be by way of limitation. I think, therefore, the suggestion of my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) is a good one, and I therefore move that all the words after 'requisite' be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then the subsection stands for further consideration?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes.

On subsection 3—powers of commissioners,

Mr. McKENZIE. I wish to express most strongly my objection to this subsection which breaks up this court of inquiry. We have heard from the Minister of Finance, and from other hon. gentlemen on that side, a great deal about the necessity of getting accurate information upon which a scientific tariff was to be based. I must say to the Minister of Finance that it would be impossible for him to get that scientific inquiry, or that scientific result from the court of inquiry proposed to be established under subsections 3 and 4. Section 4 of the Act enumerates a great many things into which the court may inquire, and then under subsections 3 and 4 the commission can be split up into a number of subdivisions—not more than three because I understand there are to be that number of commissioners—any one of which may hear evidence apart from the others, and then they are to get together and they are to evolve a scientific result from the evidence obtained in that way. Now I submit to the minister in all honesty that the kind of court which he proposes to establish under this Act is a gypsy institution which will not give the good results which he anticipates. In the judicial courts of the land three judges must sit, and when they hear evidence they are to notice the demeanour of witnesses. But the commissioners in this matter will have to deal with a greater matter than most of our judges have before them. They will have to deal with the whole tariff of Canada involving millions upon millions of money

to the people, and, therefore, this court of inquiry is as important, if not more important than any court we have to-day. If it would not be tolerated for one moment that a court consisting of three judges could be split up for the purpose of hearing evidence here and there, and then coming together to agree upon a result, why should such a procedure be adopted in this case? I submit to the minister that notwithstanding any further expense that might be involved to the people, and the difficulty or inconvenience which might be caused to the commission, he should as far as possible insist upon these three commissioners sitting together and hearing evidence, and that they be not split up every which way and proceed according to what seems to me to be a rule of thumb method. We heard from the Minister of Trade and Commerce the other day that after travelling over this country, that after a great deal of toil and labour, he had at last to sit down in his office and give this country a tariff by rule of thumb. Now, I submit that what is proposed here is the worst possible rule of thumb procedure, and I again urge upon the Minister of Finance not to divide the commission in the way proposed.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think the hon. member for Cape Breton is to be congratulated on coming so rapidly towards an appreciation of the necessity of this commission.

Mr. McKENZIE. My remarks do not warrant that interpretation.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The hon. gentleman argues that not only are the duties of the commission to be important, and not only is it vital that they hear witnesses and get evidence from all the sources they can, but he says it is even necessary that each of the commissioners be present in order that they may properly value the personal element in the evidence. So that those factors being also essential in the mind of the hon. gentleman, I am sure he sees that the objects to be served by the commission more than warrant its appointment.

Mr. McKENZIE. What I said was that if we are to have this commission at all, if it is to be forced upon us, let us have the best possible commission. I am not saying that I want it.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am sure that any one who reads the hon. gentleman's remarks in 'Hansard' will see that I quoted the hon. gentleman accurately and have made my point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What about yourself?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We want a commission and we want a good commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The evidence to be brought forward is to be well weighed, and were it practicable within reason to have all the commissioners present at each hearing, I should deem it in a large degree important that they should be. But with the work to be done by the commission, and the limited number of commissioners, it would seem to me impossible that they can cover that work if the principle urged by the hon. member for Cape Breton were to prevail. There are thousands of items in the tariff, there are thousands of square miles of territory to be covered, there are scores of sources from which evidence can be obtained, and consequently there must be the utmost facility for division of the work consistent with doing it well. Now the Railway Commission is a body enjoying a judicial character, which this commission does not enjoy.

But even in the Railway Commission, one commissioner has certain powers, and two commissioners have very wide powers, given them, no doubt, for the very purpose under which powers are given to one and to two of the Tariff Commission under this Bill. Section 13 of the Railway Act is the section that gives individual powers to one and to two commissioners. In the case of the Tariff Commission, if all the commissioners are to be present, even when a sitting is held at the furthest end of Canada, it is going to be a decided inconvenience to the public that may, for some urgent reason, desire a hearing before the commission at the other end of Canada. So, the proposal may have disadvantages even greater than its advantages. But the insuperable objection, to my mind, is, that it would render the work altogether out of proportion to the number of commissioners appointed. And no matter how many were appointed, the same objection would hold. I think the Minister of Finance has struck the happy medium.

Mr. McKENZIE. So far, we have got along, perhaps not scientifically, but still we have got along, with ministerial tariff inquiries. And those bodies were not split up, but went as a body.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is, two members of the Cabinet went, and they did the work for fifteen. Then I cannot see why at least part of the work could not be done by one Tariff Commissioner for the three. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) seems to be still labouring under the apprehension that this commission is to have executive and administrative powers. On the contrary, this commission is for the purpose

of investigating and reporting, and that alone; and, that being the case, the hon. gentleman will see that two commissioners, or even one, in the majority of cases, is quite competent to make the investigation. It might, perhaps, be better that the three should hear the witnesses, observe the demeanour of those witnesses, and so on, but the object to be gained, is not worth the objections that there would be to it.

On section 5, subsection 4:—

Two commissioners shall have power to conduct any inquiry under subsections 3 and 4 of the next proceeding sections, and may, for the purposes of such inquiry, exercise the power conferred upon the commissioners by subsections 1 and 2 of this section.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Would the Minister of Finance please explain just the effect of that?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). In cases of inquiry to ascertain whether there has been a combine to unduly enhance prices, it was thought desirable that there should be at least two commissioners. My hon. friend pointed out the importance of an inquiry of that kind, and we thought that it should be safeguarded, by having at least two commissioners. I think that under the Railway Act, two commissioners form a quorum, and can hear causes. It seems to me that in this case, there should be two, instead of one. Subsection 4, to which reference is here made, covers inquiry into matters referred to the commission by the Governor in Council. This is made wide in its terms—purposely wide, and may embrace very important objects, for instance transportation by railway or by a navigation line, marine insurance, the question whether a monoply may exist in any part of the country, and so on. It seems to us that this should be safeguarded by a provision that at least two should be in an inquiry of that kind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do I correctly apprehend the Bill as to the matter which I shall now explain? The commission is to be composed of three commissioners, and under section 4 the commission is to inquire into the matters assigned to them by the Bill. By subsection 3 of section 5, one commissioner may exercise all the powers vested in the three commissioners with respect to certain matters, including the price and cost of raw materials in Canada and elsewhere, the cost of transportation, the cost of production in Canada and elsewhere, the cost, efficiency and condition of labour in Canada and elsewhere, prices received by producers, all conditions which enter into the cost of production and the price to consumers, and generally all conditions affecting production, manufacture, cost, and freight, as compared with other countries. Under section 4 these are powers given to the commission as a whole. But by subsection 3 of section 5, one commissioner alone is given power to investigate these matters. Then, under subsection 4 of section 5, you say that with regard to combines, to go no further, two commissioners, and not one, must investigate. I thought that at first the intention of the Bill was that in these matters one commissioner or two commissioners, as the case might be, should investigate, and then that the facts should be digested by the three commissioners and a report made to the Minister of Finance by the commission as a whole. But as I understand the Bill as explained by the Minister of Finance now, one commissioner or two commissioners may report to the minister on the subject which they have been empowered to investigate, and therefore, you will not have the benefit of the three commissioners in such cases. I do not think the Bill can be read otherwise.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will look at section 4, he will see that it provides, 'in respect of goods produced in or imported into Canada the commission shall, under the direction of the minister make inquiry,' and so on. Under the interpretation clause, 'commission' means the Tariff Commission provided for by this Act. This commission is to make inquiry and report. Now, under subsection 3 of section 5, one commissioner shall have power to make inquiry into matters covered by subsections 1 and 2 of section 4, and, for this purpose may exercise the powers conferred upon the commissioners 'by subsections 1 and 2 of this section'—section 5. Now, subsection 1 of section 5, gives the commissioners power to summon witnesses to testify and produce documents, and under subsection 2 of section 5, they are given the same power to enforce the attendance of witnesses and to compel them to give evidence as is vested in any court of record in civil cases. As I read the Bill, the Tariff Commission shall make a report. But we go on the analogy and in accordance with the practice of the Railway Commission, one commissioner being appointed to take evidence. Let me point out how that works out practically. There are several thousand commodities embraced under the tariff. Unless we make a provision of this kind it would be impossible to make any headway with a revision of the tariff. An inquiry may be going on in British Columbia or Alberta while another is going on in Nova Scotia.

It seems to me it is a common sense provision. It simply means that the commission must go to all these places and give a hearing, or obtain evidence in

some other way. What we propose to do is to multiply the commission, and I think my hon. friend will see that, as I have pointed out, the matter is well safeguarded. The report of the sub-commission will be made to the commission, and while we are giving one commissioner power to take evidence, his evidence will have to be submitted to the board to be passed upon.

Mr. NESBITT. He reports the evidence back to the commission.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). I desire to ask the Minister of Finance if this Bill provides for an investigation into the capitalization of bonds, into the value of the common stock, into the valuation of the physical assets of any 'company?' According to my reading the Bill does not go that far, it does not contain provisions sufficiently wide to enable the commission to investigate those matters. I think the Bill should provide for that, because there are certain interests that are, perhaps, seeking favours from the government, for instance, the Steel Company, and other corporations, and I think it would be well to have these matters thoroughly investigated so that all the facts may be laid before the commission and before parliament.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The primary purpose of this Act in appointing the Tariff Commission is not to investigate the matters referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Sharpe); but so far as those matters have any bearing at all upon the cost of production—and they have a very important bearing upon the cost of production—then, of course, they would come within the scope of the commission, under section 4.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what way would they have a bearing upon the cost of production?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think my hon. friend can scarcely be serious in suggesting that they might not have a bearing upon the cost of production. Take, for example, the cost of the production of steel; if it was important that we should know the cost of the raw material and of transportation, that is to say, the cost of raw material laid down, is it not important that we should know what capital is invested in a particular business, in order to ascertain what the real cost of production is? Does my hon. friend mean to suggest that the cost of production does not depend to some extent upon the amount of bond issue upon fixed capital? Is it not a factor in connection with ascertaining the cost of production? In order to ascertain the cost of production of steel to-day, not only what I have said with regard to raw material should be considered, but we should also know, in the case of a particular company, what is its bond issue, how much did its bonds sell for, what are its fixed charges.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). In that event, then, the capitalization, the bond issue and everything belonging to a company in that line, would enter into the investigation?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No question about it at all—that is, your fixed charges, that is, your bond issue, what interest is paid. Then in addition, you have your cost of labour and cost of management; and then the question arises how much capital is invested, to what extent is the stock watered, or if it is watered at all.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). Then it might take cognizance of an over bond-issue.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The commission has power to go into that to ascertain the cost of production—as I have said, to ascertain what is your fixed charges, how much is your bond-issue, how much have your bonds sold for, what is your interest charges in the course of a year. Then you have the expense of management and the overhead charges as they are called, insurance, &c. Then the question arises how much capital was put in, in the case of an ordinary individual putting in a certain sum of money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Take an analogous case, that of a railway company; does the bond-issue or the stock-issue enter at all into the computation of operating expenses?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If you were pursuing an inquiry as to whether the freight rates, for example, were reasonable or unreasonable, does my hon. friend mean to suggest that we should not take into consideration the bonds, the interest on which must be paid first?

Mr. PUGSLEY. But your Bill does not provide for that.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It provides for it in the widest possible manner. My hon. friend will see that section 4 covers all that, as I explained when section 4 was under consideration, 'the cost of production in Canada and elsewhere.' All these are pertinent facts. And as I say, in the case of an individual who is producing a commodity of a certain kind, you will show in addition to his own services, and in addition to the cost of labour, and to any fixed charges, how much capital he has in this

business, and what would be a proper or normal profit on that capital.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). Then the cost of production would vary according to the bond-issue in two analogous companies?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Not necessarily, because one might have a much larger output than the other. All these are questions of fact that the commissioners, in pursuing an inquiry as to the cost of production of a particular commodity, would have to inquire into, and obtain all the information available, in order to make a finding to show what is the cost of production of any commodity in Canada. All these factors will undoubtedly have to be considered in the inquiry.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It seems to me my hon. friend has not answered the point of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). The cost of production cannot be extended to all the points he has just stated. It is obvious that the cost of production depends upon general conditions which affect all parties who are producing in a certain line. The fact that one man has put more water in his stock than another, or the fact that one has been imprudent in his bond-issue and another has been prudent, does not at all affect the cost of production. But the cost of production is regulated by general rules.

Mr. EDWARDS. Might it not affect the price to the consumer ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think it can. It can affect the profits of the man who has put his money into the business. But the cost of production is regulated by general rules, which will have to be regulated here. The cost of labour, for instance, is general, so is the price paid in interest on the money markets of the world. I think it would be proper that these matters should be considered whenever they do affect the cost of production. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for North Ontario should be included in the Bill as matters for the Tariff Commission to investigate. But I do not see how the imprudence of one man, because he does not administer his business properly, can be allowed to affect the cost of production, whenever he comes before the commission and asks for an increase in the tariff on his commodity.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I do not think my right hon. friend and myself are in disagreement at all. All the factors that have been mentioned undoubtedly enter into the cost of production. But if you have an inquiry into the cost of production, it is obvious that you must consider, among other things, the particular things mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Sharpe).

Mr. McKENZIE. Suppose under the Bill, if it goes into effect, the commissioners were to undertake an inquiry into the watered stock, or otherwise, of any concern, and the manager or the president of the company refuses to disclose the facts, and says, it is none of your business; I would suggest to the minister that in a case of contempt of court the minister should have more extended powers to enable him to go into that inquiry. It is extremely questionable if there is anything in the Act that would enable him to ascertain the conditions of the company. But if the minister is so clear in his mind that he has that power, why not put it in the Bill ?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). You cannot put anything of that kind in specifically without limiting it. As clause 4 is drawn there are the widest possible powers given, and if you attempt in any way to limit it you fetter the commission. Clause 4 as drafted enables the commission to inquire into every factor that enters into the cost of production and, without question, the matters mentioned by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the matters mentioned by my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) are factors entering into the cost of production. I surely do not understand my right hon. friend to suggest that fixed charges are not a factor in the cost of production. Supposing an inquiry is to be made we will say, into the cost of steel, that investigation must take in all the companies which are manufacturing steel. It is true, as the right hon. gentleman has stated, that one might have sold their bonds more prudently than another, that one might have a larger bond issue than another, that one company might have no watered stock, that another company might have watered stock and that a company might have watered stock to a certain amount and stock not watered to a certain amount. These are facts that must be considered by the commission and they must apply their best judgment to the facts in order to form a conclusion as to what should be a reasonable figure at which to place the cost of production of steel in Canada. I pointed out at the time I introduced this Bill that the determination of the cost of production has not been reduced to a science. You may have in one country a cost of production different from the cost of production in another country, and you will have in the same country a difference in cost at different places and different times in the year. These are all factors entering into the situation, and they will all have to be considered. The fact that there are so many of them should not preclude the commission, or a commissioner, from investigating them. They have to consider all these matters and they have to consider them in order that they may make their finding as best they may

The argument, I have always understood, is, that watered stock, the selling of stock at a discount, and the selling of bonds at a discount, are undesirable, because they do in the end affect the cost to the consumer. If they do not have that result, they are of no importance. Therefore, if you have not only the cost of production, but the price to the consumer to be inquired into, it is perfectly obvious that the considerations which have been mentioned by my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) and hon. gentlemen on the other side, are within the scope of the inquiry which these commissioners may make.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would like to suggest that the hon. member for North Ontario draft an amendment and submit it to the committee. I think it is a matter that is hardly covered by section 4. It is possible that a general inquiry into the capitalization of a company might not come within section 4 and, at the same time, as the Minister of Finance states, it is quite possible that the commissioners could conduct an inquiry to a certain extent into the matter of capitalization. There are two schools of thought upon whether capitalization has reference to the cost of production. Some say that it is not an element in the cost of production, but that it is an element when you commence to consider what profits shall be added to the cost when once determined. However, I just rose to call the minister's attention again to subsection 3, of section 5. It is suggested by my right hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, that it is hardly clear whether the commissioner would report to the minister, or whether the commission itself should report, after having the findings of the commissioner. I was going to suggest to the minister this amendment, although I am not quite satisfied with it myself: After the word 'power' in the first line, you might add the words 'on behalf of the commission.' It would then read:

> One commissioner shall have power on behalf of the commission, &c.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If my hon. friend will look at section 4, I am sure that he will agree that it covers the point. It says that the commissioners shall report to the minister. In other words, when the report is made, it is the report of the Tariff Commission. Let me say to my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in answer to his argument, that I would agree with him, that if stock is watered that should not be a consideration in determining the cost of production. But this commission, being a commission for the purpose of obtaining information, would endeavour to find out how much stock was actually cash. In other words, the commission, in ascertaining the cost of production, would say to the man referred to by my right hon. friend: You claim that you should make 5 per cent or 6 per cent, or 8 per cent or 10 per cent, as the case may be, upon your capital stock issued, so we desire to find out how much of your capital is actually bona fide capital, and how much is water. I think my hon. friend may be satisfied that the matters he has referred to, will be matters to be investigated by the commission.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Who would report under subsection 3, one commissioner or the commission?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My intention is that it should be the commission.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I know that is your intention, but does it say so?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). For the purpose of getting the best results I believe it is necessary to divide up the work.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I approve of the division of the commission.

On section 5,

Mr. McKENZIE. The Minister of Trade and Commerce told us that whatever evidence would be obtained would be fully reported to the House although the Minister of Finance was not so explicit in his statement in reference to that, but sections 5 and 6 are closely interwoven and they provide for the taking of evidence which may not be submitted to the House. I do not think it proper that this commission should take secret evidence, I believe that this commission should give publicity to every kind of evidence that is submitted to them, and that nothing should enter into their consideration which would not be open to the public and open to parliament. I do not think this proviso for secret evidence is in the best interest of the country or in the best interest of the Department of Finance itself. During the fifteen years that Mr. Fielding was at the head of that department he refused to have anything to do with secrecy of any kind, everybody had to lay his story before him open and above board, and I think that practice should be followed. I move, seconded by Mr. Charlton, in amendment:

> That it shall be lawful for the commissioners to hear any application secretly, or to receive in writing any representation that is not to be made a public document.

In my opinion, there should be no objection to publicity being given to everything in the shape of evidence that is submitted to this commission. If the word 'unlawful' sounds harsh, the minister can substitute another word which will carry out my meaning, which is, that everything pre-

sented to the commission in the shape of evidence should be made public.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I would think that probably under subsectioin 4 they could obtain evidence in any way they pleased and that section 5 is not necessary.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). One section provides that they are to make inquiry, and the other provides for the procedure. It appears to me that all sources of information should be open to the commission.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). One section refers to the subject matter of the inquiry and the other provides the method.

Mr. NESBITT. The purpose of this section is to relieve the commissioners from the necessity of taking evidence under oath.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes, and to obtain a great deal more information than could be obtained otherwise. This commission will have to accumulate a great deal of information, and they can collect that information from trade reports and all available resources. Then again, they might have to get information in a foreign country and we could not authorize them to compel the attendance of witnesses in such a case.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the idea is to apply this section only to foreign countries, I would have no objection, but in that case you have put this power in the wrong section.

Mr. WHITE, (Leeds). For instance this commission might have an accountant go into the affairs of a company and make a report, and the figures would be submitted and it surely ought to be open to the commission to act upon that information. Now, if you had a bureau, as has been suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of this board, your bureau would have to obtain information otherwise than by oath and affirmation, and they would act upon it. If a bureau would mean anything in connection with the Department of Finance, the Minister of Finance might act on the information obtained by that bureau no matter what source it came from, if the bureau deemed it authentic. There is, in this respect, no difference at all in principle between the two, except that this commission has very much wider powers. This being the case, I cannot see what possible objection there can be to subsection 5. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), is looking at it entirely from a judicial standpoint; he seems to have the impression that this commission should not take evidence in any other way than under oath, but my idea is that it should very sparingly resort

If you attempt to restrict it you limit the powers of clause 4 which covers everything in respect to the factors relevant to price, cost, conditions of labour and all the conditions affecting manufacture or production in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is perfectly right in what he states as to the object of the commission being to investigate all things that tend to disclose the cost of production. No one doubts that, but the point raised by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) is as to whether the powers conferred by the commission would authorize the commission to investigate the facts stated by him. For instance, a company may come asking for an increase in the tariff. They insist that the cost of production is much more than it is supposed to be by the commission and, desiring to give their reasons for that stand, the commissioners may say: Very well, let us look into the cost of production. We find you have put no capital into this enterprise, that it is all watered stock; you have given to the public a large amount of stock in which there is not a dollar but which is all water, and the company might very properly say: This has nothing to do with the cost of production.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It has a good deal to do with it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it has nothing to do with the cost of production at all. Now, the company might have a million dollars of that stock. That does not affect the cost of production one iota, and it is quite evident that the object set forth by the hon. member for North Ontario is not served by this Bill. I do not think it is quite clear that the Bill would provide for such a condition. I speak all the more advisedly upon that because the other day upon a Bill which came before this House—I do not want to refer to a past debate, but merely to mention it—we saw how particular we must be when it comes to the interpretation of a statute.

Mr. BORDEN. It must be perfectly obvious that the cost of production includes the cost of raw materials, the cost of labour, what are called over-head charges, and the interest upon capital invested. You have to take all these things into consideration. I think that my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, is perfectly correct and logical in the position which he has taken. But, further than that, if he were absolutely wrong, you have the words of this statute which go beyond the cost of production, because if you look at subsection (f) of section 4, you will find that it includes:

All conditions and factors which affect or enter into the cost of production and the price to consumers in Canada.

to taking evidence under oath. Of course I could not limit the commission in the exercise of its powers, but it seems to me that the commission will succeed very much better, in fact it will succeed almost in proportion to the degree in which it does not use these coercive powers of summoning witnesses. I believe the commission will obtain information very much better in most cases, and more accurate information, than if they insisted upon men going into the witness box. However, I believe it is necessary the commission should have that power; to have the power is one thing, to exercise it is another. To clothe them with that power gives them an authority and standing which no mere bureau could possibly have.

Mr. McKENZIE. Under subsection 2 the minister clothes his commission with the procedure of a court, but under the section we are discussing he deprives them of that procedure.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It merely provides that it is permissive to the commission to take evidence under oath if they so desire, or to act upon evidence not taken under oath if they deem it advisable.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think under subsection 4 they could obtain evidence in any way they pleased.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If that is so, what harm is there in defining what they may do, so as to make that point clear should any question arise. In reply to what was said by my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), that my predecessor in office would not hear any confidential information, I may tell him that there is no office in all the departments of the government in which there has been more confidential information confided to the minister, and properly so, than in the Department of Finance. The Minister of Finance is the repository of the business secrets of a great many people. The Minister of Finance meets with all kinds of business people continually, and communications of the most confidential nature are necessarily and properly made to him. My predecessor, and his predecessor before him, were placed in that position time and again. There are hundreds of confidential communications on the files of my office. Now, suppose we had a bureau instead of a commission, and suppose that bureau obtained information as to the financial standing of a company or a firm, or the trade secret of a firm, or the names of customers of a firm, or the trade connections of a firm, does the hon. member suggest that such information should be made public? I do not believe that public opinion in this country would for a moment approve of a commission that would pry into business secrets, and make them public.

Mr. McKENZIE. Why should we want information of that kind?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Because we need all the information we can get, and if we have not a provision of this kind in the law we will deprive ourselves of information which we would otherwise get. It is quite possible that the financial standing of a firm might be in a precarious condition at the time the inquiry was being made, and would any one assert that that fact should be made known to the public?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Might not this commission consider and act upon certain information, given to it as confidential, without it being so stated in the Bill. What authority is there to compel this commission to disclose confidential information, either to parliament or to any one else. Of course, I agree with the general argument of the minister.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I believe it valuable to have such a provision in the law, because I believe it will encourage people to give information which they would not give unless they knew they were protected under the statute. It seems to me that the more it is looked into the more the value of that particular subsection will appear. Prima facie, it would seem to be open to objection, but the fact is that confidential information, of the nature referred to here, has been continually placed before the Minister of Finance, whoever he may have been, and has been continually acted upon. This report of the Tariff Commission should be sent on to the office of the minister, with all the information, and if there is any statement which is in its nature confidential, that would injure a firm either in its credit or give its competitors an unheard advantage, then I think, following the usual practice and the precedents which they have held in the past, that that information should not be made up in such a manner as to injure that firm.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think on looking at the section itself the minister will agree with me that the discretion is not with the Finance Minister, but with the commission.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The subsection does not say that the Finance Minister shall make the information confidential. Is not this the great objection to the clause: That the commission may be basing their report and taking such action under subsection 5, and yet not one particle of that information be

given to the Finance Minister under this Bill ?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No, we think not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Under this subsection they may get such information and use it and act upon it, and yet there may not be a particle of that in the records submitted to parliament, and parliament would have no knowledge of the information upon which these commissioners have acted. Now it does seem to me that the evil of leaving these commissioners to act upon information of a private character, which is not to be communicated to parliament, is very much greater than eliminating the clause altogether and simply providing that if there is information of a confidential character the commissioners shall not take it at all. Any evidence that the commissioners may take, either under oath or otherwise, should form a part of the public records of the country, so that parliament and the country generally can judge of the wisdom, or unwisdom, of the conclusion which they have reached from the information submitted to them.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) will look at section 4 he will observe that the commission has to make inquiry and report to the minister. Not only must it report to the minister, but if he will look at subsection 5 he will see that

> Inquiries under this section shall be conducted in a summary manner and the respective reports to be made pursuant to its provisions, accompanied by a copy of the evidence, if any, taken in connection with the inquiry shall succinctly state the result thereof.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They can hold back all confidential information.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). No, it does not say so.

Mr. GERMAN. Could they not hold back anything which they have taken orally ?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). They must give the results of their inquiries. In other words you must trust the commission with a certain amount of discretion. They could not pass on all the oral evidence they heard. We must look at this matter from a practical standpoint. They could pass on any evidence which they heard, but I imagine they will hear information on a great many things which it will not be possible for them to pass on. However, all this information will come to the minister. In other words, what I would like the House to understand in regard to this Bill, at least as to our conception of it, is this: that the situation is not changed radically at all. I have pointed out to the House that the Finance Minister to-day acts on information which he has on file in the department obtained from a man or two that he has there, and he acts upon information obtained from deputations that interview him from time to time, and he has in addition to that a very great deal of confidential communications in his office which unquestionably influence his mind in connection with tariff matters. I think I can recall one budget speech of my predecessor relative to the Tariff Commission going out to take evidence, in which he says a great deal of the evidence is given ex parte, that a good deal of it is tinged, so to speak, and evidence that he would not altogether care to rely on; but, at the same time, a very great deal of evidence of a confidential nature did come to him, as it comes to every Minister of Finance, and influenced him unquestionably in coming to a conclusion on tariff matters.

Mr. NESBITT. If subsection 5 were struck out altogether would it make any difference to the Bill? Would not the commissioners have the same power?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Except this: while to my hon. friend's intelligence, clause 4 may seem wide enough, he is a lawyer—

An hon. MEMBER. No he is not a lawyer.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Well if he is not a lawyer he ought to be one.

Mr. NESBITT. Just simply a common farmer.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If there is any doubt whatever—and there may be a doubt—then they have this specially mentioned power of summoning witnesses and any other mode which might be employed. Therefore I see no harm in having section 5 in for the reason it is to supplement the other provisions. In addition to obtaining evidence under oath they may obtain it in a mode they deem proper so long as they believe the evidence is authentic. Now with regard to confidential information. As I have said, the Ministers of Finance in the past have acted on all classes of information, and when they have come down to parliament with a tariff they have had to prove their case as best they could. They would give, I have no doubt, certain facts of which they were sure, which they had obtained in such a manner as they might be able to, in order to substantiate whatever tariff changes they proposed, but confidential communications in their office were never brought down, and the practice under this would be in no way different. All this information will come into the Minister of Finance's office and will be departmental papers precisely as it would be departmental information in the case of the suggested bureau. Now upon a return be-

ing called for by this House the information would be brought down in precisely the same way as it would be brought down in the case of a bureau. If any confidential information was obtained by the bureau or by the minister that information would not be brought down, has not been brought down, and should not be brought down.

Mr. MACDONALD. Why have the clause in, you are only making trouble for yourself.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): My answer to my hon. friend is this: it is desirable to encourage people to give information helpful to the commission. Now if this provision is not in the Act the fact will be known and, therefore, men will not be as certain of their ground as they would be if the requirement were there. Now my hon. friend approves of the principle and I understood him to say he did not see any harm in putting something in the Act to show the business men clearly that they will be protected, under the provisions of this Bill, if they give information which in its nature is confidential, the publication of which might injure them in some way. It seems to me there can be no possible objection to that.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the minister tell me what this section means when it provides that the information shall not be made public by the commission in such a manner as to be available for use by any business competitor or rival? Does the minister say that information shall not be brought down to parliament? Is that what he intends by that provision? He has told us about the different Finance Ministers and the information which they received. Everybody knows that Ministers of Finance receive information in regard to matters of public welfare and this is made a matter of record; and it appears on file in the department, and I have never yet heard any Finance Minister in my short parliamentry experience refuse to bring down any papers relating to the public business of the country.

Mr. CURRIE. Mr. Fielding refused to bring down letters on the subject of reciprocity.

Mr. MACDONALD. They were private communications, not dealing with matters which come within the purview of what we are discussing here. Suppose that any public body interested in the tariff sent a delegation here to wait upon the Finance Minister, and they put their statement in writing and it became a matter of record. That would be all right, but can it be argued that parliament should abandon its right to have before it the information upon which the government acted, unless it was of such a confidential character as comes within the well defined rules of parliamentary practice?

Mr. BORDEN. I think it is in the practice not only of the Department of Finance, but in other departments of the government not to bring down certain information.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is well understood.

Mr. BORDEN. On confidential matters.

Mr. MACDONALD. Within the well understood parliamentary practice.

Mr. BORDEN. And in respect to matters with which parliament has to deal.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is well defined by all the books on the subject.

Mr. BORDEN. For example—one of hundreds of illustrations that might be given—some portions of the correspondence relating to the construction of the National Transcontinental were not brought down to parliament in the first instance, though the information was moved for. I am not criticising the action of the government of that day in that regard, but simply giving this as an illustration. The correspondence was brought down subsequently.

Mr. MACDONALD. If we have a well defined railway rule to which we can resort to understand parliamentary practice in this matter and know what is confidential in its nature, and if it is proposed by this section to extend that in any way—the Minister of Finance says that it is not. Then, why put it in?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The object is that business people and others giving information may feel certain that they will be protected. As between government and parliament there is no change under the Bill. But, if there were no such rule as this, based upon common sense and experience, that confidential communications should not be brought down, the effect would be that there would be no confidential communications and the Minister of Finance and the government would be denied information that might be of the greatest possible value. Take the case which has been instanced of a deputation coming, presenting their views and handing in a memorandum. That memorandum becomes public property and would be brought down to the House. But suppose the minister says to one company that has been a party to it: I would like to know your financial position. Or suppose that in supplementing the memorandum a company should write giving its balance sheet and saying: You see we are in a precarious condition. But if they indicated by marking the letter 'private' or 'not official' that they did not

desire these the facts made public, then, under the unvarying rule, such a communication would not be brought down. This Bill does not effect any change in that respect. This commission is merely ancillary to government for the purpose of obtaining information such as up to this time we have obtained in another way, and, therefore, we make it subject to the same rule that has always prevailed with regard to confidential communications.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not this subsection 6 provide that the commissioners themselves may suppress sworn testimony——

Mr. MEIGHEN. It says they shall not make it public.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not that the same thing? What, then, does it mean? It means that they shall not transmit it with their official report.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). Does not section 4 control that, in its provision that the commission shall report to the minister?

Mr. PUGSLEY. But this subsection 6 of section 5 qualifies that when it says that certain evidence or information 'shall not be made public by the commission,' as by sending in their report they would make it public.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Section 4 provides that all evidence shall be reported; and it does not confine it to evidence upon oath, or even to verbal evidence.

Mr. MACDONALD. But, on that point, this subsection 6 of section 5 refers to 'evidence or information.' That distinguishes between evidence sworn and information given otherwise.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If it is information that cannot be called evidence of any character, then, it does not come under the provision regarding the reporting of evidence under subsection 5 of section 4. But all information or evidence must be reported by the commission. Unless that is qualified, of course, it carries its weight throughout the Bill. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) argues that subsection 6 of section 5 qualifies that and authorizes the commission to subtract from the report to the minister such information as may be confidential. But the Bill does not say that. It says the commission shall not make public that part of the inquiry that is confidential. That does not say that it shall not be reported to the minister. But the commission, in the very hearing of the testimony might make it public, and might be compelled to make it public unless released from that obligation by subsection 6 of section 5. That subsection authorises them to refrain from making public evidence of that character, but does not release them from the obligation of reporting it to the minister. The minister must get it. Then, when it has reached the minister, it is in exactly the same position as other communications that come to him.

Mr. McKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) say that the report of this commission is in the same position as a private letter received by the minister?

Mr. MEIGHEN. In this respect, it is. The situation as between minister and parliament is altogether unchanged.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman say that the minister having received a report based upon sworn testimony, can refuse to bring that down to parliament, because he thinks it confidential.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have not said that. But I say that if the minister could have refused before, he can refuse now. As between the minister and parliament matters are in the same position as if there were no Bill. And it has been the practice that the minister receiving communications and reports is the judge of what is confidential and what is not, and what he deems confidential, does not come down to parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman does not forget——

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not forget the speech of the Minister of Finance on this point——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But he forgets that when we were on section 4, an hon. member moved that the commission, instead of reporting to the minister, should report to parliament, and then it was stated that what came before the commission would be brought down to parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Subject to this limitation.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I mentioned that specifically.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. One can well understand that if one communicates with a minister he has the right to set the seal of secrecy upon his communication. That is obvious. But the Minister of Finance has referred several times to the fact that we on this side were satisfied with a bureau of statistics. So we were. But he was not; he wanted to have a commission; and, as I understood it, this commission is intended to be a court for collecting evidence.

Then if the court is to receive evidence, and if any man comes before the court to give evidence, he should be told: What you say here shall not be treated as con-

fidential; if you don't want to have it published to the world, then don't give it at all. This commission, if it is to serve any good purpose, is to collect information, not for the minister alone, but for parliament also. You are arguing now that the commission may collect information which the minister may keep to himself, and not disclose to parliament. I do not think that is the way the commission should proceed. Anything that is given to the commission ought to be given to parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not think the point raised by the right hon. gentleman is the same as that raised by the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), which I have answered, namely, that there is no restriction whatever which would relieve the commission of their obligations to report to the minister. As to the point raised by the right hon. gentleman, he says that inasmuch as parliament sees fit to appoint a commission instead of a statistical bureau, and the commission is in the nature of a court of inquiry, that necessarily evidence given before it to be transmitted to the minister is to be laid before parliament. Now there is nothing that should be public property that will not be public property after this Bill goes through. Every such piece of information presented to the minister before without the medium of a commission that was public property, and that was presented to parliament, will still be public property. Then the question arises: Is it advisable to give the commission power to go beyond that, is it advisable not to restrict the commission from investigating the private affairs of a company, and reporting that to the minister because the commission is a commission. Now that is the only question before us. If the right hon. gentleman takes the responsibility of saying that it is better to have all that shut out, that it is better for the minister to keep his eyes closed to all those facts simply because this is a court of inquiry instead of a statistical bureau, he takes the responsibility of fettering the commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not object to the minister's eyes being opened, but I object to his eyes being closed.

Mr. MEIGHEN. As the minister has pointed out, the course suggested by the right hon. gentleman will have the effect of closing the eyes of the minister and the eyes of every one else, because the evidence will never be given under these circumstances. There is nothing which was made public before that will not be made public now. No evidence of the character that before was necessarily public and came before the minister, will now be confidential. But it is in the public interest that the commission be not fettered from making such inquiries and such reports to the minister as are in their nature confidential, because we believe it is in the public interest to do so. I do not apprehend that there will be much evidence of this character. But it might on certain points be vital, and it is in the public interest that the minister should have it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I object to this Tariff Commission, which is to all intents and purposes to be a court, being allowed to act upon, and to report upon, and form their judgment upon information which is not to be submitted to parliament, and of which parliament or the public is not to have the benefit. We are taking a new departure now, the majority of the House has decided that these inquiries in future are not to be made by a branch of the government, but they are to be made by an independent tribunal, whose judgment it is supposed will be the justification of action to be taken by parliament in regard to tariff matters.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Why should that new departure affect any confidential communications?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will tell the hon. gentleman why it should affect proceedings so far as evidence is concerned. At present, if the minister makes a change in the tariff, although there may be private communications upon which he has acted, he can be questioned with regard to the information upon which he has acted, he can be questioned with regard to the exercise of his judgment, and will be obliged to give to parliament a substantial reason for making an alteration in the tariff. But in the case of an independent board, if this Bill passes, even the minister might not know the information upon which his board is acting.

Mr. BLAIN. The board does not act.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does. Under subsection 5 of section 5, the board may obtain information, upon which they may act, and yet not submit it to the minister. Let me read subsection 5:

> For the purposes of any inquiry under this Act, the commissioners may obtain information which in their judgment is authentic, otherwise than under the sanction of an oath or affirmation, and use and act upon such information.

Mr. BLAIN. According to the statement of my hon. friend, the Tariff Commission would have power to make changes in the tariff. As I understand it, they only re-

port to the minister, and it is the government that makes the changes in the tariff.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The commission would have power to report in favour of such and such action being taken, and they need not submit to the minister the information upon which they base that report.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman himself has been a minister of the Crown, and so has the right hon. leader of the opposition. This Bill deals with the revenues of the Crown. Both hon. gentlemen know that the Customs Department can proceed and take evidence under oath. Information may be given relative to somebody smuggling goods into the country, and the department may take evidence under oath with reference to that. They may fine a man, and he has no recourse, and the department need not disclose that evidence nor even the names of the witness. Even this House has no power to compel the evidence or the names to be made public. Now, this Bill is exactly on a par. It deals with the revenues of the country. It is desirable that information should be got from all sources. It assumes an old prerogative of the Crown, that the commission will have a right to obtain that evidence; to say that that evidence must be made public, I think is going far beyond what any minister of the Crown or parliament have gone heretofore.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The two cases are not parallel at all. My hon. friend cites the case of a man who has been fined by the Department of Customs for infringing the Customs Act. That is an individual case, a direct case. Then, according to the law, the minister deals with that case, and he deals with it secretly; you cannot call for the papers under those circumstances. But here is a law which is passed, not to carry out an existing law, but to obtain information upon which to frame a tariff, the most important of all laws, because it relates to the collection of the revenue. This law is to supply general information upon which we can form our judgment as to what we should do in any individual case, what duties we should impose upon such and such an article. That is the object of the commission, to collect evidence to enable us to form our judgment. It is an open court to select evidence which can be digested. The two things are not at all on a par.

Mr. CURRIE. I think the two things are on a par. In the one case, the right hon. gentleman says we deal with the administration of the law. Now complaint has been made; and no doubt the right hon. gentleman knows himself how difficult it was during the last parliament to get any information with reference to tariff matters, or to the operations of the industries of the country. One of the great outstanding facts brought out last session was that the government had no information of any kind with regard to proposed tariff changes.

One of the great difficulties in connection with getting information is that, if you establish a tribunal that has power to compel witnesses to give information, you must necessarily dig into private affairs just as much as you dig into people's private affairs when a man from the Customs Department goes into a warehouse and says to the owner: You have goods here that you have smuggled and we are going to fine you $10,000. He pays the money and that is the end of it. This Tariff Commission is to be empowered to go into any factory or among any class of the community for the purpose of obtaining information. For instance, it could compel the Grange to appear and it could question its members privately with regard to some matter concerning the farming industry. It will do exactly what the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have always done in the past. It is simply an extension of the old prerogative on the same lines and it is a very wise proceeding. It would be very unjust and unfair to compel people to come before this commission and to give evidence relating to their private business and have their affairs published to the world.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE. My right hon. friend does not agree with me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is altogether wrong. I would not compel any man to give evidence that ought not to be made public, and I would not give authority to these commissioners to take evidence which might not be made public.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). Is not the cost of production a confidential matter? Surely you would not want the cost of production to be made known to competitors in some line of business? You nullify the whole effect of the Act unless you empower the commission to investigate into the cost of production.

Mr. OLIVER. Surely the citizens who have to pay the taxes that are going to be based upon the information collected have just as much right to and interest in a full knowledge of the information as the commission or as the government. They claim that right.

Mr. CURRIE. The right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says

that he would not compel a man to give evidence that ought not to be made public. This commission compels him to give evidence. We will say that a consumer complains to the commission that there is a certain article that is being sold at a very high price and that there is a combine existing; or a purchaser might say that this combine is selling goods cheaper to his next door neighbour than it is to himself. This commission can compel everybody to appear before it and give evidence. But, if you eliminate the possibility of compelling people to give evidence, you only have oral statements and hearsay. The right hon. gentleman has been so accustomed to going by oral statements and hearsay evidence that he cannot understand how it is possible to get down to facts.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is mistaken. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has told us that the Budget was made by rule of thumb whereas Mr. Fielding never did anything of that kind. But my hon. friend will compel a man to give evidence about his business, compel him to disclose it altogether, for the benefit of the Minister of Finance who will put it in his bosom, who will not give it to me or to any of my hon. friends but who will prepare his tariff with it. We will ask him for it and he will say: I cannot give you the information. That is surely not the purpose of this commission. This commission, if it means anything, has for its object the collection of evidence which will be available to every member of parliament, nay, to every voter in this country. Unless that is the object, the Bill is not worth the paper it is written on. The object we have in view is to disseminate knowledge. I state again, as has been said by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), that the man who pays the taxes will be interested to know upon what information the law is made that compels him to pay his taxes. The commission say to a man who wants a change in tariff that he must disclose everything in connection with his business, but that the information thus secured shall not be brought before the public. On the other hand I would say to him: You are not compelled to give any evidence in this court, but any evidence which you do give shall be made public.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That would simply mean that a very large and important body of information would not be available to the minister at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possibly.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Is that a desirable situation or not? Is it going to do any harm if the minister or the government is in possession of information which would otherwise not be open to them, even if the commission should resort to coercion by reason of their power of summoning witnesses and compelling evidence? My hon. friend seems to go a certain distance and then he says: Now, stop; you must not obtain any other information. I think he is overlogical in regard to this. How does it work out? The tariff may not be brought down to an absolute nicety. Both my predecessor and his predecessor had to content themselves with information obtained from committees, deputations and interviews. They had a great deal of confidential information, and if my hon. friend will read the speeches of my predecessor he will find that he said something like this: It has been made apparent to us, or from information we are satisfied that such and such is so. We have not had any sinister or untoward results flow from information of that kind. All we are doing is obtaining more information than possibly could be obtained under the old system by a tariff commission, and if we are also obtaining some information which is guarded by the seal of confidence we are not in any way changing the situation. The situation is precisely the same as it has been.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will tell my hon. friend what my conception of this law is. As was stated by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, this is a new departure. We used to obtain information in the way which has been stated by the Minister of Finance. The minister got it, some of it was confidential and some of it was not. But, we have now a new departure and my conception of this Bill is that it ought to be to get information for the benefit not only of the Minister of Finance but for every member of this parliament.

Mr. BORDEN. The information obtained under the old system was not solely for the benefit of the Minister of Finance; it was for the benefit of the government and of parliament. The information would be used in the preparation of the budget, and it would be disclosed in so far as it was not confidential. It is proposed now to gather this information in a more systematic and thorough way. Ought there to be a change in so far as confidential information is concerned? I cannot see any reason for any change in that regard Further than that, the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Pugsley) has spoken of the possibility of sworn information not being disclosed to parliament. What is the difference in principle as to whether you obtain that information not under the sanction of an oath or under the sanction of an oath?

It might be desirable for the considerations mentioned in this section and for other considerations not to bring it down in parliament.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Suppose evidence is taken in connection with the woollen schedule, and some of it is regarded as confidential and some not, then if a member moves that all the evidence taken in regard to the woollen schedule should be laid on the table, would this section restrict the right of the member to so move?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In any case, the government must take the responsibility for producing or not producing any evidence. If parliament does not consider that the government has given good reason for withholding any information, parliament is perfectly at liberty to pass a resolution accordingly. My right hon. friend would not say that because this information is to be gathered in a more systematic way by a commission than by a bureau, that the considerations which would govern the information obtained by the bureau should not be applied to the information obtained by the commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But there we are establishing a board to obtain information, and if that be so the information it obtains should be public.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it intended that the evidence taken before these commissioners shall be open to the public or will it be a private investigation, a star-chamber proceeding? I would think it should certainly be open to the public.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am very much surprised that my hon. friend should even suggest such a thing as a star-chamber in a country like Canada. I do not know whether he does so on account of any past experience. The hearings before the commission, I assume, will be open.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then how can section 6 be made applicable? If the evidence is to be taken in public how could it be confidential?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Subject to the exception in the statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then the commissioners would have to know in advance that certain information of a confidential nature was about to be produced and would have to exclude the public at that point. The matters covered by section 4, the prices of raw materials, the cost of production, the cost of construction in Canada, the cost and conditions of labour, the prices received by producers involve inquiries into the books of individuals, firms and companies.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Does the hon. gentleman suggest that it should be a star-chamber?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That is what your argument amounts to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but the moment you give the commissioners power to exclude the public while certain evidence is given under oath you make it a star-chamber inquiry.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I presume that when the inquiry approaches a point where information confidential in its nature is about to be elicited, the witness could claim privilege or the court say that the information should not be made public. The alternative would be simply a star-chamber throughout. The public would not sustain a commission which would divulge information that would injure business houses. Even in an ordinary court it is common for a judge to receive information that is confidential.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Never.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). A name for instance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Any judge who would decide a case through information obtained otherwise than by evidence given in open court would not be discharging his duty properly.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). There is a great deal of discretion reposed in a judge. Either this information will not be obtained and consequently will not be available, or some such clause as this will have to be in the Bill. I do not see anything gained by leaving it out.

Mr. GERMAN. The Finance Minister stated this afternoon that the files of his department are loaded with private information which he would not divulge. There is nothing statutory to prevent him from giving out that private information and what is to prevent such private information coming to the Finance Minister in the future as in the past? My own opinion is that this commission, appointed and paid by this parliament, should report to this parliament and that all their evidence should be submitted to us. The best Tariff Commission this country has ever seen was the Tariff Commission, self-appointed in 1896.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That is up to date.

Mr. GERMAN. The best up to date and better than this one will be in my opinion. That commission went throughout Canada

and made full inquiry into the whole business situation of the country. They did not make a decision by rule of thumb. The late Finance Minister submitted a tariff which met with the approval of the people of the whole country and for fifteen years with the approval of the present Finance Minister, the best tariff I believe that Canada ever had. I doubt very much if we can improve on it. I think it is quite proper to have inquiries made. I am not in favour of a permanent Tariff Commission.

I think it is quite well to have a Tariff Commission with ample authority to make all inquiries in regard to the trade situations of this country, but I think, Sir, that the evidence taken by that commission should be reported to parliament together with the commission's views on that evidence, and I think that should be made plain. I do not think that the commission should be allowed to hear evidence under oath, or any private conversation, that is not reported to parliament. Let those gentlemen who want to make their private suggestions to the Finance Minister make them, and let the Minister of Finance keep that information secret, as has been done in the past without any statutory provision to compel it to be done. But that this parliament should authorize a commission of gentlemen to inquire into the trade conditions of the country and to take evidence and report on that evidence to the Minister of Finance without making that evidence public, I think it wrong in principle, and will be detrimental to the interests of the country.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend (Mr. German) has gone back to section 4, which was debated at length the other day. Now, I think it has been stated from this side a score of times that the information that will come to the Minister of Finance will be brought down to this House the same as any other information on record in the Department of Finance or in any other department. If there is any doubt about that I want to clear it up now. That information will be brought down. There has been absolutely no departure from the principle which has obtained in this House. If the information is in the departments here it is subject to the demand of parliament, there is no question about that. My hon. friend said why not report to parliament. Let me tell him one reason why that course should not be adopted. In the first place—as I pointed out this afternoon, and it seems to me a reason of the greatest weight—the time when the government has to consider the question of the tariff is between sessions. There is no time in the life of busy ministers, as any hon. gentleman opposite knows who has been in the ministry, to consider such an important matter as the tariff. Now if the suggestion of my hon. friend that the commission should report only to parliament, when would the scores of reports they should be studying and considering between sessions be available for the minister? My hon. friend fails to perceive that we are working under a system of responsible government. The government is responsible to this House and the country, and we want to ask this Tariff Board to pursue these investigations and report to us. When they are made to the Minister of Finance they are made to the government. The government will have them just as it has the reports which are on file in the Department of Finance and in the other departments to-day. There is absolutely no departure in principle. There will be confidential information given. My hon. friend (Mr. German) fails to perceive it is not possible to hold an investigation, such as is contemplated under section 4 of this Act, into the affairs of an industrial concern, into the affairs of the commercial concern, without happening across information which in its very nature is private, which in its very nature if it were published might do considerable damage to the firm by giving a trade rival an insight into the methods of that firm which would be extremely detrimental to it. If my hon. friend will realize that there is absolutely no difference in principle between the system which will obtain under this Act and the system in vogue at the present time, he will have gone far to understand this Bill and clear up his doubts in the matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite this afternoon, suggested a bureau. Well, that bureau would have power to investigate an industrial plant, or a steel company, or any industry. They put accountants in, and those accountants would obtain a great deal of information. Some of that information is confidential. It is impossible to conduct an investigation by a commission without happening upon information that is confidential in its nature. It is precisely that kind of information that must be protected. It would be unreasonable to allow an investigation into the affairs of a firm if it is to be published to the world in all its particulars. If that were proposed to be done, public opinion would not justify the creation of a Tariff Commission; I think that must appeal to common sense. If my hon. friend will simply bear in mind that this is necessary to the government for the purpose of obtaining information, that nearly all the information they obtain, will be valuable, but in order to protect confidential information from publication which would do damage to those giving it, the difficulties which he seems to be afraid of would disappear, because most of them, I submit, are fanciful. The reason this provision is put in, as I have already explained, is this; it is

an additional assurance to men who have come forward and given their evidence, and who then would be quite willing that evidence should be obtained. Mr. Emery of the Tariff Board of the United States, says that men have been very willing there to give information, and that such a clause as we have in our Act is necessary, in order to protect witnesses. When a business man produces his books, his list of customers, his trade secrets and his business processes for the inspection of the commission, does any one seriously contend that all that information should be divulged to the public? I think, upon reflection, my hon. friend will see that is not a reasonable position.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why would the commissioners want evidence under oath as to secret trade processes, and that sort of thing? Why should they take any evidence, except that which has a direct bearing upon the matters which they are there to investigate? Furthermore, why should they draw conclusions and report their opinions without the facts upon which they make the report being available for the information of parliament?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am glad my hon. friend drew my attention to the point, because I failed to answer the argument that he advanced before. He is of the opinion that the only way that information will be obtained, will be by judicial proceedings. The commission may obtain information in a hundred different ways, and put their expert accountants into the offices of a firm to investigate. For example, one man may be making a saving in the cost of production, due to some business process, or some better method that he has over a rival, and then with regard to an industry at a critical time in the history of that industry, they would find any number of firms that were really in a precarious condition. That investigation would disclose they were not making money, but were running behind so much every year. Now, that is information of a very confidential character. My hon. friend surely does not mean to say that the commission should publish the fact that A, B and C were in a certain line of business, were losing money, and that their business was in a precarious condition? It is surely to safeguard things of this kind that this clause is inserted, and it must be inserted, because, as I have said, the public would not permit a commission unless it were safeguarded; and in the second place, it is advisable that it should be inserted to give an assurance to business men who, knowing the subsection is there, will give information which otherwise they would not give at all. In other words, this subsection is absolutely in aid, not in obstruction, of the commission obtaining information which they would never otherwise obtain at all. I think that upon full consideration of these arguments, hon. gentlemen opposite will say that it is a necessary clause, otherwise you are forced back to this alternative: You are going to be denied a class of information that would be very useful. But you are not any further on even if you strike out this subsection. I mean to say, that, with this in the Bill, you do get the further information, but without it you do not get that information.

Mr. NESBITT. Why?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), knows very well that no coercion will enable you to extort from men information, the publication of which will mean injury to their business. You might succeed in extorting some information, but you cannot get all the information you need. And you should not extort such information in any case. It is not right. The public will stand behind this section, because it is plain business sense. There is not a man in this House who, being in business, would submit to have his whole business made known to his rivals—his better methods would perhaps have been devised by himself or have cost him money——

Mr. NESBITT. Is there any necessity for that?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). There might be. If there is not, the clause will not be operative. It is only to provide for a case that may arise.

Mr. GERMAN. The minister is assuming that some business men are going to give evidence to this commission, and through them to the Minister of Finance, which might be a detriment to their business. No man in business is going to give any information, private or public, that would be detrimental to his personal interest. The evidence he is going to give, and the only evidence he will give, will be evidence to show that he needs higher tariff protection.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Perhaps the hon. member (Mr. German), will allow me to ask him a question. Assuming what he says to be true, what is the objection to the clause? If no such information is given, the clause will not be operative.

Mr. GERMAN. The objection to my mind is just this, and the fear is just this —that this commission is to be appointed with a view to increasing the protective tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GERMAN. That may or may not be true, but it certainly has a strong hold

on the minds of the people of the country that that is the object of the commission.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is the hon. gentleman a low tariff man or a free trader?

Mr. GERMAN. I am in favour of fair, moderate protection to the industries of this country. But I think that the fairest protection that the industries of this country can have is the protection they have had for 15 years. As I was saying, there is this underlying fear that the commission may be composed of high tariff men—I am not saying that it will be; I heard the other day in Toronto who was to be the chairman, and if the information is correct, that end of the commission will certainly be on the high protection side.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If he is a good man I will be delighted to tell the House, because, I am looking for a good chairman.

Mr. GERMAN. For a good many years he was a Liberal. He is a good man, but a high protectionist. If the commissioners are all of the same kind, is it not possible for them to get private, oral evidence to make their reports to the minister on lines that will go to justify high protection? And if that is done, the ministers can shield themselves behind the report of their commission who, they can plead, have gone throughout the country and made a full investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GERMAN. Well, I am afraid that that is what they will do; and there is a very strong feeling in the country that that is what they will do. The ministers will shield themselves behind the report, and it will be a report based on evidence that is not absolutely true to the facts, because it will be coloured by personal feeling or personal interest. There is the difficulty I see in regard to this Tariff Commission.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The hon. gentleman bases his case on a series of 'ifs,' none of which will eventuate.

Mr. GERMAN. 'If' it does not happen all right.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The hon. gentleman's mind is full of suspicion. I suppose he thinks it impossible to create a fairminded tribunal. I do not know his experience, but I would hate to think it impossible to pick out three disinterested, fairminded men——

Mr. MACDONALD. Who are they to be?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I should be glad of suggestions. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) is available. He is certainly a fair-minded man, outside of politics, but when it comes to politics, he is not so fair-minded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The newspapers say that the hon. member for York is to be one of the commissioners.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean)?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket).

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I have heard that newspapers have reported a number of gentlemen as about to be appointed on that commission. I have had a great number of applications. If there is any man in Canada who does not think he is fitted to sit on that commission I would like to know. I think it is possible to choose men who are not going to look at this matter from a standpoint of high tariff or low tariff, men who have a talent for economic investigation and who will regard the subject fairly. And I believe that those who want information with regard to the tariff, with regard to the dark places in the tariff, are the farmers and consumers; and I say that this Tariff Commission is more in the interests of the consumers and the farmers than it is in the interest of the manufacturers. I think it is in the interest of all. What is the purpose of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. OLIVER. To raise the tariff, of course.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The purpose of the Tariff Commission is to secure information. Now, there cannot be any harm in obtaining information; you can not know too much about the facts. Our methods with relation to the tariff in the past have been hugger-mugger methods, go-as-you-please methods, rule-of-thumb methods, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce said. But this government comes in with a proposal for a commission to investigate this matter and obtain information, and hon. gentlemen opposite, who can find no fault with the Bill itself—for they cannot find in it, high tariff or low tariff—declare that they are fearful and suspicious, and to justify this declaration they conjure up spectres of various kinds. They say they fear that we will appoint a high tariff commission. We have responsible government in this country, and this government is responsible to the House and to the people, and must do right or the people will hold them to account. The government will be held responsible for the appointments they make, and in the last analysis, for the work of the commission. My hon. friends opposite are a little inconsistent, for, I believe, most of them believe in this measure. And I am the first to say that

the measure should be debated because it is a departure from old methods. But now they suggest a statistical bureau. For what reason? To get information? They never made any such suggestion until this Bill was brought down. If such a bureau was a good thing, why did not they create it five years ago or earlier? Was it because they did not feel the want of information? or because they preferred to act without information? This Tariff Commission is simply a bureau clothed with powers that could not be given to a bureau. The men appointed will be the kind of men, we hope, who will make an impartial investigation. There is absolutely nothing in the Bill which indicates that the gentlemen who are to be appointed will be high tariff men, or moderate tariff men, or low tariff men, or free traders; and anything said as to the kind of men that will be appointed is entirely without foundation, because, as a matter of fact, not one of the men has yet been selected.

Mr. NESBITT. Section 5 gives the commission the right to obtain information without taking it under oath, and section 6 says that any information they take should not be given by one firm to another, they need not make it public. Now, I agree that there may be a good deal of information that probably should not be made public, that is, if the commission goes into the inquiry as far as it is suggested. For instance, information as to the process of manufacture should not be made public. I can imagine that there are many things people would object to say if they thought it was going to be made public. But after all, this Tariff Commission is appointed by the government, and have we a right to say that any evidence given before that commission should not be at the disposal of this parliament? I doubt it. I appreciate that there are many private communications given to the minister which he is at liberty to keep to himself; but the Tariff Commission, I think, is in a different position. But supposing these two sections 4 and 5 were stricken out entirely, would not the commission have the right to take evidence otherwise than under oath?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think my hon. friend must have been out this afternoon, because I have explained that many times over. Number 4 shows the scope of the Tariff Commission; it shall make inquiry as to certain specified things already mentioned. Number 5 deals entirely with procedure in obtaining information. Now, if we struck that out I have no doubt the commission might, in the exercise of its discretion, obtain the information which is mentioned in Number 4, and also keep it as confidential. But I have explained why that is put in. In the first place, it is to remove a doubt, and there can never be objection to putting in a clause to remove a doubt; it is to show that they may act upon information not obtained under the sanction of an oath. Further, it is an advantage that a clause safeguarding confidential information should be in the Bill, for the reason that parties outside may be willing to give confidential information of this nature if they know that their communications will be protected by a subsection in this Act; I think these clauses should remain in the Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For one, I am not yet convinced, notwithstanding that we are feeling so good on this side of the House, that I would be willing to do almost anything to cause even a momentary pleasure to my hon. friend; but in the public interest, I do not think we should do so. I move that section 5 be amended by striking out subsection 6. I do not think it is necessary. How would it do to dispose of the amendment already moved to subsection 5?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). When we resumed the sitting I had an amendment which we had considered. I think its substance is the same as suggested by my hon. friend. This amendment, I think, will add nothing to the Bill, except to make a little more clear what the hon. gentleman had in his mind. My own idea is that the commissioners, in the exercise of their discretion, and in the conduct of their proceedings, would be very glad to give a reasonable opportunity to all who might desire to be heard, that is, to take evidence on a particular inquiry, and if any one desires to be heard, I assume they would give reasonable opportunity to parties to be heard. I think that is what the commission would do, but there is no reason why it should not be made clear if there is any doubt. Therefore, I suggest the following as subsection 2, to section 5:

> The commissioners shall give reasonable opportunity to persons who may not have been so summoned to appear before them and give evidence upon oath or solemn affirmation as aforesaid, orally or in writing, upon any matter relating to the inquiry which is being held by the commission.

It is practically the same. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), got very excited when he was dealing with an amendment which gave absolute right to any number of persons to come in and pile up evidence on any subject, no matter whether the commissioners were dealing with that subject or not. I do not think the hon. gentleman quite understood the situation. 'Shall take evidence of person or persons.' That simply means that the

commission would carry on its proceedings in the most desultory fashion imaginable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte), said he would accept the amendment which I sent to my hon. friend. We have gained two things in Canada to-day.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). You have one or two things to your credit for Canada, I know, but they are set off against a great many other things. However, I am very glad to see my hon. friend in such good humour. He is usually in good humour, but I have not seen hon. gentleman opposite very happy for a long time: They looked gloomy the other day when we brought in the 'implementing' Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. How is the Minister of Finance himself feeling to-night?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). He is feeling fairly well, thank you.

Mr. MACDONALD. You are not looking very well.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I feel reasonably well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wonder how the Minister of Trade and Commerce now feels about that poison which he said would be injected into the veins of the government if the election went against them.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think you will find that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is quite able to answer for himself and if my hon. friend will renew the question when he returns from Toronto, where, I believe he is to-day, I think he will get an answer which will be in keeping with the ability of my hon. colleague to take care of himself. The only reason I am explaining this at some length is because the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) stampeded a little this afternoon. There can be no difference between us when I make the explanation that there is no objection whatever to a reasonable opportunity being given to persons to state their views in any particular inquiry.

Mr. NESBITT. That is all I want.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). What I had in my mind to-day was one or ten or twenty persons coming in, offering such evidence as they might feel disposed to offer and having a perfect right to insist upon being heard. You will not find a clause like that in any statute, the railway Act or any other. This subsection, I think will make a little clearer the intention of the Bill with respect to this matter:

The commissioners shall give reasonable opportunity to persons who may not have been so summoned to appear before them and give evidence upon oath or solemn affirmation aforesaid, orally or in writing, upon any matter relating to the inquiry then being held by the commission.

Mr. NESBITT. Orally or in writing?

Mr. BORDEN. It follows the previous clause.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We will put that in subsection 2.

Mr. NESBITT. I would like to say that I am very much satisfied with the clause as the minister has moved it. I am very glad that he is giving the people an opportunity to be heard. That is all I want.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We always intended to give them an opportunity.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). In the practical working out of this matter I would like to ask the Minister of Finance how notice of the sittings or examinations or investigations into particular schedules will be given to the public? Is it the intention to publish the dates of the sittings and what will there be considered, or how will the various interests be notified? For instance, if they are going to discuss the cement schedule or the steel schedule or any such schedule will the interests be given public notice of it or in what way will the various parties receive notice?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Having put this clause in I feel that very great discretion must necessarily be reposed in the commission. I assume that the commission will, of course, carry out their duties in such a way as is best calculated to effectuate the intention of the Bill, namely, to obtain information, and I have no doubt they will give notice of their sittings. I think that if these matters were too closely prescribed we might fetter the commission in carrying out the work entrusted to them.

Mr. NESBITT. If I remember correctly the last part of the amendment that the minister read stated that persons would have an opportunity ' to give evidence upon the subject under investigation '?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Upon the subject of inquiry.

Mr. NESBITT. I want to know to what extent that goes. Supposing, as an illustration, that they were investigating the question of the yarn duties and they were in a town away from Ottawa, we will say, in the western part of Ontario. If they were investigating that question on a particular day would it be possible for those who wanted to be heard on other questions, that they knew the commission were going to investigate later and which did not have reference to the particular line of business that they were then taking up, to be heard, because, otherwise, it would be a great

hardship. Suppose they were in Windsor, or London, and somebody wanted to be heard upon some other question; would it be possible for them to be heard?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That is in the discretion of the commission.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not think we could go into details of that kind in the statute. The language which has been used in that regard is the language that has been suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite—relative to the matter then under inquiry, or in relation to the matter then under inquiry. You leave it to the judgment of any tribunal as to what evidence would be relevant.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chairman has called my attention to the fact that the record is a little bit mixed by his receiving the amendment of my hon. friend from Richmond, then my suggested amendment and then the amendment of the hon. Minister of Finance, which is really the same as the one I suggested with the addition of a few words. How would it be if the amendment of my hon. friend from Richmond were withdrawn, if mine were withdrawn and the amendment of the Minister of Finance were adopted? That would keep the record right.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think that is the correct procedure.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not understand what is meant by evidence 'orally or in writing.'

Mr. CURRIE. Perhaps it means testimony as differing from evidence. People give testimony and the evidence is the truthful part of it.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think that my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) will understand that evidence, of course, may be oral. But evidence by way of affidavit is written evidence.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is never spoken of as evidence in writing.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Evidence in writing would be this: There is power taken in the Act for the employment of experts, accountants, and so on.

Mr. McKENZIE. You are apt to have lawyers before this commission and they will never agree that evidence in writing means an affidavit.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The commission is authorized to accept any evidence that they deem to be proper. Take the books of a firm——

Mr. McKENZIE. That is never evidence.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). But it is made evidence by this Act and they may accept it if they see fit. Then, there are the reports of various departments of government, not only of this government but other governments, such as trade reports and everything of that kind. These do not ordinarily constitute evidence given under the sanction of oath, but, by virtue of this section it is competent to them to obtain information of that kind. What my hon. friend says is not evidence ordinarily in the courts of justice is made evidence under this Act.

Mr. McKENZIE. If that explanation is to be accepted it is all right. I simply want to know if, when a man comes and places a set of books before the commission and says that is evidence, it is to be accepted as evidence. Ordinarily it is not evidence, but if that is what the minister means it is all right.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. CURRIE. I wish to speak on the amendment of the hon. member. Under the present law respecting the customs, evidence can be taken on oath, and it is provided that that evidence may not be made public. Not only is that the case, but the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when Prime Minister, and his Finance Minister, Mr. Fielding, introduced what is known as the dumping clause legislation, and under that law, a number of permanent officers were appointed by the government in Chicago, Pittsburg, Antwerp, London, New York, and other large manufacturing centres in Europe and America. If it is thought that there is any dumping of manufactured articles in Canada at less than the price at which these articles are sold in other countries these officers are empowered to go into the head offices of these manufacturing concerns interested, and to compel them to show their books and to give their cost and selling prices at home and in other countries. Now, under the legislation proposed by the late government, that information is considered to be confidential and no member of this House has the right to move for a return showing what that information is. Anyhow, it is to some extent one of the ancient prerogatives of the Crown, that secret information may be obtained for the purposes of protecting the revenue and the Liberal party, when in power, acted on that rule for a number of years. I consider it would be a very unfortunate thing if information given by manufacturers or traders in this way, was disclosed to the public and to the competitors of these manufacturers and traders. It would be absurd to appoint a commission such as this, and to provide that all information submitted to it must be made public. Then, if the rule were enforced, that whatever evidence was submitted to this commission, should be made public, occasion might be taken to abuse that privi-

lege and some crank might take it into his head to read before the commission, the writings of Karl Marx, the great socialist, and tender it as evidence, and the writings of Karl Marx would have to be published and circulated throughout the country. In the same way, a member of Congress once wanted to get Henry George's work on 'Progress and Poverty,' circulated at the expense of the nation, and he read it in Congress and had it printed in the Congressional Record, and circulated throughout the country. When the Tariff Commission of the late government travelled around the country, they were met at every place by a delegation of Socialists, who preached the doctrine of single tax or low tariff or free trade, and these gentlemen quoted the most alarming statistics I have ever seen. I think the Grangers of Ontario followed that commission around the whole province, and presented their ideas wherever they went, but I did not notice that the ministers followed to any extent, the advice they got from the Grangers. What has surprised me most of all in this discussion, is the attitude taken by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). I hope the manufacturers of Welland; I hope the people whom the city of Welland is inviting to come over and establish factories there, will pay attention to what the hon. gentleman has said to-night, because he has shown his absolute hostility to manufacturers and manufacturing in this country. He prides himself as being the one man on the Liberal benches who was against reciprocity, and who fought it strenuously, and he was returned by acclamation on that issue, but to-night we have him proclaiming himself along the same lines as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). The hon. gentleman, (Mr. German) says he is in favour of a lower tariff.

Mr. GERMAN. I will have to correct the hon. gentleman, because nothing I said could by any possible stretch of the imagination lead him to believe any such thing.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman for Welland can say whatever he likes, but if I understood him properly he said he was a lower tariff man.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I am not a low tariff man; I am a no tariff man.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. member for Welland is a low tariff man and he told us that the only people in Canada who wanted assistance from this commission were the manufacturers, and if the manufacturers of his riding give any evidence before that commission about the state of their industry; if the rope industry, if the iron and steel industry, and if the paper industry, come before the commission and state private matters concerning their business, the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) wants that information disclosed to the public. I challenge him to deny that that is what he said.

Mr. GERMAN. I am quite content with the opinion the manufacturers of my county have of me, and I am not concerned about what opinion the hon. member (Mr. Currie) has of me.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman is trying to quibble on this question.

Mr. GERMAN. The manufacturers in my riding do not think so.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman is trying to take two sides on this question.

Mr. PUGSLEY The hon. member is not dealing with the question before the House; he is obstructing the Bill in the most unwarrantable manner, and I ask that he be called to order.

Mr. CURRIE. The only trouble with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) is that he is not going to be a member of this commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. CURRIE. I hope the citizens of Welland will take cognizance of what their member has said to-night?

Mr. GERMAN. They certainly will.

Mr. CURRIE. The clause is carried.

Mr. McKENZIE. The purpose of my amendment is that nothing should be put in evidence that was not intended afterwards to be made public property.

Mr. CURRIE. I rise to a point of order. As the House is in committee the rule permitting the mover of a substantive motion to reply does not apply, any member may speak as often as he chooses in committee. The chairman has declared the resolution lost and I do not see why it should be reopened.

Mr. LENNOX. As a matter of fair play, I saw the hon. member for Cape Breton standing waiting for an opportunity to speak, but the chairman did not happen to see him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I was just asking the committee if the amendment ought to be adopted. The hon. member is at liberty to proceed.

Mr. McKENZIE. There seems to be a conflict of opinion in the government on this question. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) at pages 1322 and 1323 of 'Hansard,' gave his idea of the in-

tention of this Bill after it had been discussed in Council. He said:

You say sometimes that this is to relieve the government. It is a very poor idea of it, that, you say it is to relieve members of parliament, it is a very poor idea, that. The business of making tariffs will be just the hardest, the most delicate, and responsible business, when you have a basis of facts that a good commission has gathered, that it has ever been in the country. No minister or ministry will ever be able to shield themselves behind generalities. Parliament itself will be put in possession of every fact that the ministers possess;—

There is the point of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Subsection 6 of section 5 says that there shall be facts obtained by the commission and reported to the minister which never can become the property of parliament. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce is right the Minister of Finance and those supporting him do not understand the full force and effect of this Bill.

Mr. CURRIE. What the hon. gentleman wants is the evidence and testimony taken by this commission. That is altogether different from a summary of the facts.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is not what the Minister of Trade and Commerce meant. Whatever form the evidence may take it will surely all be facts. He continued:

—will be an efficient check upon the material quota that are laying before them what they propose to do in the matter of the tariff, and in the matter of charges. They will be able to judge. Heretofore a minister has been able to escape behind generalities, he has been able to shield himself behind the ignorance of parliament with reference to the real conditions of every item upon which it was desired to act. After this, if this commission is rightly appointed, and if it rightly does its duty, not only the members will be judging the ministers, not only will the ministers be put on their mettle, because they have got to come to the touchstone of facts, but the intelligent country outside will have a chance of judging of a tariff such as it never had before.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Is it my hon. friend's idea that these reports will be brought down to parliament?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I never had the least idea that they would not.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Is there any objection to making the Bill definite in that respect?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). All these reports given in the line of what is called for, there, in getting information which is the basis of tariff measures, is the property, not of the government, or of the minister, but of parliament and of the country. Nobody, I think in this House, has ever had any other idea of it.

Mr. EDWARDS. The Minister of Finance distinctly stated that yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think we elaborated this matter in council. So far as I am concerned, I never had any other idea of it than that. So I say that that will be the position of things. No one will be able to shield himself behind an ex parte statement, or behind lack of knowledge when the knowledge will be there, and every intelligent man will be able to draw his own conclusions.

The subsection with which we are dealing, subsection 6, says that information can be in possession of the commission and of the minister which can never find its way into this parliament, because it is to be private and confidential, and, so treated. We are told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that every one of the 220 members will be in possession of the facts and can argue for himself and can arraign the minister armed with the same evidence as the minister. The minister can reply to the member, if the evidence is to be taken as now proposed; that is all right as far as the evidence you have is concerned.

But we have information not in your possession. You are putting your facts all right, but you must not forget that power was given to us by parliament to enable us to collect facts and figures and information which you have not at all. On those facts and figures and information we have based clauses of the tariff in such a manner that you cannot criticise them. This is the position in which the members on this side will be placed, as against the idea laid down by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that every member of the House on the government or the opposition side would have the same data upon which to base his arguments. Now, however it is now proposed to carry out a contrary idea, and to gather any quantity of information of a private character which the commission intend to use but which those members who are unfortunate enough to be in opposition will know nothing about. They can always be told that the tariff is perfectly scientific and supported by the evidence although that evidence remains secret and inaccessible to us. That was the basis and the reason for the ground which I took, that no information should be in possession of the commission, that nothing in the form of evidence should be used by the government which should not afterwards become public property.

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would move that section 5 be amended by striking out subsection 6 as printed—being in reality subsection 7 because there has been another subsection added. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to this and ask him in the first place what it means, and secondly what is the necessity of the subsection. Now let me read:

Evidence.

Which, of course, would mean evidence taken under oath:

Should evidence or information in its nature confidential, relating to the business or affairs of any person, firm or corporation, be given or elicited in the course of any inquiry, the evidence or information shall not be made public by the commission in such a manner as to be available for the use of any business competitor or rival of the person, firm or corporation, respectively.

It seems to me the Minister of Finance, if he is going to insist upon this should simply say, 'it shall not be made public' but he says 'it shall not be made public in such a manner as to be available for the use of any business competitor or rival' etc.

Mr. CURRIE. Common sense would tell the hon. gentleman—

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am asking the Minister of Finance.

Mr. CURRIE. Of course if the hon. gentleman will not let me answer him the—

Mr. DEPUTY SPERKER. The hon. gentleman for St. John has the floor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the utmost confidence in the ability of the Minister of Finance to answer the question.

Mr. CURRIE. It has been answered several times already.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Currie) I hope will not feel that I am treating him with discourtesy when I suggest that the Minister of Finance should answer.

Mr. CURRIE. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the subsection containing the words which I have quoted, ought to be struck out. It does seem to me that where evidence is taken under oath—I am not referring now to confidential information which the commission and the Minister of Finance might get—but where evidence is taken under oath, I think such evidence should be published for the information of every member of parliament and the general public. Bear in mind that even the Minister of Finance is not to have the discretion to say whether the evidence is of a confidential nature or not, that power rests with the commission. They are the gentlemen who are to be the judges of whether the information is confidential in its nature or not. Now I say the commission ought not to have the power to say they can investigate one man's business and make it just as public as they please, and treat the business affairs of another man, who may be a rival, as being confidential in their character. The Minister of Finance stated that this commission was like a bureau or like the minister himself getting information. I say it is entirely different. If the Minister of Finance came into parliament with a Bill proposing a change in the tariff, and he stated in respect to some items that he was raising the duty, and in respect to other items, was lowering it, every member of parliament would have the right to ask him the ground on which he desired parliament to make the change. In this case, it is an independent body of men, independent of the people, and independent of parliament, and it does seem to me that they ought not to be allowed to report the results of their inquiries, the effect of evidence which has been submitted to them, and then withhold that information from the public. That, I think, is the clear distinction, and that we on this side of the House should insist as strenuously as we can, that whatever evidence is taken by this commission in respect to matters which may affect tariff action, and upon the strength of which the government may take action, that ought to be available for the use of every member of parliament. Now as my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), said in his very clear remarks upon another clause, when the matter was last before the House, the Minister of Trade and Commerce gave us to understand that whatever evidence the commission acted upon would be accessible to every member of parliament, that it would be open to us to ask him as to the facts upon which he based any proposed amendment to the tariff. Then we could examine those facts entirely for ourselves and criticise if we desired, the action proposed. But if this Bill passes, there will be an abundance of testimony, which these commissioners may say is of a private or confidential character, evidence relating to the cost of production, to the cost of the raw material, relating to transportation,—evidence which they must necessarily get by examining different individuals and different corporations, evidence which, under this section, they could say, was of a confidential character. They would report to the minister their conclusions, they would say to the minister the evidence was confidential, and the minister would have information and a report from the Tariff Commission, but the evidence on which the report was based would not be available for parliament. There is nothing in this law which would prevent my hon. friend from getting private information if he wishes to. There is nothing which would prevent these commissioners from getting private information, although it is objectionable that they should do so.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). Without this provision the commission could not compel the giving of that information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At all events under the Bill as it now stands, the amendment of my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) having been voted down, these commissioners could get private information, but the clear intention is that they shall take evidence under oath. They have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses, and to subject persons to fine and imprisonment, if, on being summoned, they fail to attend and give evidence. I think that whatever information they get from witnesses under oath, that information ought to be submitted to the minister, and, in the ordinary way, by the minister to parliament. The court ought to be an open court, just as the Board of Railway Commissioners is. Whoever heard of a proposition to amend the law establishing the Board of Railway Commissioners so as to authorize them to hold a secret and private tribunal or to give them power to take evidence under oath secretly which they might declare should not be made public? I have never heard anybody suggest such a thing, and I should be surprised to find any such provision in the Railway Act, certainly I have never heard such a suggestion.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. member look at section 374?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be that there is such a section, but certainly, I never heard of it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be good enough to let me see it. This section reads:

> All returns made in pursuance of any of the provisions of the four sections of this Act last preceding shall be privileged communications, and shall not be evidence in any court whatsoever except in any prosecution for,—
>
> (a) Default in making such returns in accordance with the requirements of this Act;
>
> (b) Perjury making any oath required by this Act in connection with such returns;
>
> (c) Forgery of any such return; or
>
> (d) Signing any such return knowing the same to be forged.

That is entirely a different matter from the section before us.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Just the other day I had occasion to write to the secretary of the Railway Commission asking him for the list of complaints that were made in respect of a certain crossing, and was informed by him that it was not the custom of the commission to divulge any information obtained in that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may be. All I say is that every examination under oath before the commission should be a public examination and everybody should have the right to hear the evidence of every witness. All that this section 374 of the Railway Act—and I thank my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) for sending it to me—provides is that the return made shall not be used in any other proceedings which may be taken.

Mr. MEIGHEN. They are privileged entirely.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be so, but they are public.

Mr. MEIGHEN. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are absolutely and necessarily public. But the evidence given in a case——

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). Section 374 refers to returns, not to oral evidence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What the section of the Bill now before us provides is very different from that provided by section 374 of the Railway Act. It is proposed here that the Tariff Commissioners taking evidence under oath may, in their discretion, determine that certain evidence is private and confidential and that it shall not be made public. Then follow the extraordinary words 'in such a manner as to be available for the use of any business competitor or rival.' If the section declared that such evidence should not be made use of in a court of law that would be in accordance with a well known principle of law, and I should have no objection to a section of that kind. But this provides that parliament shall, in the discretion of these commissioners, be debarred from the knowledge of the evidence on which they have based their conclusions with regard to tariff matters. I say that is unjust to the public. This commission being appointed by authority of parliament, parliament ought to have access to every fact on which these commissioners make their report.

Mr. MEIGHEN. While I should like to see better progress made, the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) may be worth replying to once more. The hon. gentleman started out by stating boldly that this was 'unprecedented', and suggested 'star-chamber' methods, and said he would be astonished to find such a provision in any other Act. But section 374 of the Railway Act, to which I have referred him, distinctly says that certain evidence to be taken before the Railway Commission shall be privileged and then goes on to specify that, besides being privileged, it shall not be available in any court of law. Is that evidence to be public property when it is specifically declared to be privileged? The hon. gentleman is too good a lawyer to say that. But if the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with section 374, he might turn his

attention to section 292 of the Railway Act. The first subsection of this section provides that the commission may make investigation into accidents and causes of accidents, and that reports shall be made to them by the railway companies, of all the circumstances of these accidents. Then subsection 2 provides:

The board may by regulation declare the manner and form by which such information and notice shall be given and the class of accidents to which this section apply, and may declare any information so given to be privileged.

Mr. McKENZIE. 'Privileged' does not mean private.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) contend that information may be 'privileged' and still be public property?

Mr. GERMAN. Why, the statement the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) makes here is a 'privileged' statement, even though it may be libellous; but it is a public statement nevertheless.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) contend that the word 'privileged' is used in that sense?

Mr. GERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) inquire of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) made inquiries and the reply confirms exactly what I say. The information is given a certain way and is given under privilege, that is to say it shall not be public property. Here is another instance: The United States Congress, not altogether a star-chamber body, not a body wholly unused to constitutional methods, created a tariff board—or attempted to do so, and would have created it had not methods similar to those used by hon. gentlemen opposite filibustered it out of the House. Under this Bill, (No. 32,010) of the Congress of the United States, which passed the Senate, but was referred back by the House of Representatives, the following clause occurred:

No evidence or information so secured under the provisions of this section from any person, firm, co-partnership, corporation or association, shall be made public by such a manner as to be available for any business competitor or rival.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Precisely as it is copied into this Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN. No doubt, it is very largely copied from it. If the hon. member will search the debate in the United States House of Representatives or Senate, where every imaginable attack was made on this Bill by members of the Democratic party, I think he will search in vain for any attack on this clause of the Bill. I read that debate and it seemed to be unanimously assumed in the House of Representatives—I did not read the debate that occurred in the Senate—that this was nothing more than expression of common sense.

There would be a body of information concealed from the commission and from the president if such a clause were not introduced. That is what is being presented here. I think I could go beyond the Railway Act, and beyond the precedent in the United States to find authority for such a clause as this. It seems to me the opposition have to show that the creation of this commission is an additional reason why the minister in framing his Bill should be debarred from the use of information which he has had before.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have here a copy of the congressional Bill, but the Bill did not pass.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It passed the House and passed the Senate, and was referred back, but was filibustered out of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has my hon. friend read section 6 in the congressional Bill? It does not only apply to private or confidential information, but applies to all evidence and information which the board may obtain. No wonder it was thrown out in Congress. Let me read the section of the Bill that Congress rejected:

In any investigation authorized by this Act the board may obtain such evidence or information as it may deem advisable, but said board shall not be required to divulge the names of persons furnishing such evidence or information; and no evidence or information so secured under the provisions of this section from any person, firm, co-partnership, corporation or association shall be made public by said board in such manner as to be available for the use of any business competitor or rival.

Is it any wonder that that was thrown out?

Mr. MEIGHEN. That was not thrown out. This section was adopted, in the Senate but it was filibustered out of the House by people talking too long.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has tried to copy that, because he is using the identical words, but adding 'evidence of a confidential nature.' The clause has been taken by the draftsman holus-bolus from section 6 of the Bill of the United States Congress, only adding these words. Some person who drafted the Bill for Congress provided that any evidence, whether confidential or otherwise, which was taken by the board, should not be made public in such a manner as to be available for use by any competitor or

rival. But how could it be made public without being available for use by a business competitor or rival? It is absurd. And so it is absurd to say in this Bill that no evidence of a confidential nature shall be made public by these commissioners in such a way as to give advantage to any business rival. Once you make it public, it is open to business competitors as well as the whole world to make use of it.

Mr. CURRIE. Let us be fair and don't let us be partisan. The Bill introduced into Congress made a provision that the commission should be composed of both political parties, a certain number of Republicans and a certain number of Democrats. It was supposed to be a non-partisan commission. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, in this country we do not recognize political parties as they do in the United States, where they give them a legal standing. That was the idea of the United States Commission, it was to be non-partisan. I hope that our commission will be a non-partisan commission; I only hope that the statement is true, made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that a very prominent Liberal is to be a member of the commission. and that the commission will be non partisan. Now why should that commission not stand as a buffer between the manufacturers, we will say, and a minister of the Crown? Suppose that a certain line of business in this country, say the leather manufacture, which is supposed to be carried on largely by Liberals, was investigated by this commission, which finds a state of facts, without giving the names of the people that were investigated. If hon. gentlemen have read, for instance, the schedule on woollens and other things in the States, they would understand it. Now, if the minister was unfortunately opposed to the majority, or to some of the members of firms engaged in that business, he might take advantage of his position to pass legislation that would seriously injure them. I could name another line of business, for instance, the manufacture of iron pipe. Most of the people engaged in the manufacture of iron pipe are Liberals, and if they were investigated by this commission, and facts were brought out, which they thought it would perhaps be well to withhold from parliament, largely composed of the opposite side, this commission, being non-partisan, would simply make a plain statement of the facts, without giving the names of any members of the firms or of any members thereof. Now, if there is a buffer offered by this whole Bill to the Liberals, who are manufacturers, it is that very clause in the Bill. I do not assume that the Minister of Finance is illiberal, but suppose he should be so unfortunate as to have strong partisan feelings, where would my good Liberal friends in the manufacturing business be, if the minister could compel this commission to be constantly investigating them to find out the condition of their business, and proclaim their financial standing to the whole world, and put their business into such a shape, that they could not get money to carry it on? I think the Bill is fair and just, and I cannot see that the hon. member for St. John city can oppose that clause on any fair ground in view of these facts. I do not think there is any ground of complaint.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Before six o'clock, I stated, in answer to a question put to me by the Minister of Finance, or in some manner at least, that I believed in the principle involved in this section. What I meant was that there must be many occasions on which the Tariff Commission would be in receipt of evidence which would be considered as confidential and which would be tendered to them only upon the understanding that it is to be held as confidential. In the very nature of things the commission must constantly be receiving information of a confidential character, but, I believe, that confidence can better be retained by the elimination of this clause. There is nothing in the Bill itself which compels the publication of any evidence or information which comes to the commission. If any confidential information comes before the commission, I assume it would be their duty to ascertain whether the facts stated therein were in substance true and if the commission found them to be true they could make them a part of the report of the findings of the commission. It is a very unfortunate thing to concede by statute the power of making evidence or information confidential particularly when received by a public body whose chief duty is to go around the country ascertaining information. There is nothing in this Bill compelling the commission to disclose information given to them confidentially, and it is in the interest of everybody that the commission themselves alone determine how to safeguard confidential information, permitting at the same time the person or persons tendering this information to decide as to what shall be the measure of it. I know of no other instance in legislation where a similar power was asked for. I do not think it is very important what they do in the United States in so far as the matter of the form of our legislation is concerned. I think we are very much ahead of Congress in this respect, and I do not think the fact that there is a similar clause in the United States Bill affords any justification for this clause. I propose voting for the amendment of my hon. friend from St. John simply because I think the restriction im-

posed by the Bill on the commission is absolutely unnecessary, and it is very much better to leave in the hands of the commission the power to determine how they shall treat confidential information.

Mr. CURRIE. I would like to point out to the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), that under a clause of the Bill which we have not yet reached the commission have power to pass regulations which, on being confirmed by order in council, and by the minister, become law. If you do not put limitations upon the face of this Bill the commission may pass what regulations they please. I believe that the proper way of framing a commission Bill is to make it as short as possible to place certain limitations upon their actions. That is identically the form of this Bill. It does not go into a long rigmarole and lay down in detail what they can and cannot do. This is the proper form of a Bill creating a commission. You have put a clause in permitting persons to appear before them and give evidence. Then you must also put in a clause preventing the passing of any regulations compelling the evidence to be made public. Then, the people who come before them will know that they have that protection. This is not a question of party; there are just as many Liberals, and perhaps more, engaged in manufacturing and other business in this country as there are Conservatives. Conservatives are not the only people whose interests are going to be involved by this commission, and it is in the interests of all that these facts should remain as they are, that the Bill should remain as it is and I believe that nobody who has at heart the best interests of individuals engaged in different lines of production will support an amendment of this kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is one thing that I forgot to mention. It has reference to the Congressional Bill mentioned by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). My hon. friend also forgot to quote section 7 of the Bill which is very important as showing that the draftsman seemed to have in his mind that in some way the Tariff Board should be prevented from making evidence public in such a manner as to be available for any business competitor or rival, yet by the next section he was very careful to provide that all testimony should be available for the information of Congress. The words of the section are as follows:

That said board shall submit the results of its investigation, as hereinbefore provided, including all testimony, together with any explanatory report of the facts so ascertained to the President or to either House of Congress from time to time when called upon by the president or the leader of either house of Congress.

All I want is that whatever testimony is given before these commissioners who are constituted a court, shall be available to the minister, to his colleagues in the government and to this parliament. That is all we want and if my hon. friend will consent to another subsection being added similar to the one in the Congressional Bill I shall be quite willing to withdraw my amendment, and let the subsection be included. What I thought of proposing is this:

The said commission shall submit the results of its investigation as hereinbefore provided including all testimony to the minister who shall lay the same before parliament within ten days after the opening of the next then ensuing session.

If my hon. friend will consent to that I will be quite willing to leave the subsection just as it is. If the commissioners choose to obtain information privately let them do it. Give them large latitude in that respect; I think that is a just and sound principle. But what we do want is that whatever testimony they take, with all the power that they are going to have to go from one end of this country to the other to compel people to come before them and to examine into their business matters, shall be available for the members of this parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN. And made public?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then parliament can deal with it as they please. If this parliament is satisfied that there is information of a confidential nature that ought not to go to the public upon the recommendation of the Minister of Finance probably a committee of this House can be appointed to deal with it. But, at all events this parliament and not this Tariff Commission, should be the judge as to whether evidence is of a confidential nature or not.

It is contrary to every principle affecting the public interest that this commission should have power to say that they can keep their doors open or that they can close them just as they please. It is not right to give them the power to say that when they are investigating Mr. A's business the public shall be allowed in, and when they investigate the business of Mr. B that the doors shall be closed and the information he gives treated as confidential. That is a power which ought not to be vested in this board which is practically independent of parliament for a period of five years.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is it not the fact that in the past the Cabinet ministers have had the advantage of information which was not available to parliament and not in the public interest to disclose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Undoubtedly so, and they will still have that privilege. There is nothing in this Bill which takes away from the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs the power or right to receive confidential information. But, when the Minister of Finance asks parliament to make a change in the tariff he has to give the reasons to parliament for that change, and he is responsible to parliament. But that is a very different thing from constituting an independent tribunal with the power of examining witnesses under oath and to determine what evidence shall be open to the public and what evidence shall be private.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that the Congressional Bill does not give the commissioners the same power as to subpœnaing witnesses as the Bill we have now under consideration. It is true that the Congressional Bill says the commissioners shall have power to summon witnesses, but if a witness does not appear there is no remedy and all the commissioner can do is to report the fact to Congress. Under the present Bill, if the witness does not appear he is liable to imprisonment. The reasons for protecting evidence of a confidential character under our Bill are much stronger than under the Congressional Bill, because under our Bill we can put men right into the factories and take the most confidential information that their books contain. The very fact that we are giving this commission these larger powers is the reason why we should treat the information we have thus compulsorily obtained, more or less confidentially. If you are going to get at the root of the matter and you want to get full and frank information as to any particular line of industry, the very fact that the manufacturer knows that the information will not go into the hands of a competitor in his business will be a reason why he will be more frank about it. We have to choose in this case between an absolute publication of all the evidence as to a man's private business, or we have to put in some limitation of this kind. I would not like taking on myself the responsibility of making the secrets of every man's trade in this country absolutely open to the public. The clause of the Bill simply says that the information shall not be made public in such manner as to be available to a competitor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does that mean?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think it would permit the commission to make the evidence public to the minister and it would enable the minister to make it public to the Cabinet Council which is sworn to secrecy. If you are at the stage where under this Bill you can give this information to the Minister of Finance and to the Cabinet Council, are you in any different position than you are to-day as to the confidential information you receive, and which of course goes to the council and which may never go a step further? When that information goes to the council chamber then you can as heretofore use your discretion as to whether it should be made public or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But is it not a fact that these commissioners can determine as to when the doors can be closed and a star-chamber investigation proceeded with, or when the doors can be opened and the public admitted?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. There is nothing in the Bill which says the commissioners shall not publish the evidence. It says they shall make a report of the fact and they shall submit the evidence, except that it shall not be submitted in such a manner as that it may be used by a trade competitor. There is no power in this Bill for the commissioners to refuse to give to the minister the evidence they obtain; the only restriction is that they themselves shall not make public the evidence in such a manner as to be used by a competitor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it not so that if this Bill passes the commissioners can determine when they can hold secret inquiries or when they should hold public inquiries?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not think so; I think the minister would have the right to demand at any time all the evidence that the commissioners have gathered, but that evidence should not be made public in such a manner as that it might be used by a competitor. The minister would give the evidence to the Cabinet Council which is sworn to secrecy, and then you are in the same position as you are in to-day. You determine whether or not it is in the public interest that the information should be made public.

Mr. GERMAN. It rests with the commission to say whether the evidence shall be taken in open court or whether it shall be taken in secret.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friends are too theoretical about this. How it will work out in practice is this: suppose any business man in this House is asked to give evidence on oath before the commission, he invokes the subsection which says that evidence is not to be made public in a way to injure him with a trade rival, and as a matter of common sense is there a man in this House who would seriously suggest that a business man of this country should

be subpœnaed by this commission and asked to divulge the last secret of his business before a crowded court room ?

The mere statement of the thing brings its own refutation. It is not to be thought of, public opinion would not stand for a moment for the creation of such a tribunal. It seems to me that every phase of this matter has been brought before the committee and considered. I am unable to adduce any further arguments and I think that none have been adduced since 8 o'clock and we might well proceed to a vote. In reply to the hon. member for Cape Breton, however, with regard to the position taken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, there is absolutely no disagreement between the minister and the rest of us who have spoken on this question. The minister was acquainted with all the provisions of this Bill including the subsection now under consideration, he was speaking generally and was simply saying what I have said over and over again.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The minister has not said definitely whether or not he would accept the proposal of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). It would have some influence on my vote on section No. 6 if I knew he would consent to a section being inserted that would enable parliament to have possession of the facts. This clause is a dangerous one unless there is some restriction, perhaps a provision that ten days after the opening of parliament the evidence taken by the commission should be laid before the House.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think the clause as it stands is sufficient to protect all interests. I am sorry to say I cannot see any necessity for the amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question has been quite thoroughly discussed as the minister has said. Of course he discussed it himself quite freely and has been well supported by gentlemen all around him. When a government wants to shorten a discussion they can do it by limiting the number of their supporters who speak. We on this side are called upon to criticise and feel it necessary sometimes to take more time than hon. gentlemen supporting the government. I think the government should accept an additional clause, perhaps to this effect:

The said commission shall submit the result of its investigations as hereinbefore provided, including all testimony to the minister, who shall lay the same before parliament within ten days after opening of the next ensuing session.

With the Bill in its present form, if the commission should decide that certain evidence will be of a confidential nature, and so state to the witness, then when their report of that evidence was submitted to the Minister of Finance he could not properly bring that evidence down to parliament because the commissioners had undertaken that it should be confidential. Thus the Minister of Finance and his colleagues might have that evidence before them but parliament would be absolutely debarred from examining it. That is a condition of affairs that should not be permitted. If confidential information must be obtained it should be obtained by the minister as it has been in the past. I feel like pressing this amendment if the minister will not add a further subsection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. McKENZIE. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not have to wait a minute. We will keep them very much longer if they get nasty. I wish to bring to the notice of the minister the scope of subsection 6, notwithstanding the fact that he may have made up his mind not to listen to us.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I shall be very glad indeed to listen to hon. gentlemen opposite, but I have really nothing to add to what I have already said.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the minister would bring his legal training to bear on subsection 6 he will see there is hardly any kind of evidence this commission could get or look for but would come within its operation. There is no kind of contract or undertaking which a merchant might enter upon but would be regarded as private except a public contract. The contract of a merchant to supply goods to the government, of course, is public in its character, because the public pays for it. Every other kind of business which a merchant or manufacturer is engaged in comes within the scope of this provision. The wages of his men doing his own private business, the price he charges for the article, the commodities which enter into the manufacture of the article, the transportation arrangements he makes with steamship companies or railways, all these are private under the terms of this section if it passes.

Amendment (Mr. McKenzie), negatived: Yeas 24, nays 50.

Section agreed to.

On section 7, staff,

Mr. PUGSLEY. I move, seconded by Mr. Sinclair, that the following be added as clause 8:

The said commission shall submit the results of its investigation, as hereinbefore provided, including all testimony, to the minister who shall lay the same before parliament within ten days after the opening of the then next ensuing session.

That would take the place of the present printed clause 7, which otherwise would be section 7.

Mr. CURRIE. That is an amendment to clause 8.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it becomes a new clause.

Mr. CURRIE. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman. It is the amendment to the clause which has just been carried

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is a new clause, but that is the order in which it will come.

Mr. CURRIE. It is simply an amendment to clause 7.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I do not propose to strike out clause 7 as printed, but this will become a new section.

Mr. CURRIE. The clause to which this amendment is proposed deals with the salaries. Clause 7 is the clause we have just passed.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). If the hon. gentleman's amendment is carried it will nullify the vote on the last amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). It must be out of order. The amendment of the hon. gentleman will have the effect of nullifying the vote on the previous amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will not be out of order even in the judgment of the Minister of Finance, because he says that while the commissioners shall not make the evidence public, they shall submit it to him, and then we provide by this amendment that the Minister of Finance shall submit it to parliament.

Mr. CURRIE. That is exactly what you asked before.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not inconsistent with the subsection passed.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). It is absolutely inconsistent.

Mr. CURRIE. It is the same thing.

Mr. NESBITT. We have been told by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and certainly by the hon. member from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), that it was the intention of the government, to submit the evidence taken by this commission, to parliament. If that is the case, why refuse this clause?

Mr. CURRIE. I have raised the point of order, and I would like a ruling from the Chairman.

Mr. NESBITT. I would like to see the minister accept this amendment, because it looks very simple to me. Of course it is all right to say that any information can be submitted to parliament, but it means when we ask for information, we are subject to the will of the government, no matter what it may be.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think the Minister of Finance ought to accept this amendment, more especially as it appears to me to be carrying out the idea he himself expressed to the House. I have been trying to think all through this discussion that the minister was sincere, that he was trying to give us a Bill that would be of advantage to the country, and I have not so far, been at all suspicious. The refusal of the minister, however, to agree that the evidence on which the tariff is based shall be given to parliament is inclined to make the suspicious that this subsection 6 may be used for a purpose for which it was not intended. Hints have already been thrown out by hon. gentlemen opposite, for example by the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), who, it will be remembered, told us that the members of this commission must be men who would be in sympathy with the ideas of the government. In other words, they must be high tariff men, who would be inclined to raise instead of lowering the tariff. Then there is my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), who declared the other night, when it was suggested that the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) might be a suitable man to put on this commission, that such a proposal would be absurd, and that the gun would not go off if such an appointment were made.

What did he mean by that? Does he mean that this is some deadly instrument that is levelled at the farmers and consumers, and that if my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) were put on the commission it would not go off? With statements like that made by two prominent men on the other side, men I suppose in the secrets of the government, and with the Minister of Finance refusing to adopt a simple suggestion that the evidence should be placed before parliament, what are we to think? How is parliament to get the evidence? Will it be necessary for some member to give notice and to move that the evidence taken by the commission shall be produced and if this is done, how do we know it will be granted? It is within the power of the majority to refuse it. It seems to me there ought to be some rule by which the evidence—or the main part of the evidence; if the minister wishes to qualify, let him suggest a form of words that would prevent the confidential and private parts of the evidence being called for, that would be a reasonable position for him to take—should, as a matter of course, be furnished to parliament. But that the minister should refuse to accept an amendment of this kind seems to me unreasonable. And I think that when he considers the matter

he will not want to have it go to the country that he refused a proposition of this kind.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). I think the members of this House clearly understood that the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) merely expressed their private opinions and were in no way attempting to commit the government to placing high protectionists upon this commission. Representing, as I do, an agricultural constituency, I should be sorry to see high protectionists upon this commission. I have yet to learn that because a man is a free trader or a moderate protectionist, that he is, therefore, incapacitated from ascertaining the facts that this commission is created to ascertain. Hon. members opposite have repeatedly stated that this commission was not asked for by anybody but the manufacturers. That is not in accordance with the record. This commission is created for the purpose of benefiting the consumer, and as a representative of a rural constituency I am in favour of the creation of the commission, because I believe that it means that the tariff will be revised downwards if the facts justify it, rather than upward. The Minister of Finance showed conclusively that the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) favoured a commission similar to this when he was speaking before the manufacturers in Montreal. We also remember that in 1910 when that right hon. gentleman, touring the west, was approached by a delegation of farmers asking for a revision downward of the tariff, his answer was that the government would refer that matter to a commission. What did he mean?—what kind of a commission? A commission similar to that which it is proposed to create under this measure. When such a commission was conceived in the mind of their leader, hon. members opposite seemed to think it calculated to benefit the community, but when the idea is taken hold of by the Minister of Finance, elaborated and put into execution, it is calculated to benefit the manufacturers alone. In my opinion, it is calculated to benefit the consumers; and for my part. I am in favour of it because I believe it will do justice both to the consumers and the manufacturers. I think it would be unfair to make public the confidential reports of this commission. It is well that the commission should be in a position to learn the confidential facts relating to men's business, and it would be monstrous to have these things published. It seems to me that this amendment is only designed to re-introduce a proposal which has just been voted down by the committee. On that ground, it seems to me, the amendment should be ruled out of order.

Mr. McKENZIE. We were told a moment ago that there was not the slightest difference of opinion in the government in regard to this Act. There is a motion before the committee that the proceedings of the commission should become, at a certain stage, the property of parliament, and the Minister of Finance and his friends oppose that idea. I would like the hon. gentleman to square what he says with what was stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) with respect to this commission. In the same speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce which I quoted a moment ago, I find the following:

> Mr. GUTHRIE. Is it my hon. friend's idea that these reports will be brought down to parliament?
>
> Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I never had the least idea that they would not.
>
> Mr. GUTHRIE. Is there any objection to making the Bill definite in that respect?
>
> Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). All these reports given in the line of what is called for, there, in getting information which is the basis of tariff measures, is the property, not of the government, or of the minister, but of parliament and of the country. Nobody, I think in this House, has ever had any other idea of it.
>
> Mr. EDWARDS. The Minister of Finance distinctly stated that yesterday.
>
> Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think we elaborated this matter in council. So far as I am concerned, I never had any other idea of it than that. So I say that that will be the position of things. No one will be able to shield himself behind an ex parte statement, or behind lack of knowledge when the knowledge will be there, and every intelligent man will be able to draw his own conclusions.

I think the ingenuity of the Minister of Finance will be strained to the breaking point to show how he is in 'absolute accord' with the statement of his colleague and yet continue to hold his view that this evidence should not become the property of parliament.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) never asks me anything more difficult than that I shall be much obliged to him. There is no difficulty in reconciling the two statements. A few minutes ago, the committee voted against striking out subsection 6. My hon. friend from St. John now moves an amendment to the effect that the information that comes to the Minister of Finance, even if it is the confidential information which is absolutely safeguarded from being made public by this section of the Act, shall be brought down and made public. In other words, as pointed out by my hon.

friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) he raises again the very question that was voted down only a few moments ago.

Now, what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) said, I say, that all the information would be brought down and would be subject to the order of the House, save only as expressly provided in the statute by this subsection. He was not discussing every section. Of course the Minister of Trade and Commerce knew what was in the Act, he had gone over it carefully. How could he say anything that, on the face of it, was in contradiction to the express words of the statute? How could he say that everything would be made public, knowing at the same time that there was a clause in the Bill that expressly forbade making public certain classes of information? My hon. friend failed to remember that the minister was speaking generally of the class of information obtained by the commission which would not come within this subsection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is there anything in this Act which provides that such report as can be brought down without any violation of the provisions of subsection 6 of section 5, will be brought down without being moved for? Surely we ought to be put in possession of a blue-book containing such evidence as is not objectionable under that subsection.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe). I was going to rule that subsection 6 having passed, this amendment is inconsistent with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then I shall have to appeal against your ruling. It seems to me the point of order is not well taken. The subsection as now carried by the committee is simply that the commission shall not make the evidence public in such a way as to be available for use by any business competitor or rival of the person, firm, or corporation respectively. That is the section which has passed. It simply means that the commission shall not make the matter public, but shall report the result of the investigation, with the evidence, to the Minister of Finance; that is not making it public in such a way as to injure any business rival. Then the amendment further provides that the minister must submit the evidence to parliament within ten days of the opening of the session. Parliament may have it printed, or may treat it as it pleases. I take it that this parliament has just as much power as the Governor in Council to keep any of its documents private if it wants to. Parliament is the high court of the land, and has absolute control over its papers. I submit that there is nothing in my amendment which is inconsistent with section 6 which has already been passed.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe). I see no reason to change my opinion, and I still hold that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then I appeal to the Speaker from your ruling.

Committee rose, and the Speaker took the chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to explain to your Honour——

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not open to debate. Those in favour of sustaining the ruling of the Chair will please say 'Aye.'

Those opposed will please say 'No.'

I declare the ruling of the Chair is sustained.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before you leave the Chair would you allow me to say that there has been no appeal made to the House, but an appeal to your Honour under the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The appeal is to the House, not to the Chair.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I made no appeal to the House. Before you leave the Chair——

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot permit discussion, because the rules strictly forbid it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would your Honour not permit me to point out——

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

House again went into committee on the Bill.

Mr. GAUVREAU. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves on the other side.

Mr. CURRIE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) has used unparliamentary language.

Mr. GAUVREAU. I am going to bow to the ruling of the chairman.

An hon. MEMBER. There is no ruling.

Mr. CURRIE. It is an insult to the House and it should be withdrawn.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order; I want your ruling.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman has used unparliamentary language and I think he should be compelled to retract.

Mr. GAUVREAU. I do not think the hon. gentleman was in his seat when I spoke and I do not know what I am called upon to say.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman said that we should be ashamed of ourselves.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe) I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the remark.

Mr. GAUVREAU. I suppose, for the sake of peace that I will have to take it back.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe) The question is on clause 7.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Will the Minister of Finance permit me to make a suggestion here which is not strictly referable to this clause. Clause 5 provides that the commissioners shall subpœna witnesses. I notice in section 63 of the Railway Act in reference to witnesses and evidence—

Mr. CURRIE. Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is not in order—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I have the permission of the Chairman.

Mr. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman has not permission unless there is a motion to go back to that clause. Otherwise he cannot discuss it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I ask the minister if he will be good enough to receive a suggestion upon a clause we have passed, and if the suggestion is worth anything I am going to ask him to consider the advisability of an amendment which perhaps cannot properly be made to the clause now before the committee. I wish to refer to section 63 of the Railway Act, providing for the summoning of witnesses contains this provision:

Provided that no person shall be compellable against his will to attend——

Mr. CURRIE. Now, Mr. Chairman again I ask for your ruling.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe). If the hon. gentleman is speaking with the consent of the minister—

Mr. CURRIE. It is patent to any person who has sat in this House for a number of weeks that the rules of the House in committee have been trampled under foot again and again. As one member who likes to see progress made I would ask for a clear interpretation of the rules. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss this unless there is a motion to reconsider clause 5.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I consider—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr Bennett, Simcoe). The hon. member is speaking with the concurrence of the minister.

Mr. CURRIE. No, he is not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He is not.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I have no authority to consent in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe). Then the hon. gentleman must move the reconsideration of the clause.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I will try and discuss the question—

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). If my. hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will give me privately a note of the suggestion he wishes to make I will consider it but we cannot go back to this clause now.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think it is your duty, Mr. Chairman, to keep order in this committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe). I rule that the hon. gentleman must move a reconsideration of the clause or else come back to clause 7 which is before the committee.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I was going to make a suggestion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Well, some hon. gentlemen may consider that very smart and indicative of some intelligence.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. I do not think it is very smart, but I do think that when the Chairman rules every hon. member of this House ought to bow to the ruling. The hon. gentleman who has just been speaking has refused to bow to the ruling and is persisting in going on. I therefore call him to order and unless he will move to reconsider this clause he has no right to discuss it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I deny the right of the hon. gentleman to say that I have disobeyed the ruling of the Chair. I do not propose to submit that statement being made by the hon. gentleman or anybody else in this House.

Mr. LENNOX. I will not withdraw it all the same.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). The trouble with hon. gentlemen opposite is that I have not had an opportunity of making the statement that I propose to the committee. Section 7 provides that the commission may carry on an inquiry at some suitable place in the city of Ottawa and that in their discretion they may carry on that inquiry elsewhere. The only suggestion I was going to make was that the commissioners should not have the power of compelling—

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has to sit down when I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is proceeding to discuss section 6.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I deny the right of the hon. gentleman to say so.

Mr. LENNOX. He says that is the section that he is referring to. The hon. gentleman has no right to discuss section 6 unless he moves to reconsider it. The hon.

gentleman has had a long experience in this House and he knows that what I say is correct. I insist upon the rule being carried out, that the hon. gentleman shall obey the ruling of the Chair and that he must move the reconsideration of this section or else say no more about it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe). So far the hon. member for Halifax has simply treated of the particular wording of clause 7 and until he transgresses I cannot rule that he is out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise again to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise again to a point of order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Chair.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman did speak of section 7 but he went on from section 7 and he said: Now, the suggestion I want to make in reference to this section—referring to section 62—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). 62 of what?

Mr. LENNOX. Section 62 of the Bill, as I understand. I have not the Bill before me.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There is no such section in the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. Referring to section 62 is what he said. I have not the Bill before me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not going to take up time unnecessarily, and I am not going to be howled down by anybody. I am referring to the point now before the committee, and I say that this hon. gentleman is persisting, in defiance of the ruling of the Chair, in discussing that clause as having been passed. I submit to you, Sir, that he shall not be allowed to do so unless he will move to reconsider that clause and discuss it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Chair, chair.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Chairman, I wish to call your attention to a very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe). The hon. gentleman for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has the floor.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I wish to call your attention to the fact that the mace is on the table, and to ask whether that is proper?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I do not think or believe for a moment that I was out of order, and if hon. gentlemen opposite had been good enough to listen to me just for a little longer I am sure that they would have concluded in their own minds that I was not out of order. The section before us is subsection 7, which states that inquiries under this Act shall take place in the city of Ottawa or, in the discretion of the commission, elsewhere. A previous clause of the Bill which has been passed gives the commission the power of compelling the attendance before them of certain witnesses. The amendment I wish to suggest is that the commission shall not have the power of compelling witnesses to attend before the convention except in the province where the witness resides. I would suggest further to the Minister of Finance that possibly it would be better to have that amendment in clause 5. That was the suggestion that I wished to make to the committee earlier in the evening, and I submit there never was a time when I was out of order. That amendment might fairly be placed in some section of the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes, I think the suggestion of my hon. friend might fairly be taken into consideration. I am quite willing to consider that, and before we conclude with the Bill I shall see whether or not it is acceptable and if acceptable it might be inserted in section 5. Prima facie it seems to be a good suggestion.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is there any provision for the payment of the fees of persons who are summoned to Ottawa?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think it is covered by section 5.

Mr. MACDONALD. That language is not sufficient to provide for the payment of witness fees, because the procedure under which parties can be summoned and attendance compelled must be prefaced by an arrangement for the payment of fees.

Mr. CURRIE. I should think that subsection 3 of section 8 would cover it. It refers to the salaries and actual and reasonable travelling expenses and all other expenses incidental to the carrying out of the provisions of the Act, and makes these expenses payable out of the appropriation by parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think subsection 2 of section 5 would cover it. It says:

> The commissioners shall have the same power to enforce the attendance of witnesses and compel them to give evidence as is vested in a court of record in civil cases.

Before you compel the attendance of a witness in a civil case you must tender him his witness fees.

Mr. MACDONALD. But you have a provision in the procedure relating to civil courts for the payment of witness fees and fixing what they shall be. Section 2 is not sufficient to provide for the payment of fees of persons who may be summoned to Ottawa.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I shall be glad to consider the point raised by my hon. friend. In the Railway Act there is a provision by which persons summoned to give evidence before the commissioners or any officer of it may in the discretion of the minister or of the Board of Railway Commissioners receive like allowances as if summoned before the Exchequer Court.

Mr. MACDONALD. That would be sufficient.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I shall consider the matter, and if the Bill as it stands is not sufficient to cover the point raised by my hon. friend I will introduce an amendment.

Mr. GERMAN. I hope it will be made clear that the commissioners should not compel gentlemen who are interested in business affairs, say in Hamilton or London, to come to Ottwaa simply on the payment of witness fees. The Minister of Finance is aware that men engaged in large business concerns cannot afford to come to Ottawa simply for the compensation represented by the fee of a witness. The commissioners should hold their meetings in the locality where the matter is to be inquired into. For instance, they might meet in Ottawa, or in London, or in Welland, or in Toronto, to take up any cases within those districts.

Mr. CURRIE. The Bill provides that the commissioners may in their discretion conduct their inquiries in whole or in part in any place in Canada, and they can go outside of Canada with the permission of the minister.

On section 8,

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There is a clause in the Bill which says that the inquiry shall be conducted in a summary manner; what is the meaning of that?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The idea is to get at the result expeditiously without the formalities attending the procedure of a court of justice. For instance, a police court is called a court of summary procedure.

Mr. MACDONALD. Whoever drafted this Bill for the minister must have taken some sections from other statutes and put them in piecemeal without any regard to whether they were apropos or not. The minister has very aptly likened the procedure described here to the procedure in a police court, and whether it is or is not a police court commission that is being instituted I do not know. To say it shall be disposed of in a summary manner is certainly very poor drafting and I don't think it carries out what the minister has in his mind.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend will find the description 'summary manner,' in many instances where it is intended to provide that the hearing it to be carried on without the formalities which cumber a court of record. The idea is that the commission will endeavour to get at the facts with as little formality as possible.

Mr. GERMAN. The word 'summary' is a well known legal term in Ontario.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Before we pass from the consideration of clause 8, I want to propose an amendment. This inquiry is for the purpose of ascertaining in what respect the tariff bears unjustly on certain industries. I presume it would be contended by certain interests that the tariff in certain cases, was too high, and by certain other interests that it was too low. In order to enable the commission to come to a correct and proper judgment as to whether the duties on particular commodities are sufficiently high to enable capital invested in them to earn dividends, it will be necessary to go into an inquiry outside probably of the inquiries we all have in our minds at the present time. We do know that in the last two years a great many companies have become reorganized, amalgamated and combined with other companies, and in the process of this reorganization, they have increased their capital to a very large degree; they have issued bonds and preferred stock and common stock to an extent which would appear to us to be altogether out of proportion to the amount of capital necessary to be invested in that particular industry. The amount of capital in a company has to do with the amount of earning power which that company possesses and the proportion of dividends that is divided from year to year among the stockholders. If the capitalization is large, the earning capacity relatively will be small. Owing to the enlargement of these companies, the presidents and directors vote themselves larger salaries than in the past. This has a bearing upon the dividends. In order that all the facts and circumstances may be before the commission before they report to the minister, I think it would be necessary to add an amendment. I propose to add to section 5, the following subsection:

Whenever application is made on behalf of a manufacturing company for higher duties the commission shall investigate the capitalization of the company and all salaries paid to the president, directors and managers and the wages paid to their employees.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The question of capitalization of companies is a large one, and its investigation may have several objects. One object may be to ascertain whether over-capitalization affects in any way the cost of production. There might also be an investigation to see whether it affects the banking of the country generally, or if it affects the credit of our country or of our industrial institutions abroad and so on. Only one section is to be investigated by this commission, their only object is to ascertain how far, if at all, over-capitalization affects the cost of production or affects any matter that concerns the tariff. That is to say, under the Bill, as it stands, particularly having reference to subsection 4, the commission has full power to investigate over-capitalization or capitalization providing they are investigating it only for the purpose of ascertaining cost of production or such a subject as comes within the review of this Act. They have no power to investigate over-capitalization in so far as it affects such other objects as I have mentioned. This Bill already clothes the commission with all powers requisite for this purpose and requires no amendment.

Mr. KYTE. I quite understand the provision of the Bill limiting inquiry with respect to the subject to be dealt with by the commission, but I desire to enable the commission to have all the facts before it, particularly when a certain industry claims that it has not sufficient protection to enable it to earn dividends. The question of capitalization is a very pertinent one and ought to be considered in connection with this matter. The wages paid to their employees and the salaries paid to their directors all add to the cost of carrying on an industry, and if they are unnecessarily high there is no reason why the capital invested in that industry should make that an excuse to have further protection to enable them to earn greater dividends.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). It was clearly shown this afternoon that all these questions could be investigated and would be investigated by the commission in ascertaining the cost of production, as these are all factors entering into cost. It is not necessary to particularize in the statute, the Bill itself covers all those points and many others.

Mr. KYTE. To what section of the Bill does the minister refer?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Section 4.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). I raised this question this afternoon and was anxious to meet the objection met by the amendment now proposed. It was only on the assurance of the Minister of Finance that the Bill as drafted covered that point, that I accepted the Bill without the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment will be important if the Bill already did not cover the point. It is well that this commission should have power to investigate all these things in regard to capitalization, bonds, etc., but as the commission has that power according to the minister the amendment is not necessary.

Mr. CURRIE. As I understand that amendment covers clause 4 and should have been moved there. I ask your ruling if the hon. gentleman's motion is in order at this stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. minister is proposing to add a subsection to section 5. We are now on the last subclause of clause 5, and the hon. member is perfectly in order in moving it at this stage.

Mr. GERMAN. I am opposed to the amendment, and I am opposed to the proposition of the Minister of Finance, when section 4 gives to this commission as wide a scope of investigation as he describes.

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I move to add as subsection 9 of section 5:

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

It is the same subsection as was moved by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), excepting that it does not conflict with subsection 6. I think the Minister ought to adopt this subsection, because there really cannot be any objection why the evidence which is not confidential should not be put in the possession of the members of this House at the earliest date possible after parliament meets.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I would be very glad indeed to take the matter under advisement if the hon. gentleman will allow the matter to stand.

Mr. McKENZIE. If ten days is too short a period the time can be extended.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I will consider the matter carefully.

On section 7,

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I would suggest that the following be inserted after the word 'enquiries' on line 25 of subsection 2.:

And may employ shorthand reporters.

The commission will need to employ shorthand reporters to take the evidence whereever it may be sitting.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would point out to the minister that from my reading of the Act the staff should come under the provisions of the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1908.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The employment given under this Act may be of a very limited character. The commission will have to employ different classes of men, and offhand I do not think it would be wise to put them under the Civil Service Act. The check upon employment is of course the Governor in Council.

Mr. NESBITT. And the reporters may only be employed for a short time.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 8—salaries of commissioners,

Mr. PUGSLEY. Are these not pretty high salaries, $7,500 for the chairman, and $7,000 for each of the commissioners, in addition to all travelling expenses? The Minister of Finance and his colleagues have to serve the country for a salary of $7,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. Look at the honour they enjoy though.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The judges of the Superior courts of the country get I think $6,000. That is the limit, in the smaller provinces. In New Brunswick $6,000 is the salary of a pusine judge of the highest court in the province. The salary of the chief justice is $7,000. Now, it is proposed to pay the chairman of this commission a salary of $7,500, and the commissioners $7,000 each. Although the tendency of late is to give pretty good salaries to commissioners, I am inclined to think that this goes a little too far in that direction. In this country $7,000 is a very good salary. In the public departments there are men in very high positions receiving $3,000 and $4,000 a year, men who have been in the service a long time, who are charged with great responsibilities and have the control of the expenditure of vast sums of money. The deputy ministers receive only $5,000, and they hold positions of the very greatest responsibility. It may be that some more liberal allowance should be made to the public officials, but up to the present time, we have not gone far in the direction of paying high salaries to anybody but commissioners. In this case it is proposed to follow that line and give very liberal salaries to these commissioners. I think it only fair to compare this with what public officials are receiving. The chairman of the managing board of the Interconial railway receives only $6,000. And he must be a man of experience, of good judgment, and of the very highest technical knowledge.

Mr. CURRIE. Under subsection 3 the matter of witness fees was brought up. I suggest that an amendment be made there and that the subsection be made to read:

All salaries and actual and reasonable travelling expenses, witness fees, and all other expenses incidental to the carrying out of the provisions of this Act shall be payable out of any appropriation granted to His Majesty by parliament to defray the same.

The addition there, is the words 'witness fees.' This insures that these fees shall be payable out of the appropriation.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I will consider that suggestion of my hon. friend when considering that of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald).

Mr. McKENZIE. If anything is to be governed by regulations surely this should be.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That might be. I will consider the suggestion. Now. with regard to what my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has said: I believe that no commission that has been appointed by the government, not even the Railway Commission, will be charged with more important duties than the Tariff Commission, a very high order of intelligence and special aptitude will be required for this work. And when we consider the scale of remuneration in recent years, the salaries paid to men in the world of business and finance and in professional life now as compared with a few years ago. I think my hon. friend will agree that $7,500 for the chairman, and $7,000 for the commissioners are not high salaries, provided we get the right men for this important work. In the Railway Commission the chairman who is a very exceptional man and occupies a very exceptional position, and who must be a lawyer of high attainments, receives $10,000 a year. That is a very small salary for him. The other members of the board. I understand receive $8.000. The salaries of the Tariff Commissioners are placed below these figures, and I think they should be placed below, although this work is fully as important as, or even of more importance than, that of the Railway Commission. It must be borne in mind also that when you ask a man to take a position on this commission, or in fact, on any other commission, if he is a man in active business you interrupt the business in which he is engaged, and unless you compensate him reasonably well the offer will not appeal to him.

Mr. NESBITT. He has to devote his whole time to the work.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Yes, that is provided for in the Bill. Take men of high ability and with the good judgment and knowledge required for the position, and I submit to the judgment of the House that the salaries fixed are reasonable. To be frank, I have been afraid we should not be able to obtain the class of ability I would like to obtain at the salaries fixed. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the salaries of members of the Cabinet. I think it is clearly understood. and the hon. gentleman would probably be the first to concede. that these salaries are probably the least consideration with those who take these responsible positions and give their time to these duties.

Mr. McKENZIE. What is the main one?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think it is the public service. If not, you reduce the position merely to a seven thousand dollar position. I should not like to believe that the ministers have that principally in mind. The hon. gentleman referred also to the civil service. Since coming to Ottawa I have been impressed with the very high class of men whom you have in the civil service who are not paid nearly enough, such men as the chief engineer and other engineers. I am assuming that the men occupying these responsible positions have the ability to fill them, as I believe they have. Those who have been longer in Ottawa than myself can pronounce upon that point better than I can. But some of these exceptionally able men have salaries out of all keeping with the importance of the positions they fill. That is a condition which in time may be remedied. Of course, there may be men in such positions who are overpaid, not having the ability to fill these positions properly. One difficulty of the civil service is that it standardizes positions, as it were, and brings men to a common level. Of course, there is greater certainty in their employment, and they have a pension to look forward to, and so their future is taken care of, and they have a fixity of position that does not apply outside. But, after all that is said, I have no hesitation in expressing my own opinion that the ablest men in the civil service occupying these high positions are not well enough paid. Of course, I am not speaking for the government, but give what has struck me in my own observation and express my own opinion.

Mr. OLIVER. I just want to put in my earnest protest against the amount that is being paid in these salaries. In my judgment, there is no warrant, in the statement of the duties of these gentlemen, for the payment of this salary. The idea that men whose business it is simply to make the inquiry into industrial or commercial conditions, should be entitled to the same compensation as members of this government, or members of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, or of the Railway Com-Commission, does not appeal to me at all. I certainly think that the salary of $7,000 each, proposed to be paid to the commissioners, who are not required to perform administrative functions nor yet judicial functions, but simply the functions of investigators, is out of all proportion to the duties they will be called upon to perform. If the civil service is underpaid, that is no reason why such a startling exception should be made in the case of these gentlemen, who certainly cannot claim any higher rank, or sustain any more necessary qualifications for the work they have to do, than the gentlemen who are in the higher positions in the civil service. If we can properly administer an expenditure of $60,000,000 within two years, under the control of one man, who draws a salary, I think, of $10,000, then I must protest that a proposed payment of $24,500 to secure the collection of information such as suggested in this Bill, is absolutely out of proportion. To say that these gentlemen have duties that require greater abilities or experience than a deputy minister of this government, has no foundation in fact. These extraordinary salaries give this proposition the appearance of being a gross political job.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think these gentlemen will find it very irksome business to keep tab on all their expenses from time to time. It seems to me, it would be better to give them a sufficient salary to cover once for all their travelling expenses.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think that would be impossible. We do not know how much a man will spend in travelling. In cases of this kind, travelling expenses cannot be foreseen.

On section 10, franking privilege.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I move that this section be omitted. The Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) has a strong objection to extending the franking privilege to every one who may have correspondence with this commission. He thinks that the Post Office Department should stand on its own basis, and I am disposed to agree with him. It seems hardly fair that the post office should be deprived of the revenue that it needs, to carry on its business.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The franking privilege may properly be extended in respect of letters which are sent by the commissioners from Ottawa; and don't you think that those who have business with the commission, who want to make complaints, should be allowed to write to them free of postage, as is done in every other public department?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) It is extraordinary how few people avail themselves of the franking privilege. I think a very large percentage of those who write to the departments, put a stamp on their letters for fear they will miscarry. The amount being so small, there is no hardship upon the people who desire to make communications to the commission, in asking them to pay the postage.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT.—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my right hon. friend tell us what business will be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN. We will take up government Bills.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Any particular one?

Mr. BORDEN. We will take up as many as possible—I think Item 25 which would have been taken up to-day except for the absence of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux).

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the Bill to amend the Civil Service Act?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes. We will probably take up Order Number 21, Bill (No. 77), and I would hope that we may be able to take up Order Number 3, Bill (No. 97), and possibly the second reading of Bill (No. 100); after that, Supply, the estimates of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. OLIVER. The Grain Act will not be taken up?

Mr. BORDEN. I understand the Grain Act is not coming up to-morrow, but it is to come up on Monday, I think.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Might I suggest that Friday would be rather an unfavourable day upon which to take into consideration the Highway Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. Why?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). There is usually a very small House.

Mr. BORDEN. The Highway Bill is not responsible for that.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I know, but it is rather an important Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 23, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

The report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, part 1.—Mr. Foster (North Toronto).

GRAIN ACT.—NOTICE OF AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I beg to give notice that on Monday next when the House goes into Committee of the Whole on the Grain Bill I shall move the following amendment:

Clause 57 is amended by adding the following as subsection 2 thereof:—

2. Notwithstanding any other provisions in this Act that may conflict therewith, sample markets may be established in the cities of Winnipeg, Fort William and Calgary, and the mixing of grain permitted in connection therewith, under such rules and regulations as shall be recommended by the board and approved by the Governor in Council.

3. The provisions of section 208, with the exception of subsection 3 thereof, shall apply to sample markets when established.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 112) for the relief of James Denny.—Mr. Aikins.

YUKON TERRITORY JUDGES.

Mr. DOHERTY moved that on Monday next the House do go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the payment to each of two judges of the Territorial Court of the Yukon Territory of an annuity equal to the salary of the office now held by him; such annuity to commence upon the resignation of such judge.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA BOUNDARY EXTENSION.

On the orders of the day being called.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, from the papers brought down yesterday concerning the boundaries of Manitoba, one despatch has been omitted. Mr. Roblin in a letter to the Prime Minister says that he is forwarding through the regular channels to His Excellency the Governor General in Council a memorial regarding the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba and the terms and conditions on which such extension shall be made. This memorial is not to be found among the papers.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I think it will be found in the other return.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I think not; I cannot find it.

Mr. BORDEN. I recollect seeing it, I think it is just a reprint of a memorial previously forwarded, I shall send for it at once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to the resolution itself, I observe in the papers brought down yesterday another communication of the Prime Minister to Mr. Roblin, Premier of Manitoba, in which it is said:

> The extension of the boundaries of Manitoba has been under consideration at those interviews and a basis of settlement has been reached respecting the financial terms which hitherto have been in dispute. The basis adopts the principle of equality of terms as between Manitoba and the other Prairie provinces. The application of this principle to the details remains to be worked out.

I notice in the resolutions which have been introduced and are now before the House for consideration, it is proposed to allow to the province of Manitoba a sum equal to the interest on $7,631,683.85, the difference between a principal sum of $8,107,500 and $475,816.15 heretofore advanced by the government to the province for provincial purposes.

This, I suppose, is what was referred to by my right hon. friend when he wrote to Mr. Roblin that the details were to be worked out. I presume the details have been worked out and are in tabular form. It would facilitate the discussion if these details were brought down in advance. The same thing would apply to the other paragraph of the resolution with regard to the money in lieu of land.

It is proposed to pay to Manitoba an annual sum based upon the population of the said province as ascertained by each quinquennial census thereof, less certain deductions in respect of what are known as swamp lands and university lands. It would also facilitate the discussion if the acreage of swamp lands that has been disposed of in favour of Manitoba, or that is intended to be disposed of, should be brought down.

Mr. BORDEN. There is no objection to that, the statement will be prepared.

THIRD READING

Bill (No. 60) to amend the Civil Service Act.—Mr. Borden.

HARBOUR COMMISSION OF MONTREAL.

Bill (No. 97) to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—Mr. Hazen, read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT—AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE.

House went into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to amend 'the Civil Service Act' by providing for the employment in the office of the Auditor General, for a period not exceeding two years, of such temporary clerks as may be necessary in connection with the audit and payment of fees and expenses under the Dominion Elections Act.—Mr. White (Leeds).

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Leeds). I am not sure that any explanation is required in connection with this resolution. Action is made necessary by a difficulty experienced by the Auditor General, because of the amendment to the Civil Service Act. Prior to 1908, temporary clerks could be appointed by order in council for a period not exceeding six months, and the appointments could be renewed for six-monthly periods indefinitely. But under the amended Act, these temporary clerks can hold office for only six months in any fiscal year. Very heavy duties devolve upon the Auditor General in auditing the election accounts, and six months is altogether too brief a period for the proper performance of these duties. The work is such that trained temporary clerks are necessary. As the law now stands, the Auditor General trains clerks for a period of a month or so, and about the time they reach their maximum of usefulness he is obliged to dispense with their services. He advises me that he discussed this matter with the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when leader of the government. That being so, I assume that there is no objection to the passing of this amendment. The Auditor General has only twenty of these clerks, but they are trained; and after six months the number will diminish. From the investigation I have made I believe that, if not absolutely necessary, at least it is highly desirable that this amendment should be made in order that the Auditor General may efficiently perform this part of his duty. I have figures here showing the amount of work, and other documents bearing on the subject, but I think it is not necessary to present them unless objection is taken.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I remember discussing the matter with the Auditor General. I understood that it involved nothing more than the employment of those already engaged; it does not involve new appointments.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That is all.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK.

Hon. F. D. MONK (Minister of Public Works) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 111) to authorize the payment of a subsidy to the Collingwood Ship Building Company, Limited. He said: At the time the resolution was introduced upon which this Bill is founded, I gave a full explanation of the circumstances. It was a subsidy applied for and worked out under the Subsidy Act of 1908. The work was begun and an agreement was to be signed, when the Act of 1910 doing away with the Act of 1908 was passed. This subsidy conforms absolutely to the conditions of the Act of 1910, except as to the depth of water on the sill. The Act of 1910 requires, in dry docks of this description, a depth of 18 feet on the sill. This dock has a depth of only 16 feet. In every other respect the proceedings are absolutely in conformity with the Act of 1908. It was deemed necessary by my predecessor in office to ask parliament to legalize the change, but there was no time during that session to do so. Hence this Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On looking over the matter carefully, I think this legislation will be necessary in order to carry out the agreement. I think that in the agreement made by the company a clause was inserted providing for legislation. The dry dock referred to by my hon. friend is in some respects better than the dry docks provided for under the Subsidies Act of 1910. This is a wider, and in many respects a more expensive dry dock. But in the one particular, as my hon. friend says, the depth of water over the mitre sill, it does not comply with the legislation. I think this is very proper.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

THE IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHWAYS.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Before we proceed to the consideration of this Bill I will have to ask your ruling on the objection I raise that the Bill is not in order. It contravenes article 54 of the British North America Act, and rule 77 of our own rules, inasmuch as it is a money Bill to all intents and purposes. I have to call your attention to section 3 of the Bill which is in these terms:

> The Governor in Council may, in any year, and upon such terms and subject to such conditions as are prescribed by order in council, grant to any province in aid of the improvment of existing highways or the construction of new highways in such province, or for both such purposes, a subsidy not exceeding such sum as may in such year be voted by parliament for that purpose.

The only answer which can be made to the objection I now raise is that the Bill does not actually dispose of money. The money which it is intended to dispose of in this Bill is to be appropriated later on; the appropriation is to be carried out later on. But the purposes for which the appropriation is made are now disclosed. I have also to call your attention to article 54 of the British North America Act, which makes my point very clear, that this Bill cannot be considered at this stage. In article 54 I find these words:

> It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of this public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is proposed.

I call your attention to these words:

> To any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is proposed.

The purpose now indicated in the Bill is the disposition of money which it is proposed to vote later on. But according to my reading of article 54, that very purpose must first be preceded by a recommendation to the House by message of the Governor General. Later on it is indicated that an appropriation will be asked for from parliament for a certain purpose, that is to say, to aid in the building of highways. But that purpose, according to my reading of section 54, must be first considered by resolution upon a message from the Governor General. As I said a moment ago, the only question which can be raised is as to whether there is an actual disposition of money and I have to call your attention to the fact that according to the jurisprudence of the House upon section 54 the rule applies not only to moneys which are actually voted but to all Bills which involve an expenditure of money. You will find the explanation and authority in 'Bourinot,' page 568:

The constitutional provision which regulates the procedure of the Canadian House of Commons in this respect applies not only to motions directly proposing a grant of public money, but also to those which involve such a grant.

Well, Sir, this rule applies particularly to this case. It is quite true that the Bill at the present time does not actually propose a grant of money, but it involves such a grant of money, because it is intended to make disposition of the money which it is proposed to ask for later on. Bourinot goes on to say:

A member who has not received the permission of the Crown has not been allowed to move the House into committee on a resolution providing for the purchase and exportation by the government of certain depreciated silver coinage.

Then he goes on to give another illustration of it, and I would call your particular attention to this:

In 1871 it was proposed to go into committee on an address to the Queen for a change in the Union Act, so as to assign the debt of old Canada to the Dominion entirely, and to compensate Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in connection therewith; the Speaker expressed the opinion adverse to the proposal on the ground that it was intended as preliminary to legislation imposing a public burthen, and was consequently not a mere abstract resolution which did not necessarily involve a future grant.

This decision of Mr. Speaker Cockburn is to be found in a book which we have in the library entitled 'Decisions of the Speakers of the Legislative Assembly and House of Commons of Canada,' No. 181. On the 6th March, 1871, Mr. Dorion moved as follows:

That this House will, on Wednesday next, resolve itself into a committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1st. That the division between the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec, of the surplus of the debt of the former province of Canada, over and above the sum of $62,500,000, assigned to the Dominion of Canada by the British North America Act, presents great difficulties, which it has not hitherto been possible to overcome in a satisfactory manner.

2nd. That the difficulties, resulting as well from the uncertainty as to the amount of the debt to be divided, as from the absence of an acceptable base for the making of such division, and that of the assets remaining in common to those two provinces, threaten to give rise to serious embarrassment.

3rd. That for the avoidance of such difficulties, the debt of the former province of Canada should be assigned entirely to the Dominion, as though it had been so from the first, with compensation to the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia for the share which those provinces would have to pay upon the surplus of that debt.

4th. That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her to be pleased to recommend that the British North America Act, should be amended in accordance with these resolutions.

There was no disposition of actual money in that resolution; it was simply that an address be presented to Her Majesty praying for an amendment to the Act so that the parliament of Canada could make a disposition of money as between these different provinces. Objection was taken by Sir George Cartier:

That the resolution cannot, under the provisions of the 54th section of the British North America Act, 1867, be considered by the House, unless recommended by message from the Crown.

Mr. Speaker decided as follows:

The motion proposes that an address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her to recommend that the British North America Act be amended, so that the public debt of the Dominion be increased, and that compensation be made to the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

In my opinion this motion cannot be entertained, it being in contravention of the 54th section of the Imperial Act for the Union of British North America. In that section it is provided that this House shall not adopt any vote, resolution, address, or Bill, for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, &c., &c., to any purpose that has not been first recommended by message of the Governor General. The contention——

On the part of the mover, presumably,

—is that the proposed appropriation being beyond the power of the parliament of Canada, this provision of the statute cannot therefore apply.

If any answer is made to my objection this will be the answer:

The contention is, that the proposed appropriation being beyond the power of the parliament of Canada, this provision in the statute cannot therefore apply.

Mr. Speaker Cockburn went on as follows:

In its literal construction it does apply to the motion, and certainly it seems to me to the full as necessary in a constitutional sense, to interpose the check of a message from His Excellency, under the responsibility of his ministerial advisers, before adopting an address which may be followed by legislation, imposing a burthen on the people by a parliament and ministers, owing it no responsibility, as in the case of a Bill or motion for the appropriation of money within our direct control.

The same question came before the House again a few days after in a different form. Mr. Dorion again brought the matter to the attention of the House, by moving as follows:

That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, representing that an equitable and satisfactory division of the surplus debt of the late province of Canada, between the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, is not likely to be effected in the manner provided by the British North America Act, 1867, and that the difficulties which beset the question have been greatly aggravated by the award rendered by the arbitrators appointed by the Dominion government and by the government of Ontario, in the absence of any arbitrator for the province of Quebec, which is regarded by the government and the people of Quebec as illegal and unjust, and praying that Her Majesty be pleased to recommend the passing of an Act by the imperial parliament, so amending the British North America Act as to authorize the parliament of Canada to deal by legislative enactment with all questions connected with the said surplus debt.

That was simply an abstract question, and it was met by Sir George Cartier with the following amendment:

That all the words after 'that', in the original motion, be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—'The validity of the award rendered by the arbitrators appointed by the Dominion government and by the government of Ontario in the absence of any arbitrator for the province of Quebec, being contested by the province of Quebec; and the government of Canada having come to the conclusion not to act on such award until its validity shall have been determined by a competent judicial tribunal, this House refrains from expressing an opinion on the award so rendered.

Mr. Chaveau moved in amendment to the amendment that:

It is highly desirable that the difficulty now existing between the provinces of Quebec and Ontario concerning the divisions and adjustments of the debentures, liabilities, credits, properties and assets of Upper and Lower Canada, provided for by the British North America Act, be speedily set at rest, and that this House will give its most favourable consideration to any measure to be introduced by the government, having this object in view, and involving any aid on the part of the Dominion commensurate with the importance of the object itself, and with our resources; due regard being had to the rights of the other provinces.

I would specially call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the effect of this amendment:

That this House will give its most favourable consideration to any measure to be introduced by the government, having this object in view, and involving any aid on the part of the Dominion commensurate with the importance of the object itself, and with our resources.

There was nothing there to bind the House. It was simply a proposition that this House would give its most favourable consideration to the object which would be a charge upon the public revenue. Objection was taken by Mr. Mills and the objection was sustained. That was on the 9th of March. On the 13th of March, Mr. Speaker Cockburn made the following statement to the House:

I observe that it is entered on the Journal of the 9th March, that upon objection taken by the honourable member for Bothwell, the motion of the honourable member for Quebec county was declared out of order for the reason there alleged.

I desire to correct that entry. The motion was out of order, in my opinion, not because it proposed an appropriation of public money, within the meaning of the 54th section of the British North America Act, and should have been preceded by message, but because it involved an increase of the public debt, and should, therefore, have been first considered in Committee of the Whole.

I am aware that it is doubted whether it is a correct rule of parliamentary practice, that every abstract proposition which, if acted on, would increase the public debt of the country, should be first considered in committee, but my opinion on the point has been expressed on two or three occasions, and I shall so continue to decide, unless the House should think proper to express a contrary opinion. This rule, however, being self-imposed, may be enforced or relaxed, as the House shall determine. But the constitutional rule, contained in the 54th section of the Imperial Act, is one that, being absolutely binding, should be neither extended nor restrained by implication but should, at all times, be most guardedly considered by the House. I desire, therefore, to correct the error on the 'Journal', so that the precedent shall not be understood as having any relation to the 54th clause of the Constitutional Act, 1867.

What is most remarkable about this, is that the opinion of Mr. Speaker Cockburn on that occasion was ordered to be printed in the Journals of the House, and it was, therefore, incorporated as a rule of the House, which has not since been repealed, and which is at present the law of this House. In my humble opinion, the case seems clear that the present Bill, although it does not actually appropriate money, is the first step towards the appropriation of money, involving therefore, the appropriation of money and is consequently quite within the rule as interpreted by the Speakers who have been your predecessors in office, Sir. I have only to add that this objection is not made in any captious spirit, but it has a purpose behind it, and a very important one. The Bill that is now before us, proposes a wide departure from what has been hitherto our constitutional law. It proposes to extend to the building of new roads or the improvement of old roads, moneys out of the federal treasury, and which roads have hitherto been under the charge of the respective provinces. I do not say that I am against this legislation; on the contrary, I think, under

the circumstances of our buoyant revenue, this legislation may be wise, but we have certainly the right to take exception to the manner in which it is proposed. It proposes to give to the Governor in Council all moneys that may be appropriated, without any regard to the future action of parliament, and to bind ourselves in advance without any rule to be followed, but simply the intention or the action of the government of the day. If we are to discuss this Bill, and vote appropriations of this kind, the time when we should dispose of the manner in which the money is to be expended, is when the money is appropriated, and therefore, it should be first of all, introduced by resolution, when any objections which may properly be urged against the legislation should be urged. All the conditions which are to be attached to the expenditure of that money, should be set forth at the time the principle of the Bill is being discussed. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I invite your ruling upon the objection I have raised, for the reasons I have given.

Mr. BORDEN. We have no fault whatever to find with the right hon. gentleman for raising the question which is always an important one to consider in connection with the introduction of Bills. The very language of the British North America Act, which he has read, shows that there is no ground whatever for the objection my right hon. friend has made. Section 54 of the British North America Act reads:—

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address, or Bill is proposed.

I venture to submit that this Bill is not within the meaning of that section. It does not appropriate any part of the public revenue, it does not appropriate one dollar of the public revenue for any such purpose. It merely does this: It provides that if parliament shall at any future time appropriate a certain sum of money for that particular purpose, then that money shall be expended by the Governor General in Council under the provisions of this Bill, according to the method now laid down in the Bill before the House. The provisions of the Bill are perfectly simple and plain and not to be misunderstood.

The Governor General in Council may in any year and upon such terms and subject to such conditions as are prescribed by order in council grant to any province in aid of improvement of existing highways or the construction of new highways in such province, or for both such purposes, a subsidy not exceeding such sum as may in each year be voted by parliament for that purpose.

Therefore, it is apparent that before one dollar of public money can be expended under the provisions of this Bill, a resolution must be brought down in parliament, assented to by His Royal Highness the Governor General, considered in Committee of the Whole, and be the foundation of a Bill which will alone justify any expenditure under this Act. When I have said that, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I have said all that is necessary to be said upon this subject. Not one dollar can be expended under this Bill until a resolution has been brought down in the House of Commons, passed through Committee of the Whole, and until it has also passed through all the stages of a money Bill in this House and in the Senate. Therefore, to suggest, as the right hon. gentleman has done, that this is a Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenues, seems to me to be entirely a misstatement of the case. The simple answer to it is, that without this Bill, if an appropriation were presented to this House, passed through Committee of the Whole and embodied in an Act of this parliament, the Governor General in Council would be left without any machinery whatever for the expenditure of that money. This Bill is solely designed to furnish machinery for the expenditure of a certain sum of money which may or may not be voted by parliament for that purpose. There is no question of the appropriation of one dollar of the public revenue of this country for this purpose until an appropriation Bill has been brought in founded upon a resolution which shall conform to section 54 of the British North America Act.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that when this Bill was introduced I took advice, as it seemed to me to be the kind of Bill that it was contemplated should be introduced by resolution under section 54 of the British North America Act which says:

54. It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by a message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address, or Bill is proposed.

Bourinot goes further and refers to a Bill which 'involves' the expenditure of money but no authority for that is found in that clause of the British North America Act. My attention was drawn to the fact that this Bill did not come within that class of Bills, for the reason that the clause which refers to the money says:

The Governor in Council may, in any year, and upon such terms and subject to such

conditions as are prescribed by order in council, grant to any province in aid of the improvement of existing highways or the construction of new highways in such province, or for both such purposes, a subsidy not exceeding such sum as may in such year be voted by parliament for that purpose.

My attention was drawn to the fact that when parliament could vote any money for that purpose, the resolution must pass through the usual course required for all money resolutions or Bills; it must first be founded on a resolution, and it must afterwards be considered by a committee of the House, and then pass the House in the form of a Supply Bill. That in my judgment seems to be ample guarantee for the House that it would have the full consideration that all money Bills have, and therefore I thought it unnecessary at the time that it should be introduced by a resolution. That was my opinion then, whether it was correct or not, and I still hold the same opinion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is nothing more to be said on this point, and I shall now proceed to the consideration of the Bill itself. We had an explanation of this measure on the first reading. The Bill is a short one, and, as my hon. friend himself stated in introducing it, is rather meagre. It disposes, in a manner which I think it not in accordance with true constitutional principles, of the money to be expended, by giving the control of it absolutely to the Governor in Council without any guidance as to the manner in which the expenditure should be made. The Bill contains only six clauses. The first is the title. The second is the definition of the word 'Minister'. The third provides:

The Governor in Council may, in any year, and upon such terms and subject to such conditions as are prescribed by order in council, grant to any province in aid of the improvement of existing highways, or the construction of new highways in such province, or for both such purposes, a subsidy not exceeding such sum as may in such year be voted by parliament for that purpose.

The fourth section provides simply that the specifications for the improvement and construction of highways are to be contained in an agreement between the minister and the government of the province, and are to be approved by the Governor in Council before the money is expended. The fifth section provides:

Each highway to be constructed or improved shall be defined or described in such agreement, and provision may be made therein for the future maintenance of such highway in good condition according to a specified standard and to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council.

These are all the dispositions of the Bill. Under this Bill, if it were to pass as it is, the Governor in Council would be given the most extraordinary powers. We on this side of the House have no exception to take to this new departure for the purpose of aiding in the construction of highways out of the federal treasury. This has not been the practice hitherto, but in the affluent condition of the treasury today, it may not perhaps be unwise that we should apply money in that direction. Moreover, the demand for highways is today more acute than it ever was before, and if it is intended to build new highways of a certain standard and to assist the various provinces in that respect, for my part I see no objection. The only exception I have to take to this Bill is that any such exception should be made upon some rule provided for in the Bill, and should not be left to the whim or caprice or favour of the government of the day. If this Bill passes in its present form, any appropriations for this purpose can be devoted to one or two or three provinces, according as the ministry of the day may determine. In a matter of this kind there should be a principle of equity and equality applied as between provinces. What is to be the line that is to determine how the money shall be expended? Shall the larger provinces of Ontario and Quebec be taxed for the benefit of the smaller provinces, or shall the new and younger provinces be taxed to enrich the already richer provinces? Shall the whole matter be left to the ministry of the day without any rule of guidance? I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will recognize that the Bill in its present shape is altogether undesirable and goes to the verge of unconstitutionality if it be not altogether unconstitutional. I submit that any expenditure of this kind should be regulated by some principle. Now, what shall that principle be? For my part, I submit that the only principle for the expenditure of such money is the principle to be found in the British North America Act, which in section 118 provides that the moneys paid out of the treasury to the various provinces shall be according to population. This provision was amended subsequently, complaint having been made that the allowances to the provinces were based simply upon the census of 1861. There were several conferences of the provinces, first in Quebec and then in Ottawa, commencing in 1887, all protesting that the allowances made to the provinces were not made on the principle of population, but on the population as it was in 1861.

It was felt and contended with great force that the allowance should be regulated on the principle of population, not on the fixed population of 1861, but on the moving population as determined by each census. There were several conferences of the provinces, they all joined

unanimously in asking that the principle should be amended so that the allowance should be made on the scale of moving population as determined by each census, In 1907 this House unanimously adopted this view, amended article 118, and provided that thenceforward the allowances to the provinces out of the treasury should be in accordance with the population as determined by each census. This seemed to me the most regular and the fairer way of approaching the subject. I do not presume that any man in this House will find fault with me if I say that there should be some principle to regulate these appropriations and I do not believe that any fairer principle can be found than that of population. If anythink fairer can be devised I would be willing to consider it, but after giving the matter the best consideration I could, I did not find anything fairer than the principle of population. The great province of Ontario would be the largest beneficiary out of this appropriation. Nobody can find fault with that because if the province of Ontario is the wealthiest of the provinces it is also the province which has the largest charges to maintain. The province of Quebec would come next. This would also be natural because the province of Quebec has also large charges on her treasury. Therefore, I submit that this House should adopt the basis of population in making these grants and that the appropriation should not be left to the arbitrary disposition of those who for the time being happen to be the advisers of the Crown. Therefore, I beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read, but that it be resolved that while the House is favourable to the granting of federal assistance towards the construction of permanent roads it is of opinion that such aid should be given to the governments of the provinces for such purposes, and should be granted on a fixed basis similar to that now prescribed by the British North America Act and amendments thereto for subsidies to the provinces.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) professes warm sympathy with the purposes of this Bill, but he adopts a very peculiar way of indicating it. He meets the Bill with an objection which was made at the first reading and answered at the time. Unless his memory is very short indeed he did know that the question as to the allotment of any moneys to be voted by parliament was raised on the first reading of the Bill by himself and an answer was given at that time by the minister in charge of the Bill, the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane),

who said that the distribution of this money among the different provinces was to be on the basis of population or to use the phrase he then used: On the same basis as that on which the subsidies are granted to the provinces. My right hon. friend seems to have doubt on that question now, notwithstanding that assurance. Let me say to him that that doubt is unnecessary.

This is not a government which proposes to deal upon the principle of warm sympathy and cold justice, which actuated hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. When these subsidies are brought down we propose to vote a specific amount for each province which cannot be appropriated to any other province, and we propose to proceed on the basis of population or amount of subsidy. So far as I understand, that will amount to the same thing. My right hon. friend also says that this Bill gives extraordinary powers to the Governor General in Council. In that he is mistaken again. This Bill was introduced by my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways and Canals, who in framing it, adopted the analogy of at least half-a-dozen Acts introduced by the right hon. gentleman or his government. I refer to the Bills providing for railway subsidies. It is impossible in a Bill of this kind to indicate particular highways, because the province in each instance must be consulted in regard to that. Provision is made for consultation and co-operation with them. But apart from that, the safeguards which have been introduced in this Bill by the Minister of Railways and Canals, with regard to the character of the highway, and the expenditures of this money upon permanent work and upon work that will bring the highway up to a particular standard, have all been taken from the Bills providing for subsidies to railways, and according to the very lines of these measures which have been introduced not only by the late administration, but by previous administrations.

I do not know that there is very much else in what my right hon. friend has said that deserves consideration. I do not propose to reserve to the Governor General in Council, power to determine what amount shall go to one province or another. When the estimates which are necessary before one dollar can be paid over in aid of the construction or improvement of a highway are introduced it will be found that they provide for a particular amount to each province and that those amounts will be regulated according to the principle mentioned by the Minister of Railways when he introduced the Bill.

My right hon. friend speaks of the importance of highways. They are very important indeed, and it is for that reason that this proposal has been made in order that

provinces with limited revenues may thus be enabled to keep up the standard of their highways, and that that standard may be improved from time to time, by means of this grant from the federal exchequer of Canada. I think that is a very worthy purpose.

I do not claim that this Bill is a perfect Bill. It has been prepared in the hurry of a session, by a government which had to meet parliament within five weeks after it assumed office, and the Minister of Railways and Canals, who introduced the measure, stated that it was introduced as the best method of dealing with this matter that could be devised by the government in the short time at their disposal for its consideration. It is very likely that in the next, or the following session, a more elaborate measure may be introduced, but it is considered desirable by the government that no time should be lost in implementing the pledge made by the Liberal-Conservative party in the last elections, that it would provide aid from the federal treasury of Canada towards the improvement of highways throughout the country.

I have not found that this proposal has been greeted by the people of Canada in quite the same spirit as that in which the right hon. gentleman seems to regard it. I have found unanimous approval among the people towards a measure of this kind, which follows the analogy of the Railway Subsidies Act, reserving to the Governor General in Council, certain control over the expenditure, in order to ensure that that expenditure may be made wisely and in the public interest.

We have no desire or intention to discriminate against any province on the ground of the political complexion of the government; we propose to deal with every province justly and fairly and without the slightest discrimination. We shall be glad indeed, after the close of this session, to take up this matter with the governments of the nine provinces of Canada, and to deal with them on fair, reasonable, and just lines, in order that this expenditure may be wisely and properly made. Having regard to these considerations, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is no ground whatever for the obstructive motion which the right hon. gentleman has made, which seeks to delay the passing of this measure, and to prevent the people and governments of the nine provinces of Canada from receiving any measure of assistance from the federal treasury for the very important purpose of improving the public highways. I should have thought that if my right hon. friend had entertained the opinion that the principle of this Bill was in the public interest, he would have allowed the second reading to pass without seeking to delay or obstruct it, and would have sought to introduce by way of amendment, to the Bill in committee, some of those precautions which he mistakenly supposes to be necessary in regard to the measure. He has not seen fit to take that course. He has asked this parliament to postpone the second reading of this Bill to another day, and to pass a resolution which is entirely unnecessary in view of the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, on the introduction of this Bill. The resolution says:—

That this House is of opinion that such aids should be given to the governments of the provinces.

The third clause of the Bill does that very thing:—

3. The Governor in Council may, in any year, and upon such terms and subject to such conditions as are proscribed by order in council, grant to any province in aid of the improvement of existing highways or the construction of new highways in such province, or for both such purposes, a subsidy not exceeding such sum as may in such year be voted by parliament for that purpose.

It is perfectly true that section 6 makes another provision:—

6. The minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council and uopn such terms and conditions as are prescribed by order in council, may undertake the construction of any new highways or the improvement of any existing highways in any province, and may expend in such improvement or construction the whole or any part of the sums voted by parliament for such subsidy to that province. Provided, however, that the minister shall first obtain the necesary authority from the legislature of such province and the consent of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Thus, not one dollar can be expended under section 6 of this Act without the authority of the provincial legislature, and the consent of the provincial government having been first obtained. So that this is a Bill to grant aid to the provinces in the first instance, under proper regulation by the Governor in Council, in order that the money may not be expended for any other purpose and may not be unwisely expended, or else it provides an expenditure by this government in any province but only with the consent of the provincial legislature, but also of the provincial government. Are not the rights of all the provinces, and all the provincial governments thoroughly safeguarded under the proposal? The right hon. gentleman's resolution says also:—

The assistance should be granted on a fixed basis similar to that prescribed by the British North America Act and amendments thereto.

He was assured on the first reading of the Bill, and has been assured again today, that when the estimate in furtherance of the purpose of this Bill is introduced

into this parliament, the amount payable to each province will be set forth and that amount will be based in each instance, upon the population of the province, and upon the subsidies founded upon that population. Under these circumstances, it does not seem necessary for me to say anything further in reply to the observations of the right hon. gentleman, but to ask this House to vote down his proposal and let us proceed with this Bill in order that the highways in the nine provinces of Canada may be improved by means of aids from the federal treasury with the least possible delay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not need the statement of my right hon. friend the leader of the government, that this Bill was prepared in a hurry to convince members of this House of that fact, for an examination of the Bill, I think, will show them that the measure is of the most slip-shod character, that it is rough, crude and immature in its structure. And, having in view the importance of the subject, I think it would be difficult for any hon. member to call to mind any Bill introduced into this parliament which has shown such a want of care in preparation. I do not wonder that my right hon. friend the leader of the government thought it desirable to make the excuse which he has made. But he coolly tells us that if the time be given, if we will leave it with the government until another session comes round, having more leisure, they will no doubt prepare a measure which will be more acceptable to parliament. That is the effect of what he says. He says that the government have not had very much time to prepare a measure. Well, they have been in office since the 10th of October. From current rumour, they have been very busy, but only in one direction—in wielding the axe, and decapitating officials in the public service, and have not even had time, some of them to give attention to the business of their departments. After four months we have a Bill which takes up not quite two pages, and which certainly could not have occupied a great deal of time. And I do not think it would take a great deal of time to prepare a Bill which would be thorough in its character, and would accomplish what is intended. There was a rumour that the Bill was hurriedly prepared, and submitted to parliament in order to give some evidence to one constituency in Canada—the constituency of South Renfrew—that the government intended to improve the highways. For the report in the public press shows that very great stress has been laid upon that provision, and very great efforts made to capture votes in the constituency by reason of the government having determined upon this policy.

So much for the reason of the hurry which the right hon. gentleman admitted in connection with the preparation of this Bill. Now, he admits that the Bill ought to contain the provision embodied in the amendment of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Mr. LENNOX. He did not say so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He admits, in effect, that the moneys ought to be expended upon that basis. If that is so, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this House, that before we are called upon to support this measure these provisions should be in the Bill. The Bill is of the most meagre description, as I have said. It contains no statement as to the basis to be adopted for the expenditure of these moneys.

It lays down no principle upon which the government shall act. All we have is the statement of my right hon. friend that when, later on, they come to submit estimates to parliament, they will ask for amounts for the different provinces. If that is the intention of the Bill it ought to say so. Before parliament is to be committed to this expenditure there ought to be a provision as to what shall be the basis of the appropriation. Now let me call your attention to the third section of the Bill:

> The Governor in Council may, in any year, and upon such terms and subject to such conditions as are prescribed by order in council, grant to any province in aid of the improvement of existing highways or the construction of new highways in such province, or for both such purposes, a subsidy not exceeding such sum as may in such year be voted by parliament for that purpose.

Under that section it would be open to the government to come down to parliament and ask for a total vote for the improvement of highways throughout Canada, and if parliament passes this Bill with that section, we shall entrust to the Governor in Council the manner in which this lump sum shall be divided between the different provinces. If my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, when he had this Bill drafted, had clearly fixed in his mind that there should be a definite sum for each province to be voted by parliament, based upon population, I think he would have said so in the Bill, I think he would have laid down distinctly the basis upon which the appropriation should be made. Either he had not made up his mind when the Bill was drafted, or had not time to prepare a section which would cover the ground when the Bill was submitted to parliament.

Now as to section 4, I think it is a very wise provision that a highway which

is to be aided shall be built or improved, as the case may be, according to descriptions, provisions and specifications approved by the Governor in Council on the report of the minister. I think it is very desirable, and everybody will admit it is desirable, that federal aid should only be given to what, as stated in the amendment of my right hon. friend, may well be termed permanent highways. There should be no federal aid given to roads of a temporary character. The highways which the federal government are to aid ought to be in the nature of main highways, of important highways, and those highways should be built up to a high standard, and be in all respects permanent roads.

I object to the Bill upon another ground, that it leaves it open to the government to take either one of two courses. They may either make grants to the provinces in aid of the construction of highways and allow the moneys to be expended by the provinces, or they may make arrangement for the construction of some highways as federal works entirely, and entirely outside co-operation with the provinces. I think we ought to determine upon one course or the other. Either these grants for permanent highways should be entirely for the provinces, and we should allow the provincial governments to expend the moneys, subject to the specifications being approved by the Minister of Railways, or we should, as a federal government, undertake the construction of these permanent highways ourselves. We should not have an alternative provision in the Bill. That I think is a most objectionable feature of it. I think hon. gentlemen on consideration will see that it is objectionable. See what an opportunity for undue influence it gives to the government of the day in respect of any province. If they cannot agree as to the specifications with regard to any particular highway, or as to the particular highways to be aided, then the Minister of Railways can very well say: Oh, well, we will undertake the construction of highways in some particular province where we don't want the provincial government to have anything to do with the matter; we will undertake the construction of those highways ourselves. It is true, the right hon. gentleman says that the government cannot do that unless with the approval of the government of the province. But you can easily see what an engine for pressure upon the government of any particular province this would give to the federal government of the day, in case this section were passed. Surely there can be no objection, if these grants are to be based upon the population of the province, to limiting the provisions of the Bill to that mode of aiding public highways. I think it is extremely objectionable that this double-barrelled provision should be contained in the Bill, that in some provinces, or in some localities in a province, the provincial government may have charge of the building of highways; and in other provinces, or in other portions of the same province, the federal government may carry on the construction of a highway as a federal work. I think heretofore highways have been entirely attended to by provincial governments and by the municipal authorities, largely in co-operation with the provincial governments, and I think the better way would be that, whatever money the federal government is to give towards improving or constructing highways, should be handed over to the provincial authorities. Then there is another objection which I find in section 6. Certain roads may be undertaken as federal works.

Mr. BORDEN. Only with the consent of the provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is objectionable, because if that is done, you may have to have a staff of highway engineers in the employ of the federal government to carry on these federal works. I submit it should be one way or the other; either the federal government should take charge of the highways—which, of course, would be limited to trunk lines or main highways—and aid this work entirely as a federal work, to which a strong objection can be urged, or the work should be done wholly by the provincial governments by means of the money which is to be paid out by the Minister of Railways. I think myself the proper way is to leave the matter of expenditure to the provincial governments, always making provision that the highway to be aided is subject to the approval of the minister.

Now I think there is another provision which ought to be in the Bill. It ought to be provided that if, during any year, a provincial government does not expend upon highways the amount to which they would be entitled according to population, that money should remain in the federal treasury, and should bear interest, to be paid over to the provincial government at such date as it will be required for the particular highway it was proposed to undertake; that is to say, that if the amount is not expended in any one year, the province should not lose it, but it should remain in the fund to be added to the payments which might subsequently be made.

Now in conclusion, I think my right hon. friend the leader of the government is not doing himself the greatest possible credit when he accuses the leader of the opposition of obstructing this Bill. I see no obstruction to the Bill. My right hon. friend

the leader of the opposition is simply moving an amendment declaring the opinion of this House that the Bill ought to contain just what the Prime Minister I think himself is almost disposed to admit, and which he would have inserted in the Bill when it was brought down if he had given the subject longer consideration. All that the leader of the opposition is contending for is that a principle should be adopted that the whole people will approve of. If the leader of the government were to approve of the suggestions contained in this amendment, it would be the easiest thing in the world to adopt the amendment, take the second reading of the Bill to-day, and then we could expedite it in every possible way. There is no disposition on this side to obstruct the Bill. We are anxious to facilitate its passage just as much as gentlemen on the other side of the House, but what we do desire is that when this Bill passes it shall be a proper Bill, that when this parliament engages to approve of the appropriation of federal moneys for the construction of highways, the Bill shall provide that the appropriation shall be based upon the proper principle. We say that the principle should be the population of the different provinces which is the basis upon which the subsidies are now payable under the British North America Act. With these objectionable features removed, and the Bill improved and made what, I am sure, my right hon. friend the leader of the House will agree the Bill ought to be, because he says that is the way in which they propose to work it out, he will find no disposition upon this side of the House to offer the slightest objection but every disposition to facilitate its passage just as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the government and the country upon the introduction of this Bill. I can hardly conceive of any Bill which would be more to the credit of the government, or which would give more substantial benefit to the country than this Bill. I congratulate the country particularly because it is a distinct act in favour of the farmer and the rural population. With a somewhat lavish hand, at all events with very great generosity, we have been from year to year voting large sums of money for the construction of railways, the development of our canal systems and the improvement of our ocean ports, but we have not been doing very much that brings aid directly to the farmers' door. For many years I have felt that, however much we might devote to the construction of railways, so long as the main highways of the country remain in the imperfect condition in which they have existed in Canada, the farmer will be handicapped both as regards getting his products to the markets of the world and also in the matter of the valuation of his land. There is nothing which detracts so much from the ready sale of land at a good price to people coming from Great Britain visiting Canada and inspecting our homesteads as the fact that they contrast the condition of our roads most unfavourably with that of the roads they have been accustomed to in the land they come from.

So, I hope that the government, having embarked upon this policy, will be generous—very generous indeed, almost lavish—in the expenditure of money which will so directly concern the farmers of Canada. I congratulate the government, too, upon the fact, which seems to irritate and annoy hon. gentlemen oposite, that the government have not lagged back and for years and years been prodded on to implement their promises, but that they have come down at the very first opportunity to make good the promises which were made on the hustings or elsewhere in this regard. It does not agree with our hon. friends opposite, because they are not accustomed to that kind of thing. It does not agree with them for another reason—because they know that it is in such marked contrast with the flagrant way in which they disregarded their promises during the whole period of their administration, and so the people cannot be slow to notice the contrast between the present administration and the administration recently led by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). So. this government have brought down this measure speedily, in haste, in a hurry—as the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Pugsley) says, bearing evidence of hurry—and to the extent to which it may bear evidence of hurry it redounds all the more to the credit and honesty of the present administration, as showing that they are prepared to-day, to-morrow, and always to advance step by step in the redemption of the promises made on the hustings and otherwise to the people of Canada. So, I hope it will always be. These hon. gentlemen do not understand it. For sixteen years they avoided the fulfilment of every promise—I think every promise—they had ever made. I think I have heard them say that they redeemed one, but I do not know which one it was. I could never recognize any.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The reform of the Senate was one.

Mr. LENNOX. The reform of the Senate has been very considerable. I think that is one they claim to have carried out. But, for sixteen years they had the hardihood, if the expression is parliamentary, to ignore their promises,

to fail to implement them although they were very prompt to implement that very unfortunate contract which they entered into in 1903 for the construction of the Transcontinental railway, so far, I mean, as the expenditure of money is concerned. Now, the hon. member for St. John says that this money is to be expended outside of the co-operation of the provinces. That is not correct at all. This section of the Act provides that the government may themselves directly expend the money in the permanent improvement or construction of main roads through the country. But if they see fit they may do it in co-operation with the governments of the provinces. Why should not the federal government spend the money if they will? Why should not the federal government have the option on other occasions of placing it in the hands of the provinces to be spent in co-operation and in conjunction with liberal expenditures at the same time and perhaps on the same works by the provinces? This is a gift, it is a voluntary contribution by the Dominion. Just as we have been expending enormous sums of money in the promotion of railways—and nobody has ever said that we were bound to consult the provinces as to that expenditure and nobody has ever said that we were bound to expend it in proportion to population—so this government, a progressive government, a government that is going to mark a new era and a higher plane in the history of Canada, have come to the conclusion that not only the great water routes should be attended to and the iron highways should be developed, but that the highway which practically goes to every farmer's door in Canada shall be attended to and that the government of Canada shall embark in the enterprise and bend their will and energy and intelligence to the solution of this great problem.

My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition thinks that this should be an expenditure in proportion to population, and he is so concerned about that that he would give this Bill a black eye in order that he would be able to say that he has brought in something new in connection with this scheme. My right hon. friend the leader of the House (Mr. Borden) has pointed out that already the desire of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition has been gratified. But, if there is anything on which I would be disposed to express a regret and a hope at the same time it is that it has been announced that this money, or this initial vote and the inauguration of this system, will be upon the basis of population or some analogous principle. I want to be distinct upon this point. Whilst I congratulate the government most heartily upon this great advance in the development of Canada—and it is one of the most important steps in the advancement of Canada that has been taken for a long time—yet I would have been a great deal better pleased if this really generous appropriation of money was not to be spent exactly upon that basis. This is a progressive government and I cannot believe that they will not come to my view some time. I am quite sure that if they believe it is right they will. That is the difference between this side and that. I would be glad if we had been allowed more latitude and probably we will take more latitude later on in this respect in the appropriation of this money and shall say that not the question of population alone shall govern us, but that we shall be guided by the question of the need of the various provinces and localities.

I believe that in the future in some instances it will be advisable to give even larger than a fair proportion according to population, to some provinces, in order to develop their highways, and for the reason that the more sparse the population the greater the need of assistance is, I trust that in time the principle will be recognized by the government that the need of localities throughout the Dominion shall be the guiding rule in expenditures on highways from time to time. On behalf of the people whom I have the honour to represent, the farmers of the great riding of North Simcoe, typical of the farmers of Canada, I congratulate the government most heartily upon this great advance in progressive legislation.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). The manner of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is so different from the benevolent and smiling addresses which he used to direct towards us in opposition, that I cannot help thinking that he is sharing in an unusual degree the evidence of perturbation and excitement which are animating the ranks of our opponents generally today. Recent events have evidently produced an undue effect upon my hon. friend from Simcoe. I am surprised, very much surprised, at the tone and substance of the remarks of the Prime Minister. He terms this amendment an obstructive amendment. I think he cuts the feet from beneath such a charge by the admission which he himself made that the Bill was drawn up in a hurry and was capable of improvement, and, if the Bill be capable of improvement, what more natural on the part of the opposition than immediately to attempt to improve it. Sir, this is not an obstructive amendment; it is an improving amendment. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister's argument faltered

so and his manner was so different from usual that I could not fail to recall a few nights ago our having the assurance of so high an authority as the Minister of Trade and Commerce that if a certain event happened yesterday it meant the injection of venom into the veins of the government. Most clearly the venom is in the veins of the government and a double portion of it appears to be in the veins of the Prime Minister. We on this side of the House hope it will go on working, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce prophesied it would work, until the government is destroyed. Now, the amendment proposes to insert in the Bill a provision that this expenditure upon the highways shall take place upon a fixed basis. Of course, if we were always to have in power a Minister of Railways such as the present, I do not know that such an amendment would be necessary to be written in the Bill. We know that he is a non-political minister; we who have listened to him in the House are aware of the almost metaphysical detachment of his intellect. We know the high planes of political thought in which he wanders; he takes no interest in elections; elections are things apart altogether from his consideration. We know his political career; he would never use the money for highways for the sake of winning an election; no one could think it for a moment. But, then the present Minister of Railways will not always be in power. We have the assurance of the Prime Minister, and I accept it, that he would not use this money for such a purpose and that so far as his government is concerned this money for roads would never be used for electioneering and polical purposes. The fact that my right hon. friend gave us that assurance almost amounted to an admission that as the Bill is drawn it suggests that that is a possibility, because the suggestion did not proceed, so far as I heard, from the right hon. the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, it was in reply, to a remark made by the leader of the opposition that I spoke.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I may not have heard the address of my right hon. leader as carefully as did the Prime Minister who was to reply, and therefore I accept the correction. In any case I accept the statement of the Prime Minister that he himself would be the last man to use this money in such a way. But I contend that the force with which he made the denial indicates the suspicion that the way this Bill is drawn up would leave such a possibility open. I say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister as I said in regard to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, that he will not be in power for ever. Recent events would almost indicate that he may be in power for only a very short time. From all that I hear by correspondence from every portion of Canada, his government has gotten in wrong, and there is widespread thought in the minds of the people of this Dominion, and in many cases in the minds of people who are not by any means strong Grits, that this will be a short lived administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Be that as it may, I am going to take a ground that gentlemen opposite cannot jeer at, and I say: you wont' be in power for all eternity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). And, it may just be that when this government—to which I will attribute for the moment all the perfections that they themselves claim—passes out of power, some wicked Grit administration may come in.

An hon. MEMBER. Never.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Well, there is a gentleman over there who believes in eternal possibilities. As I say. some wicked Grit government may come in which would use this Bill improperly. Why not provide against such a possibility in the future; why not act in some reasonable and statesmanlike manner in respect to this matter. There is a better reason to demand that the government should accept this amendment and that is, because the Prime Minister only differs by a hairsbreadth from the leader of the opposition. He tells us that the government purposes doing what the amendment demands they shall write it down they will do. His purpose is exactly the purpose of the amendment only that the government prefers to keep a loose hand; they prefer to keep a roving commission.

If the principle be a good one—and every man of us, on both sides, I think, will be inclined to follow our respective leaders in agreeing to the principle—none of us dare do anything else in the face of public opinion—if the principle be a good one, why not put it in the Bill? What has the hon. gentleman to fear about printing it? If the Bill has been drawn in a hurry, we have at any rate taken enough leisure to arrive at the common opinion that the object is a good one. Then print it in the Bill, and it will bind not only this administration, but future administrations as well.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend who has just sat down has put the issue very properly to the leader of the government. The leader

of the government told us that his Minister of Railways and Canals, in moving the first reading of this Bill, stated that this money was to be paid to the provincial governments that was the purpose and object of it.

Mr. COCHRANE. No. I was asked by the right hon. leader of the opposition on what basis the money was going to be expended, and I said on the same basis on which the subsidies were paid.

Mr. MACDONALD. That means exactly what I said, that the provincial governments were to receive this money in the same proportion in which the subsidies are at present divided.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Mr. MACDONALD. If that is not the meaning of the Minister of Railways, I am at a loss to know what the English language means.

Mr. COCHRANE. Read 'Hansard,' and you will find.

Mr. MACDONALD. Perhaps my hon. friend will explain; I do not want to take any advantage of him. I understood the right hon. leader of the government to say that the Minister of Railways had taken that position in moving the first reading of the Bill, and he himself stated to-day that the object was to utilize the money provided under this Bill in the same way as the subsidies to the provinces were granted. That being so, my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), has put the proposition to the House in a form from which there can be no escape. If that be so, there can be no objection to the Premier causing to be put in the Bill that provision in the amplest and clearest way. That is what the leader of the opposition seeks for in his amendment. It is absolutely essential, it seems to me, when you come to consider this whole question, apart from the abstract way in which my hon. friend from Simcoe put it, unless by some unseen method the federal government of Canada shall provide money for the highways. Underneath this proposition is involved the question of the relative powers of the provinces, and the Dominion in regard to the building of roads. Now, under the British North America Act the sole right to deal with local works of that character is vested in the provinces. Outside of the western provinces, where the title to the land is still vested in the Dominion, the title to all the highways is vested in the provincial governments or in the municipalities, as the case may be.

An hon. MEMBER. In the west also.

Mr. MACDONALD. That being so, the federal government, for the first time in the history of confederation, are proposing to step within the boundaries of provincial authority and legislate on this matter. Now, why was this question of roads left to the provincial governments? Why have the provincial governments been needing more money in order to deal with them properly? Why was the suggestion made that the federal government should provide funds for this purpose? Simply and solely because apparently there has not been enough money in the hands of the various provinces to deal with the highways as the public opinion of the country would like them to be dealt with. In order that the provincial governments might be in a position to deal wtih the highways and other matters, the federal government in 1867 agreed to give certain amounts by way of subsidies to the provincial governments to be expended by them for this and other purposes within their jurisdiction. That was the reason why, from that period down to the present, the federal government has granted subsidies to the various provinces. The area within which the provincial governments could raise money by taxation was defined and circumscribed in such a way that it was impossible for them to obtain within that area the necessary money which would enable them to keep pace with the development of the provinces. As a consequence, there were repeated conferences of representatives of all the provincial governments, in which the whole question of the relation of the subsidies to their expenditures was discussed, in 1887, in 1902, and in 1907, when the provincial premiers met and decided to ask the Dominion government for larger subsidies in order that the needs of the various provinces might be properly supplied. The result was that in 1907, the federal parliament gave to the provinces increased subsidies. All the while the provinces have been dealing with the question of roads. In the province of Ontario at confederation there was vested in the municipalities the right to deal with this whole question, and the municipalities have gone on raising money by direct taxation for the purpose of improving the roads. I understand that the same system obtains in Quebec. The governments of these two provinces have used provincial funds for the purpose of building colonization roads. In the province of Prince Edward Island there is no municipal government, but the provincial government has maintained the whole road system of the province out of the subsidy paid by this government. In the province of Nova Scotia we have never had muncipal taxation for roads except that there is vested in each municipality the right to tax up to a certain amount each year for the purpose of improving the roads, but

the title to the highways is vested in the province, and the provincial government makes expenditures in various parts of the province for the improvements of the roads. The same principle prevails in the province of New Brunswick. Where does the money come from? From the subsidies paid by this government under the terms of 1907. That is the position of affairs. Some of the provinces repair the roads, and there are municipal road inspectors, whose salaries are a matter of criticism in some quarters on the ground that a certain amount of money is voted for that purpose.

Then you come into another arena and you have a provincial road inspector and his staff of assistants whose salaries and expenditures are also deducted from the total amount provided by the central authority and you have criticism there as to the large amount that is expended. Does the right hon. the Prime Minister propose under this Bill to set up a third system of officials in Canada to deal with the question of roads or does he not? If he does we are going to have a very peculiar condition of affairs. You will have municipal officials paid out of municipal funds, provincial officials, responsible to the provincial government but really paid out of the funds of this government and then federal officials paid out of the money provided for in this Bill. Roads have been discussed in my province for years and the leader of the local Conservative party has been preaching there during the last four or five years that the one thing wanted in regard to road expenditure was unification of authority, the adopting of a more comprehensive plan to which every one would give adherence.

This is not a subject which can be treated lightly and my right hon. friend cannot dispose of the proposition of my leader by speaking of it as obstruction. I am sure the right hon. leader of the House will realize the position of affairs that for the first time since 1867 the federal parliament is entering upon this arena which is peculiar to provincial governments and that in so doing he is interfering with provincial rights. True you may be interfering in a way which the province will not mind, you are going to give them money but you are entering upon the trend of an expenditure which is wholly confined to the provinces, you are undertaking to go in and spend money on roads which has never been done before. It will not do for my right hon. friend to say that this resolution follows in a general way legislation used in regard to subsidies for railways. It is all very well to reserve to the Minister of Railways and his engineers the right to prescribe the methods and the usual restrictions under which subsidies can be earned by the construction of railways. That involves only the making of certain specifications well known to engineers, But here we have a new departure. The government say to the minister: you are going to start out for the first time in the history of confederation on a Bill made in a hurry without deliberation, without stating in the document the thing you say you are going to do. No one has a right to enter upon a constitutional question in such a light hearted and careless way as these hon. gentlemen are doing.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Are you against the Bill?

Mr. MACDONALD. I am in favour of the federal government giving to each province by way of additional subsidy more money for the improvement of roads. That is my position and I hope it is my hon. friend's because I understood the Premier to say that was his position and all we want to do is to put into the Bill a statement of the fact, a statement of the position of the Premier. Of course the Premier says that this money which is to be expended under the first five sections of the Bill has to be spent in co-operation with the provinces. It is true that you have to deal with the provinces. Why does not my right hon. friend amend that a little and say that the sums of money to be granted shall be in proportion to the amounts which have already been granted to the provinces by way of provincial subsidy? My right hon. friend goes further and by section 6 of the Bill proposes a system of expenditure which is not by way of subsidies to the provinces. That is a peculiar clause of the Bill, an entirely new proposition, and one which calls for the fullest consideration by this House. He tells us there is not much to be criticised about that because if the federal government propose to go in and expend money itself in any province, it cannot enter upon the expenditure without obtaining the necessary authority from the legislature of the province. Of course it cannot, how could it? The title to the highways is vested in each one of the provinces. It is very doubtful if there is any necessity for the latter portion of the provision. What power or authority has this government to interfere with the roads in any province of the Dominion? These roads are held by the Crown in the right of the province, not in the right of this Dominion. My right hon. friend would be a trespasser, and any one of his officials would be a trespasser if he went on any public highway without the consent of the provincial government concerned. Not a dollar could be spent for that purpose except with the consent of the provincial government. If that is so would my right hon. friend tell us whether the government intend to inaugur-

ate a new department to be known as the department of highways, as stated in the newspapers, through which department the minister is going to start upon a system by which the federal government will deal with the highways of the country? The right hon. gentleman tells us that is not the policy of the government. If that is the policy of the government we want to know, because if so, this parliament is entering upon an absolute interference with provincial rights, and undertaking to deal with matters over which they have no jurisdiction, and with which they cannot deal except with the concurrence of the provinces.

Mr. BRODER. What objection would you have in the case of an interprovincial road?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend would have to come before this House with a separate proposition dealing with that problem, and it would require the greatest possible care. Of course, we have section 92 of the British North America Act, which gives to the legislatures the right to deal with local and private works within a province, except in respect of such works as may be declared for the general advantage of Canada, but the use of highways in that connection up to this moment has never formed the subject of consideration by this parliament. Of course the federal government has legislated in regard to railways which were interprovincial works, and I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite wail on this question of provincial rights in the last parliament and before the Railway Committee, day after day, complaining about the federal government undertaking to grant local charters.

Mr. LENNOX. As they had a right to do.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then they ought to be thinking about provincial rights in connection with this Bill. This House has not yet secured from the government a statement as to what its policy will be. In replying to the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the right hon. the leader of the House (Mr. Borden), said that the Bill in the preamble states that this money is to be spent on the same basis as the provincial subsidies. My right hon. friend is going to carry out that policy. Let us go on in the enacting clause and provide for that assistance. But the nigger on the fence is this section 6, and it is in regard to that that I hope the Minister of Railways, when he comes to speak, will tell us whether or not it is the purpose of this government, over and above the assistance they propose to give by way of subsidies, to inaugurate a new department to be known as the department of highways, with officials and all that. If that is the proposition I submit to the House that before we consider it, the government ought to place before the House a well defined plan dealing with the various conflicting bodies that have to do with road expenditures in this country to-day.

The unification of authority and expenditure is the policy of the Conservative party in the province of Nova Scotia in provincial affairs. Is it the policy of the leader of that party in federal affairs? That is the question upon which we ought to be informed. Have the government had any inquiries made on this subject throughout the country? The Prime Minister is reported to have said to a deputation that waited upon him about two weeks ago that it was not the intention of the government to engage in the repair of old roads, but to engage in the construction of new ones. If that is so, we ought to know it; if it is not so, we ought to know that. I saw that statement reported the other day; I do not know whether the Prime Minister cares to give assent to it now——

Mr. BORDEN. I am responsible for what I said, not for what is reported.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is, of course, not a very brilliant remark. But it does not take much to please our friends opposite since the event of yesterday. But perhaps they should rather wait for some greater utterance on the part of their leader before they break forth in applause, for, certainly, that remark of his was not exactly profound. He is responsible, of course, for what he says, aud not for what he is reported to have said. Well, that only means that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane), when he speaks, will have to tell us a little more fully what is the policy of the government in this regard. Either the policy of the government is to construct new roads or its policy is to repair old ones. This discussion, I am sure, has shown, it must have satisfied hon. members, that there are very great questions involved in this Bill which cannot be disposed of so easily as is suggested. Has the Minister of Railways made any inquiries whatever with regard to the conditions under which this federal money is to be granted? For, unquestionably, section 6 provides for the granting of that money. Has the minister any information and comprehensive plans to submit to the House? If he has not, then the House ought not to give adherence to a Bill that is put forward apparently on the basis that the money is to go to the provinces, yet with a little clause behind to enable some kind

of system to be built up for other reasons. Clearly we are entering upon an arena of legislation for the first time since 1867. This means that we ought to take great care in framing that legislation. The Prime Minister's statement that the Bill was prepared in a hurry and perhaps is not so complete as it might be, but a better one, a wider one, will be introduced at another session, is not good enough for this House. Legislation under which it is proposed to trespass upon provincial authority ought to proceed with the greatest deliberation and care, and before we are asked to crystallize this Bill into law we should understand thoroughly what we are doing. Each and every one of the provinces of the Dominion, at a conference or in some other way, ought to be consulted upon the question how far they are willing to give up their authority in relation to highways and the expenditure on them, before such a measure is introduced. It does seem to me that, so far as federal assistance to highways is concerned, as the leader of the opposition proposes, it should be confined to grants based upon the provincial subsidies.

Mr. FOWLER. So far as I could follow the hon. member for Pictou, (Mr. Macdonald), his chief objection seemed to be that the Bill involved a new departure. A strange doctrine, surely, to come from a so-called Liberal in this House—that, because this is without precedent, because never before in the history of Canada, has a government been in a position, and been wise enough, and broad enough, to introduce a measure such as this for the benefit of the people of Canada, therefore the measure is to be declared bad. This is a measure for the benefit of all the people, irrespective of class, or occupation or of where they live; it applies to every province and covers the whole Dominion.

I have also been amused by the attitude of our friends on the other side, with regard to an occurrence of yesterday. One does now begin to realize the depth of gloom into which these gentlemen were plunged, when one finds them rejoicing with exceeding great joy—over what? Over the fact that they have been able to hold half the majority they had on September 21. Just as proper would it be for our friends the Dutch, to rejoice over taking Holland, or the Irish over the retention of Cork, as for these gentlemen to rejoice so hugely because genial George, the Bill Nye of Canadian politics, has been able to hold South Renfrew, by something like half the majority by which it was carried on the 21st of September. Why do not these gentlemen remember, do they not realize, that the 'great chieftain' was there with his 'white plume.'? How could George help being elected under the circumstances. True, the 'white plume' did not have much effect on the 21st of September, but it did seem to be able to hold what they had on the 22nd of February.

Now, my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), finds fault with this Bill, because it is crude, rough, rude. He is such a polished, courteous gentleman, that I can understand how his sensitive soul would be affected by anything that is rude. He also complains of the Bill because it does not go enough into detail. He has forgotten the investigation of the Central railway. If he had remembered that, he would not have spoken against this Bill, on the ground that it did not contain details enough. He will remember that there was a Bill referred to there; it was brought up in the evidence,—a Bill in which was so little detail that it had on it only 'Five thousand W. P.' So, surely the hon. gentleman was not serious when he spoke of this Bill as being improperly drawn because it did not go sufficiently into detail.

It seems to me that the people of this country will look with very little favour upon the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to this matter, whether that criticism be based, like that of the hon. member for Pictou, on the lack of precedent for the introduction of a measure of this kind, or whether it be criticism like that of the hon. member for St. John, based on the statement that the measure is crudely drawn and the language not so perfect and not so Addisonian as if it had been drawn by the hon. gentleman himself. I think the people of this country, irrespective of party, will hail this Bill with great satisfaction, implementing as it does, the promise of the party now in power when it went to the country in the late election, and showing that this government is a government which proposes to carry out the pledges it made to the people, in sharp contradistinction to the party that, for the last fifteen years, misgoverned this country, who carried out no pledges that they made. They said they did carry out their pledges with regard to the Senate, but it was Providence that helped them out with the Senate and 'reformed' that body to the extent to which it was reformed by making the majority Liberal instead of Conservative.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). I do not intend to detain the House more than a few moments. But this question of good roads is one which, in the section of the province of Ontario from which I come, is of such momentous importance, that I feel that it is my duty to say at least a few words in regard to the Bill before the vote is taken on the amendment of the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

I might say without, perhaps, wounding the feelings of the hon. gentlemen, that if they have no better arguments to advance in favour of this Bill than those put up by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, they have a very weak case. Now, if it were not for the last clause in this Bill, I would not care much whether the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition were carried or not. But it seems to me that clause goes to the very crux of the whole matter. The right hon. leader of the government has told us that the Bill was quickly drawn, perhaps crudely drawn, and will be supplemented perhaps by a better one during the recess. We wish to supplement it by a better one now, and to define clearly and emphatically how the distribution of the money shall be made so that there may be no dispute about it hereafter. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has very properly stated that though the right hon. gentleman is Premier at present, he might not be Premier next year, not that his party will be defeated, but that he himself, whom we hope will live long, might not be in this House. There are lots of contingencies that may arise between now and the next session of parliament, and another leader, another king, may arise who knows not Joseph; another king may arise who may not feel that he is bound by the statements of the present right hon. Prime Minister of Canada, and who may not agree that this money should be divided in accordance with the suggestions made to-day by the leader of the government. So that, now is the accepted time, now is the time to rectify this Bill, and put it in the exact shape in which the leader of the government says he intends to put it. There is no question of obstruction. The amendment can be adopted now and the Bill can be put through probably this afternoon or at the beginning of next week. I want it to be distinctly understood that I am not endeavouring to obstruct the passage of this Bill. I am strongly in favour of this government granting aid for the construction of good roads throughout the country, and will do everything in my power to assist the passage of a Bill for that purpose. But I desire to protest against the way this money is to be expended. Though it may aid in the construction of good roads throughout the country, it can also be used in a way which will not conduce to the advantage of the people, or to the construction of these roads in such a way as we would like. I have my own views as to how this money should be distributed, and those views I intend to suggest when we are in committee on this Bill. I am not in favour of handing this money over to the provincial legislatures at all, but of paying it out to the municipalities directly, as the provincial governments do—of course under certain restrictions and with certain supervision. That is the proposition which I believe the people of the province of Ontario would approve. I think it would meet with the approval of ninety-nine per cent of all the municipalities in the province, that the money should be paid directly to the counties and not be paid to the provincial government. If the municipalities did not use it properly, then let this government implement, or supplement, whichever word you like to use, the moneys paid by the provincial government in that direction.

Mr. COCHRANE. I agree with the right hon. the Prime Minister that, judging by the remarks we have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite, their idea is to obstruct this Bill. As I understand parliamentary procedure, the discussion that takes place on the second reading is for or against the principle of the Bill, and hon. gentlemen have been talking directly against it. Now I do not know of any other federal government which has adopted this system of aiding highways, that work has generally been left in charge of the provinces. I do not know of any other country where the federal government contributes or co-operates with the province for that purpose, as it is proposed to do in this Bill. At Washington, I understand, there is a Bureau of Education for the very purpose of instructing the people on the necessity of good highways, and the manner of constructing them. I think probably it would be well if we had in Canada such a bureau as that, because the construction and upkeep of public roads are certainly very necessary in a country like ours. I want to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) in his reference to what I said on the first reading of this Bill. The right hon. the leader of the opposition asked me:

> I would ask the hon. gentleman to tell us if there is any basis of allotment among the provinces. The provincial subsidies are based on population; is this based on population?
>
> Mr. COCHRANE. It is to be on the same basis as that on which subsidies are granted to the provinces, in other words, by population.

I have no doubt whatever but that this government can work in conjunction and in harmony with the provincial governments in carrying out the purposes of this Bill. I think every provincial government, whether Grit or Tory, will welcome this Bill and co-operate with us in carrying it out. Moreover, the government will not undertake to force any local government to join us if they do not wish to. I hope we shall be able to arrange with the provincial governments so that they will

make a grant equal to the grant given by the federal government, and that we may be able to go on within a very short time and construct these roads. But if any provincial government does not wish to contribute, I see no reason why we should not go on and do the work ourselves. But if they join in with us, so much the better. We will co-operate with them in making the specifications. Evidently no specifications can be laid down in this Bill. You cannot draw up specifications to cover all roads, because some might cost much more, and others much less than others. The right hon. the leader of the opposition objected to putting so much money in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. What did they do last session, or the session before? They gave a subsidy to a road to be built from Montreal to join the Transcontinental railway in Quebec, and there was no company named to which the grant was to be made; it was left to the government to name the company, and they manipulated it in such a manner as to give the money to their friends. We do not propose to take that course; we propose to work with the provincial governments, not with individuals or with companies. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) negatived.

Motion (Mr. Cochrane) agreed to, Bill read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 3—grant of annual subsidy for highways.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) if he would explain what he has in his mind as being the purpose of these words:

The Governor in Council may, in any year, and upon such terms and subject to such conditions as are prescribed by order in council.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would understand that terms and conditions would have reference to the specification of the roadway.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought so at first but on reading the section which comes next I have my doubts because the next section provides exactly for the specifications:

4. Any highway for which aid is granted to a province shall be improved or constructed, as the case may be, according to descriptions, conditions and specifications approved by the Governor in Council on the report of the minister, and specified in each case in an agreement between the minister and the government of the province, which agreement the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, is hereby empowered to make.

Mr. COCHRANE.

I think this clause is perfectly unobjectionable; on the contrary, quite proper, but it disposes of the specification in so far as clause 3 is concerned. My hon. friend must have something else in his mind. I do not exactly understand what the purport of those words is.

Mr. BORDEN. There are a great many considerations which will occur to my right hon. friend in addition to those already mentioned. It will be desirable, for example, to have precaution taken that the money should be expended for this purpose and this purpose alone.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is hardly what is meant. The money must be expended for this purpose; it cannot be expended for any other. I ask for this information because I have been unable to satisfy myself as to what is intended. I do not see what conditions are to be imposed which are not to be found in section 4.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not agree with my right hon. friend in his construction of this matter. This money is intended to be handed over to the provinces for the purpose of the construction of new highways or the improvement of existing highways. It will readily occur to any one that, in the agreement which must be entered into between the government of Canada and the province in respect of such matters, terms and conditions of various kinds have to be provided for. For example, the government of Canada might be authorized by parliament to make a grant of a certain amount of money to the province of Ontario and a certain amount to other provinces throughout the Dominion. It would have to be understood, I suppose, in the first place, as to whether the money was to be applied by the province in the improvement of highways or in the construction of new highways. You have to have some understanding to that and that understanding would properly come under the expression that is used in clause 3 of the Bill 'Upon such terms and subject to such conditions.' Then, in addition to that, the question of the maintenance of the road might come up. It is true that it is referred to in another section—the following section, I think. Still it would be undesirable that money should be expended in the construction of a permanent highway of a certain recognized standard without some provision being made that the road that was so constructed would be maintained up to that standard. It would be an idle thing for the government to spend money on public highways if there were to be no assurance whatever that the road, after it was constructed, would be maintained in good order and condition so that it might be used by the

people to advantage. I do not think it is necessary to elaborate this matter; no doubt a great many other illustrations of terms and conditions could be given.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no exception to take to the statement which my right hon. friend has made; there must be conditions which will be covered by the agreement, but everything that has been said by my right hon. friend so far comes within and is covered by section 4. It is because section 4 is there that I do not appreciate the purpose of the words 'Upon such terms and subject to such conditions,' which are to be found in section 3. I would again call my right hon. friend's attention to section 4.

Mr. BORDEN. That is entirely as to the character of the road.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, that covers everything. Section 4, as I understand it, means that money may only be given to the province after an agreement has been made in regard to the specification and the conditions and everything else about the road. Then, I ask what is the meaning of these words in section 3?

Mr. BORDEN. I could give my right hon. friend many other illustrations if he is not satisfied with those I have already given and which seem to me to be amply sufficient. Let me point out in the first place that the words in the fourth section which he has referred to are taken from the Railway Subsidies Act in the form in which it has passed this parliament on many occasions. I read from the Subsidy Act of 1908:

> Shall be constructed according to descriptions, conditions and specifications approved by the Governor General.

What else do we find in the same section of the Railway Subsidies Act? —that there are provisions which are to be insisted upon by the Governor General in Council in regard to the date at which the work shall be commenced, in regard to the speed at which the work shall be carried on and in regard to the date at which the work shall be completed.

It would be eminently proper that some of these matters should form part of the terms and conditions upon which the money should be handed over to the provinces. For example, we would not hand over a large sum of money to any province except according to the terms and conditions that it should be expended, not only for this purpose, but within a reasonable time, and further, that the work should be carried on with certain safeguards to satisfy the government of Canada that the work would be conducted economically and under proper supervision.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Are not all of these comprised in the section?

Mr. BORDEN. No. I believe 'the descriptions, conditions, and specifications,' refer only to the character of the road, and the expression in section 3 deals with matters to which I have alluded, and many others that I might suggest. It is impossible to foresee at the moment what terms and conditions may be thought desirable, but, those conditions I have brought to the attention of my right hon. friend will no doubt occur to him as conditions that ought to be agreed upon between the governments before the money is handed over.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not dispute that at all. I simply say that in my humble opinion that is included in section 4.

Mr. GERMAN. I call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals and of the Prime Minister to my suggestion that the best way to distribute this money and the proper policy to adopt is, not to pay the money directly to the provinces, but to distribute the money among the various municipalities in the same manner as the Ontario Act distributes the money among the municipalities in Ontario. The Minister of Railways knows that the Ontario legislature appropriated $1,000,000 in aid of good roads in that province, and that money is distributed by granting to each municipality one-third of the money which that municipality itself expended for the construction of good roads.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is given to the county municipality.

Mr. GERMAN. That policy has worked out with the greatest possible degree of satisfaction and that is the policy which I am convinced ninety-nine per cent of the county municipalities in Ontario would wish to see adopted with reference to this money. In this way you will do away with all possible chances of extra officials. You can say to each county municipality: When you have expended $20,000 or $100,000 in the construction of good roads according to certain specifications and standards, we will pay you a proportion of the money you have expended. If you give the money directly to the provinces it simply means an increase of the provincial subsidy because the province is very likely to use this money for good roads, but they will not use any money of their own for such a purpose.

Mr. LENNOX. What the hon. member (Mr. German) says may sound very plausible, but you have to consider how it will work out. Should the Dominion government take upon itself the burden of direct-

ly dealing with all the county municipalities in Canada? I do not think so. This emphasizes just the meaning of section 3 as contrasted with section 4. The right hon. the leader of the opposition will not think it is an unfriendly statement if I say that he has told us a great many times that he is not a business man and I think that is true of him so far as I have been able to observe from his actions. There is a very clear emphatic distinction between clauses 3 and 4. Clause 4 is directed to the character of the road that shall be constructed and in which the Dominion government will put its money, but it goes no further, while clause 3 deals with the question of the terms upon which the Dominion will agree to give its money. For example, some of the municipalities have adopted toll gates upon their highways and the Dominion government would probably say: As we are expending this money not for local or sectional purposes but for the general advantage of Canada, we insist that the beneficial results of this work shall not be hampered in any way by the erection of toll gates, and if you have toll gates we will not pay over any of this money. It may be true that this money could be best expended through the instrumentality of the county councils. The government of Ontario arranges that by contributing a certain proportion of the amount expended by the municipalities upon the improvement of the highway. We might make it a condition, if we wished to, that this money shall be expended directly through the county councils in certain cases where that system has been found to be working satisfactorily, and we might say: We will pay the money over to the province to be handed by the province to the county municipalities. It might be that in the case of a very expensive bridge we would contribute a certain amount towards it if the province would contribute another certain amount.

Mr. GERMAN. Will the hon. gentleman approve of the proposition, as far at any rate as the province of Ontario is concerned, that the money should be expended by the county councils in the same manner as the appropriation of the Ontario legislature?

Mr. LENNOX. No, I do not say that I would go that far, though the system has worked fairly well. The Dominion parliament, in dealing with this matter, can, if it chooses, stipulate that the money shall be expended by the municipalities in such a way as the hon. gentleman refers to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

Mr. LENNOX.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 23), respecting the Harbour of Hamilton.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill (No. 102), for the relief of Edna Wells.—Mr. Beattie

Bill (No. 83), respecting the Saskatchewan Power Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No 70), to incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Keewatin.—Mr. McKay.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 108), respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Baker.

Bill (No. 109), for the relief of Herbert Horsfall.—Mr. McKay.

Bill (No. 110), for the relief of Kenneth Molson.—Mr. Rhodes.

IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHWAYS.

House resumed in committee on Bill (No. 77) to encourage and assist the improvement of highways.—Mr. Cochrane.

On section 3, grant of annual subsidy for highways,

Mr. BRODER. I think the importance of this legislation justifies the new departure. Perhaps it has scarcely dawned on the people of this country what this measure means to the rural sections of Canada, and to the agricultural interests. Let us look at what has been done elsewhere in regard to highways. In France, for instance, a country where agriculture has reached as high a condition, perhaps, as in any country in the world, they have 23,600 miles of what are called national highways, 28,600 miles of departmental highways—all of these roads being paid for by the state—390,000 miles of municipl roads, upon which there is an annual outlay of 125,000,000 francs, or $25,000,000, and, in addition, a great mileage of what are known as rural roads, narrow roads connecting with the greater highways throughout the country. Consider also what is being done in the United States. In the state of New York, a few years ago, they bonded the state to the extent of $50,000,000 for the purpose of improving the roads, and the state proposes to build absolutely at the public expense 3,000 miles of state roads. They propose also, with the money raised by this issue of bonds, to assist what they call towns—we call them townships. In the state of Ohio, the estimate generally accepted is that the improvement of the road system adopted by the state, has increased farm values by from 25 to 50 per cent.

I asked the state engineer of what is called the State Commission, what effect the improvement of roads in the state of Massachussets had had in bringing back occupants to the abandoned farms, of which they have a good many, and he said that hundreds had returned to the farm in consequence of good roads. So it is a very important matter from that point of view. I am glad to see the unanimity existing in the House with regard to the importance of this question.

Now, it might be wise to consider carefully whether we should not have, to some extent, what we might call federal roads built and maintained by the federal authorities. There is danger, if you come down to the municipalities with this money, that we will have a lack of uniformity, we will not have that distinctive system which should govern the outlays on these roads. Now, we have nad some experience in Ontario with reference to giving municipalities money for this purpose. Several years ago there was what is known in Ontario as the Municipal Loan Fund. A number of counties borrowed largely from this fund, while others did not borrow from it. Some counties borrowed so largely that, after a few years, they found it difficult to pay; and away back in 1871 or 1872, I think the Hon. E. B. Woods devised a scheme of settling this vexed question. The legislature passed a law to forgive the debt to many of the borrowers, and in order to do justice to those who had not borrowed, they gave them so much per head. Now, it was not easy for some years to see any real benefit following the gift of that money to the municipalities. The difficulty was that they lowered their taxation instead of using the money to make improvements. I suppose under this Bill that difficulty could scarcely occur, because this money cannot be put to any other purpose than that of assisting in road construction. But if you relieve the people along the line where you build one of these roads from road taxation, then there should be some arrangement by which the province would tax them for the purpose of forming a road fund, to build roads some where else. There has been a good deal said with reference to some definite plan or scheme being mentioned in the Bill. If you consider for a moment the varied climate of our extended country, you cannot have any uniform system that would apply to all the provinces, because our winter in some parts of the country affects the roads adversely. If you go into the far west and into British Columbia where they have a mild winter a different system would apply altogether. Then another thing is that the material out of which you have to build roads is of a different kind in different sections of the country. There are some places where road material is much more easily got than in other places. All these matters have to be considered in dealing with this question.

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), has raised the question of provincial rights. I think there is very little danger of any sharp trouble arising on this point so long as we are giving them something. The difficulty under the administration the hon. gentleman supported, was that the government was always taking something away from the provinces. That was a very different proposition. I am not a lawyer, but I believe this question of provincial rights, is largely a growth of sentiment rather than a difficulty in law. Expediency must to a large extent decide these questions between the federal and provincial authorities. Now the Americans are strong on state rights. When the federal government in the United States proposed to appropriate large sums of money to lend to the state for the purpose of encouraging agriculture, they said in the Act by which they made the appropriation that nothing in this Act should interfere with the right of the state to deal with this question; and there was no difficulty. Now it seems to me there ought to be no difficulty in this country, because our system is more elastic than theirs. I do not fear any difficulty along the lines suggested by the hon. member for Pictou. It seems to be that it will be ultimately a matter of agreement largely between the provinces, and the federal authorities. I think the direction of the road, or the location of the road, will largely be decided by conference between the provinces and the federal authority, because you must of necessity consult the provinces in a matter in which they have to so large an extent the local control.

Now, I feel that it would not be an unwise thing for the federal government to build certain roads as distinctively federal roads, and maintain them as such, because the question of maintenance is as important as the question of construction, and perhaps more so. If a road is not properly maintained, then you might just as well not build it, because it will very soon become dilapidated and useless. That is the experience of every one. Now, I wish to say that so far as I am concerned the proposal of the government has my most hearty and warm support. It is something that will affect the future of this country as nothing else will do that has been proposed for a number of years. As has been so well said by hon. members on both sides of the House, if we make such large outlays in other directions affecting trans-

portation, the burden of which has been largely thrown upon the agriculturalists throughout the country, and while he has to bear his share of other burdens in which he is also interested, the time has come to consider the advisability and wisdom of doing something to help the farmer, to get nearer to the door of the man who has worked so hard to solve the agricultural problems of this country. I can see no reason why this scheme should not be carried out successfully, and in such a manner as to result in general welfare to the country. I was much interested in reading the early history of the eastern New England States in reference to roads. Before the railway, there was a strife between different neighbourhoods to secure what was then known as the 'general travel' along those roads. The well-to-do people who rode in their carriages would choose the best roads, and the different farming communities vied with each other in constructing good roads so as to secure that travel; there was a sort of rivalry between them which resulted in better roads than would have otherwise been made. But when the railways came, they did away with all that. And, now, the era of automobiles is coming in, and is bringing that class of traffic back to the farmers' doors that has not been there before for a great many years, although it must be said that he is not very anxious sometimes to get it. But we must deal with all these questions as they arise, and they will have to be dealt with in this country. It is said that in the state of New York the outlay on roads will be largely repaid by the tax imposed on automobiles in that state. It seems to me that while this House has a right to deal with the matter, it will be a question to a considerable extent of co-operating with the provinces in carrying out the object of this Bill. I wish to say in conclusion that whatever may be the outcome, I hope and believe that great good will result from this legislation to the community in general.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think we are all agreed that the legislation which is now before the committee is per se good legislation, subject, however, to the limitations which were formulated in the amendment proposed by the right hon. leader of the opposition.

However, this amendment was lost, and we are now face to face with the legislation as introduced by the Minister of Railways and Canals. As I said a moment ago, every class in this country will readily admit that a good roads policy is a safe policy. I have always been of opinion, and this opinion is shared by many, that the provinces at the time of Confederation were not given their proper share of subsidies. They were given only limited powers and thereby limited resources. As the roads were more under their control than under the control of the federal authorities, the highway in the various provinces has not been what it should be. However, Sir, we must not forget that time flies, and that immediately after the old days were past, when that lonely trail was kept open by the settler, came the railway age which did away practically for at least forty years with the immediate necessity for an improved highway. People thought only of railways and of the settlement of the country through the railways. But a new era has dawned in this country, and not only in this country but on the whole of the continent. It is that of the good roads. My hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) has referred to the state of the roads in France and England. A comparison between the roads of the old country and the roads of the new continent cannot hold good, because the roads in France and England date as far back as the Roman conquest in some cases, and the climate on the other side contributes towards maintaining in their proper condition the highways of both these countries. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that there is nothing so glorious as a ride or drive on the highways of France or England, but, as I have just stated, it is impossible for Canada or even for the northern portion of the United States, to maintain roads in that condition on account of the climate. But we can imitate, even though it be at a distance, what has been done in the old country and by the richer states of the United States commonwealth. We have passed the age when railways were the exclusive necessity. We, of course, admit as a foregone conclusion that the whole country must be a network of railways, but our attention must also be turned towards the establishment and maintenance of a perfect system of highways. I do not know what has been done in the other provinces, but I can speak of what I have seen in Ontario, where a forward policy has been the aim of the government for the last twenty years. I have noticed, especially around Toronto, Hamilton and London, that they have almost reached perfection as regards highways. I do not know how it is in other sections or in other provinces, but the province of Ontario has had very good roads for the last twenty years. In the province of Quebec we have just inaugurated a good roads policy. The progressive administration of Sir Louis Gouin has just decided that $10,000,000 would be appropriated towards the opening and maintaining of good roads within the boundaries of the province. The municipalities are going to share in the construction and maintenance of the highways. There will be a consortium between the municipalities and the government of the province. Each will contribute its

share. No later than last week the Minister of Agriculture was given new powers by legislation for the carrying out of that policy.

Mr. BRODER. I think the people only pay two per cent and then the government create a sinking fund.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, that is the basis of the arrangement. I do not share the view of my hon. friend from Dundas with reference to the establishment of a federal roads system in Canada. I believe that we are almost all agreed that the money to be voted by this parliament for good roads throughout Canada should be distributed in the way suggested this afternoon by both my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) and my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think the Minister of Railways should prepare a concrete plan which might be submitted to the different provinces and the moneys might then be handed to the provincial exchequers, and expended under the conditions imposed by the authority of this parliament and by the authority of the minister. I believe that under that system we could have shortly in Canada a splendid highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. My hon. friend from Dundas stated quite rightly a moment ago that the automobile had completely changed the conditions of, shall I say, existence—in America. I know that in the old country conditions have been changed completely since the appearance of the automobile. There the leisurely class of people travel more by automobile to-day than they do by railway. People go across the Atlantic, and take their automobile with them in order to see the country that they do not see well when they travel by rail. I do not wish to be provincial, but I can speak for my own province where I spend the summers. Even in the remote districts of Quebec, on the coast of Gaspe and at Murray Bay in the county of Charlevoix where they have no railway system, I have seen during the summer, hundreds of automobiles coming from the United States loaded with tourists, visiting our highly favoured, picturesque regions and spending money lavishly. Their visits have had a twofold result. First of all, the people have become a little more proud; they look after their gardens, their farms and keep their habitations more clean and tidy. They supply butter, cheese, fruits and other staples to the tourists and above all they are inclined to do a little more towards maintaining the roads than before. Above all the automobile has been a blessing in disguise in that we have now, in the remotest country districts, better hotel accommodation. Though the automobile is dreaded by many habitants because some horses take fright when they see it coming, it has nevertheless been a blessing in disguise.

The advent of the automobile has unquestionably been a great inducement towards the betterment of highways, and has given us better hotel accommodation. This is Sir, a progressive policy, and provided the money we grant is not spent to debauch the electorate, but in the public interest, and with safeguards thrown around its expenditure, I believe this legislation will be most beneficial to the inhabitants of Canada.

Mr. GOODEVE. I endorse the suggestion of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) that this expenditure should be on trunk line roads, and I do so all the more readily, because of our experience in British Columbia. A few years ago, Mr. Taylor, Minister of Public Works for British Columbia, conceived the idea of setting aside a certain sum of money each session for the building of a trunk road from Burrard Inlet to the provincial boundary of Alberta. That proposal when first made was received not only by a large number of the members of the House, but by a large number of the people of the province, with very grave doubt, fearing, as they did, that a special trunk road of that nature was scarcely warranted by the then development stage of our province. However, only two or three sessions passed before Mr. Taylor was able to demonstrate the great benefit such a trunk line bestowed on the province. Mr. Taylor is now affectionately called by the people 'Good Roads Taylor,' and there is no more popular grant made in the legislature than the annual appropriation for the continuation of that provincial trunk road. To give an idea how such a trunk road advertises the province, I may mention that last winter I delivered a lecture in Toronto and having referred to this British Columbia provincial road, a number of gentlemen waited on me after the meeting; they were men of leisure and means, and they decided to so arrange their summer tour that they might motor over that scenic route in British Columbia. I feel strongly that if this grant of Dominion money is merely distributed throughout the provinces here and there, for municipal roads, you will not get the same concrete benefit you would if the expenditure were made on a distinctive trunk line road; a road that eventually would stretch from Halifax on the Atlantic to Burrard Inlet, on the Pacific. Were such a road constructed, the municipal roads would become feeders to it, with the result that they would be greatly improved and the whole Dominion would reap untold benefits. I was present at the Yukon Exposition in Seattle, and I attended there an illustrated lecture on good roads. One of the pictures thrown on the screen showed a team of horses with a wagon containing

two or three bales of cotton, the wagon stuck in the mud, the fences broken, and everything dilapidated and dismal looking. Then, another picture showed the same place five years after the construction of a trunk road, and on this road was a wagon loaded with a ton and a half of baled cotton, drawn by a splendid team of horses, and with fine residences on each side of the road. The lecturer assured us that all this change had been brought about inside of five years by the good roads improvement commission of that district, and the illustration impressed itself very vividly on my mind. It is my opinion that the municipalities should continue to look after their own roads and that the Dominion grant should be devoted to a trunk line system of roads, such as I have referred to. The trunk road would be in the nature of a model road; it would be laid out with the idea of reaching from one specific point to another, exactly like a transcontinental line of railway, and the municipal roads would become feeders to it. I believe that is the correct principle upon which the Dominion grant should be expended. A splendid trunk road extending through the entire Dominion would be an incentive to the municipalities to put their roads in first class order; it would induce travel by tourists who would be free spenders; it would encourage the erection of first class tourist hotels at various places, and on the whole it would in every way benefit every part of the Dominion. I most heartily endorse that portion of the remarks of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) in which he advocated this trunk line road.

Mr. GERMAN. I must express my absolute disapproval of the statement made by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) as well as by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) in regard to a general trunk line. The hon. member for Dundas stated that many years ago municipalities in the province of Ontario borrowed money from the government under the Municipal Loan Fund Act, and that in the settlement of that indebtedness things did not work out satisfactorily. I think they worked out with absolute satisfaction. Those municipalities which had borrowed money received certain sums from the government of the province, and that money went into permanent improvements such as the building of town halls or other public buildings.

Mr. BRODER. That was not done at all.

Mr. GERMAN. It was done in every district that I know anything about. It may not have been done in the district which the hon. gentleman comes from, because the people there may not have been as careful in the management of their affairs as they were in my section. The hon. gentleman talked of a main highway through the length of this country, as though it were as important as a new trunk line of railway, saying that the money which is voted by the Dominion parliament should be applied to the construction of a main trunk line of highway from east to west, and, as the hon. member for Kootenay said, feeders built leading to that. Let me tell my hon. friend that the good roads which the farmers of this country want are good roads leading from their farms to the railway stations in their own localities, and not good roads which lead to any trunk highway which runs from east to west, and which is built simply for the automobilist and the tourist. The farmers of this country want good roads; they are in favour of this Bill, and the Liberal party are in favour of it, because it was the Liberal party of the province of Ontario that first introduced the proposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GERMAN. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen who smile that the first good-roads legislation that was ever introduced in Canada was introduced by the government of Sir George Ross in the province of Ontario. That legislation was accepted by the succeeding government, of which the hon. Minister of Railways was a member. They improved on it, to some extent, I admit, because they increased the amount of the allowance to the municipalities. I want to emphasize that the money which is to be appropriated by this parliament for the construction of good roads must be devoted to the construction of good roads throughout the various municipalities in the Dominion—not to a main trunk line. When the government sees fit to appropriate money for that purpose, we will discuss that proposal when it comes. But this Bill is for the purpose of aiding the provinces in the construction of good roads under the legislative jurisdiction of the provinces and that is to aid the municipalities in building good roads for the use of the farmers generally in carrying their wheat and other products to the markets on the lines of the various railways, and not for the construction of a main trunk line from one end of this country to the other.

Mr. BRADBURY. I want to congratulate the government on having brought this Bill before the House. I believe the remarks made by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat are on the right line, so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned. The trunk road idea is a good one, but the roads through our different municipalities are of more importance to us at the present time. In my province we have laboured under great difficulties for many years from the fact that we have had very

poor roads and very little money to make good ones. I have often wondered why the Dominion government did not take this matter up years ago. I know that the late government, or at least some of the ministers, were approached on different occasions, but they were afraid to bring the subject before the House; they said it was too great an undertaking. That was the answer that some of my friends from Manitoba got, and I want to congratulate the government to-day on having the courage to bring this measure before parliament. To my mind there is nothing that concerns the province of Manitoba more than the question of good roads. In my own county, which is nearly 150 miles square, we have been labouring under great difficulties. Indeed, throughout the whole province the question of making roads is a very difficult one, owing to the lack of money. The provincial government has come to our aid from time to time, but owing largely perhaps to the manner in which the province has been treated for many years by the Dominion government, the funds at their disposal have been insufficient to aid us to any great extent. The consequence has been that in the settled districts after a heavy shower of rain, it is almost impossible for a loaded wagon to pass along the roads. Therefore, the proposed Bill is a blessing to the province from which I come, and I trust that there will be a well-advised scheme for giving effect to it. Some hon. members spoke of the money being handed over to the different municipalities. If I read the Bill correctly, there is no such intention. I understand that the money will be expended under a well-devised scheme between this government and the provincial governments. In that way I believe we shall obtain value for every dollar of this money. While on my feet I want to say a word about a federal road. There are some districts in Canada where I believe a distinct federal road would be justified, and I have one in my mind's eye at the present time. At Stony Mountain, about twelve miles from the city of Winnipeg, we have a large penitentiary, and the road between that point and Winnipeg is almost impassable. There is a daily train service, but we ought to have a federal state road between the penitentiary and the city of Winnipeg. We have a mountain of stone, and the government could construct the road cheaply by using the prison labour.

I hope the government will use that prison labour to construct between Winnipeg and Stony Mountain a first class state highway. The distance is about 12 miles. This would be in the interests of the whole community, and the employment of prison labour in the construction of roads throughout this country is highly desirable. The section of road I have mentioned would afford a very valuable demonstration as to the practicability of this system. The material is at hand and the road could be built as a distinctive state road. I hope that a large portion of the roads for which money is provided in this Bill will be built in the different municipalities throughout the country, especially in the province of Manitoba. For instance, a large amount of money has been spent on the road between Winnipeg and Selkirk during the last 30 or 40 years by the different municipalities, assisted by the provincial government, but it is still a very indifferent road, and I trust it will be one of the roads to receive attention. The idea of a trunk line from coast to coast is an admirable one and when the country feels it can afford the luxury of a road of that kind I will endorse the proposal as quickly as any man in the House, but at present I hope the money that is being voted will be spent to aid the farmers in getting their produce to the markets and railway stations, and the only way to do that is to spend it in the different municipalities. I want to congratulate the government on their courage in introducing this legislation, and I hope that the appropriation that is made will be a liberal one.

Mr. NESBITT. I am in favour of good roads, because naturally I like to drive on them. The people of Oxford county have built many first-class macadam roads under what they call the county roads system, assisted by the province. My support of this measure would depend entirely on what is proposed. One section of the Bill provides that the assistance 'shall be given upon such terms and subject to such conditions.' Does the minister mean that he will keep control of the money granted to the provinces to a certain extent, after it is granted? That, I think, makes a material difference. If, as has been stated by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways, the money is intended to be granted on the principle laid down by my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), then we will have no quarrel with it. As to the construction of a trunk road, if the government intend to keep some control of the construction of roads by the various provinces they could acquire a trunk road without building it themselves by seeing that the various provinces constructed roads which would connect so as to make a trunk road from province to province. I quite agree that what the farmers principally need is good roads leading to their nearest markets.

As to the benefit to the community from having a trunk road with automobiles running along it, the farmers in my sections of the country are not so keen on having

automobiles on their roads; in fact. they are rather opposed to them. The ladies, who after all, should govern, are very much opposed to them, and say they cannot go out without having their horses frightened. Automobiles do a great deal of harm to macadam roads, and I wonder the provinces have not long since taxed automobiles to help construct roads. While I am not opposed to automobiles, as I like to ride in them myself on occasions, at the same time they sweep up an enormous quantity of dust, and farmers with fields adjacent to roads suffer loss from the dust raised by automobiles. I would like the Minister of Railways to consider seriously the amendment moved on the second reading by the leader of the opposition, with reference to giving the money only in the form of subsidies to the provinces. The movement is an excellent one that should receive commendation if properly carried out, but I think it dangerous to build trunk lines, and absolutely unnecessary if the government retain the right to control the building of roads. The money should be given to the provinces on the distinct understanding that it will be given to the municipalities, and in Ontario I think it should be given to the county councils.

Mr. COCHRANE. What would my hon. friend do in the case of counties that have already constructed good roads and taxed their people for them under the system spoken of by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), or with reference to the unorganized sections of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec ?

Mr. NESBITT. To equalize them ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Mr. NESBITT. I think the moneys could be easily expended in maintaining the roads. The provincial grants made in Ontario lack provision, which is very necessary, for the maintenance of the roads after their construction.

I know that in our section of country—and we have, I suppose, as many miles of road as any other county in the province—the provincial government assisted the county in building roads. But the great difficulty is that the roads are not maintained in any such condition as they should be. Now, where, it seems to me, our section could well be assisted by the Dominion, would be in seeing to it that the province made a condition that the road should be properly maintained according to a certain standard as well as being built to a standard. I may be wrong, but that would be my idea of the way to assist those who have already built roads. There is no county in Ontario, so far as I know, that has built anything approaching the number of roads it required. That is one of the troubles in the sections of country that are building these roads—the jealousy that arises on the part of those sections which have not good roads. I do not wish to take up time, but I would urge my hon. friend the Minister of Railways to drop that portion of his Bill that, apparently, goes into the building of federal trunk roads.

Mr. LENNOX. We haven't come to that yet.

Mr. NESBITT. I know that; but, in the meantime, I hope the hon. gentleman will think it over and be willing to drop that clause, so that the subsidies may go to the provinces to be spent under the control, after all, of the Dominion.

Mr. STEELE. The Bill now before us is, I am sure, one of the most important that the government will bring forward this session. Especially is it important on account of the direct benefit it is going to bring to a very large proportion of the people of this country. It is a Bill which affects the interests of all classes. We often speak as though good roads affected only the farmers, but they affect far more than the farmers. Good roads affect the people of every village, town and city. They affect the welfare of the workingman and business man as well as that of the farmer. Good roads will tend to lessen the cost of living in our urban centres. Some years ago, when many of our towns had a population of 4,000 or 5,000, the people could be supplied with farm produce by the farmers living within a radius of five or six miles. But many of these towns, especially in the province of Ontario, have grown so that they have a population of ten to fifteen thousand. The result is that the farmer living within a reasonable radius are unable to supply all the produce which is required. Unless a farmer lives within seven or eight miles of the centre, he finds it too expensive to market his produce in that center by driving over a road which is not in good condition. The result is that the middleman is coming in. Produce is being brought to the former by train, and the workingman in these centres is being compelled to buy the farmer's produce not from the farmer direct, but from the middleman with the middleman's profit added. The greater portion of the municipal taxation of the present day is levied for the purpose of building and maintaining roads. So much is this the case, that we find the farmers of Ontario labouring under a heavy burden of taxes. We may not say so much about the burden of the farmers of Ontario as some of our western friends say about the burdens of the western farmers, but none the less it is a fact that municipal taxation in Ontario to-day is becoming

very heavy. Anything which will assist in lessening that taxation, anything that will alleviate to some extent the burdens of the farmers in that regard will be received with a great deal of favour by them. I have just said that the greater part of the taxation in municipalities to-day is raised for the purpose of building roads. Yet, notwithstanding that, we find that the municipalities are often unable to raise sufficient to construct permanent roads. The result is that the roads throughout our province generally, are not improving at anything like the rate they should improve with the vast amount of money that is spent annually upon them. The cost of labour is increasing and we find to-day, notwithstanding the generous aid given by the Ontario government to the municipalities of that province, that the taxation levied upon the farmer is just as great or greater than it was when the road system of Ontario was inaugurated. So while the assistance given has in a measure relieved the burden, it has not reduced the cost which is levied upon the farmer. This is, therefore, an opportune time for the Dominion government to come to the aid of the agricultural population in this way and assist them in maintaining the roads that they require.

I am not in sympathy at all with those who talk of building trunk lines. Every municipality to-day is labouring and wrestling with the problem of how to build and maintain their roads without raising the taxation on their farms to too great a degree. That is a need which is urgent not only in one section of the country, but, I believe, in all sections. And it seems to me that it becomes the duty of the government first to relieve the urgent needs of the farmer. Therefore, the first duty of the government in granting aid to roads, I think, is to give aid in such a way as will relieve the municipality of at least a portion of the cost of constructing and maintaining roads. Trunk roads may be all right after a few years, but the time has not yet come when the people are demanding that. What benefit would a trunk road be to the great mass of the farmers of any of our provinces? It might assist those living along that road; but I doubt very much, especilly if a trunk road is to be used solely by the automobiles, that the farmers living along that road will receive it with favour, for we find that those living adjacent to roads most travelled by automobiles say that their crops are being injured by the dust caused by the traffic. In addition to those living along the road, a trunk road might aid those living within ten or twelve miles of it. But we know that farmers living beyond that radius will benefit little or none. Farmers are not travelling fifteen, twenty or thirty miles to market as they did years ago. Every farmer has a market town within ten or twelve miles of his farm; and the road he wants improved is the road he is using from his farm to the market town.

I am sure that while we appreciate the value of the tourist travel in Canada, and while there are many counties in every province that are attractive to the tourist, I hardly think the country is at present prepared to enter upon the task of building roads for the purpose of encouraging tourists to visit Canada. I think that our most pressing need at present is to build roads for the benefit of the farmers. I hope that whatever aid is granted will be expended in such a manner as to benefit the townships and counties, to aid the farmer who is anxious to have good roads, and who is willing to pay generously to build and maintain them. At the same time, we know that he needs assistance, not only from the provincial governments but from the Dominion government, and for that reason I am in favour of this Bill.

Mr. ELLIOT. The question which seems to engage the attention of members on both sides of the House is how best to apply this money so as to get the most benefit out of it for the Canadian people. I had the pleasure the other day of attending the Good Roads Convention in this city; a majority of the representatives were from the province of Ontario. A great many of the delegates expressed their views with regard to good roads, and it was the unanimous opinion of the convention that this money should not be expended in building trunk lines throughout the province, or throughout the Dominion. When that deputation appeared in this Chamber before the Prime Minister and some other members of the Cabinet, they were addressed by five or six persons, the majority of whom represented the cities, the manufacturers and the motormen of Canada. The president of the Motormen's Association, in the course of his remarks, said that our roads were generally in a deplorable condition, that they were greatly in need of improvement, and he also favoured the system of building trunk lines throughout the country The argument of the representative of the Manufacturers' Association was along the same line. The only sound views, in my estimation, were given in the address of the president of the Good Roads Association. He expressed his confidence that the government would expend this money in road building so as to make it of general benefit to the country districts.

Some hon. members to-night have

argued in favour of a system of trunk lines throughout the country. I listened with much pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member from Dundas (Mr. Broder) in explaining the system of trunk lines in other countries. He told us that in the state of New York they had about 3,000 miles of trunk roads, and he argued that if we are going to build a system of trunk lines the federal government should construct them solely out of the federal chest, the same as they are doing in the United States. In New York state they have 7,000 miles of country roads and 2,700 miles of state roads constructed and maintained entirely by the state. The state contributes fifty per cent to the cost of the county roads, the county contributes thirty-five per cent, and the township only fifteen per cent. No doubt hon. gentlemen are aware that a few years ago a Highways Improvement Act was passed by the Ontario legislature, setting aside $1,000,000 for the improvement of highways in that province. There are at the present time 17 counties in the province that are building roads according to the regulations of the Public Works Department, and are participating in that grant. When they build roads according to the regulations they receive from the provincial government one-third of the cost, and the municipalities, or the townships through which the road passes, contribute the other two-thirds; whereas, in New York state the townships contribute only fifteen per cent. In New York state they have no less than 70,000 miles of township roads. The state contributes thirty-five per cent to the cost of their construction, whereas, in the Dominion, the farmers contribute the full cost of the township roads.

Now, let me give the experience of the county of Middlesex. It has been suggested that the trunk system would be entirely satisfactory to the people. We have in the county of Middlesex at present about 110 miles of road set apart by a county by-law. We are building sections of that road yearly, according to the regulations of the Public Works Department. The work is under the supervision of a competent engineer, Mr. Talbot, of the city of London. He attended the good roads convention in Ottawa a few days ago and gave his views on the subject. He suggested that the system followed in building roads in the county of Middlesex was not satisfactory to the people. In laying down a system of road building through different counties, in order to make a connecting link between counties, certain roads have to be set apart, and it sometimes happens that these roads are not the ones most travelled by the people, and of course thepeople in the other parts of the country object to paying for roads that they do not use. Then, again it is sometimes necessary, in order to make the connecting link, to set apart too great a mileage of road according to the appropriation at the disposal of the townships. Therefore, in expending this money, we must arrive at some basis. In some counties the rate is based on the assessed value of the property; in my own township, the township of West William, our appropriation is based on the assessed value of our property, amounting to about $1,328. We have nine miles of road set apart under a county by-law. If we go to work to build a standard road according to the regulations of the Public Works Department, we have only $1,328 to expend each year, and we are not able to build half a mile of road per year. At this rate it will be over twenty years before that nine miles of road is built. The latter half of the road will be practically worn out and will be in a deplorable condition before the other half is built. Before we complete the road the first half will be worn out. The cost of these roads in Middlesex county is too great, because we are not in a position to get the crushed stone that is needed.

Last season there were two miles of road built near the town of Park Hill and the crushed stone came from the St. Mary's quarries. Counting the cost of the stone, hauling, laying the stone on the road, rolling, watering, spreading, and everything in connection with this road, it cost the township of McGillivray, which was building this road, $10 per cord. It cost $6,700 for the two miles of road which they built, or $3,350 per mile. By building a road of that kind according to the regulations, with an appropriation of $1,328 per mile, we cannot hope in years to come to have in our township nine miles of what will be a standard road. Then again it has been argued that we could go on and build this road, raise the money and distribute it over a certain number of years. Suppose we build this road, taking into account its situation, cutting the grades as they ought to be and building a standard road it would cost not less than around $5,000 per mile. We have nine miles of it and that would mean $45,000. As I said before, this road runs in such a way across the township that part of it is the least travelled road that we have there and it would cost $45,000 to construct it up to the standard which I have mentioned. If we extended the payment over a period of twenty years it would mean that we would have to take from the citizens of our township over $2,000 per year in increased taxation together with interest and the people in the township object to building that road and

going to that expense especially when so few people are travelling on a considerable portion of it. If there was some other method of expending this money I think it would be more satisfactory to the people. For instance, if we were allowed, with the gravel that we have in our township, to gravel this road instead of constructing a macadamized road, we could gravel it in three years. Then we could go over it again, regravel it and we would have a first-class gravel road which would give us a road as we required and it would not mean the imposition of a high rate of taxation on the farmers of that locality, or if the local and Dominion government will grant dollar for dollar with the sum set apart by each township for road building, said moneys to be spent by the township councils it would be satisfactory to my people.

We have heard it stated in the corridors and also in the House that our roads, instead of improving, are going back. I do not agree with that statement. When we consider how Canada has advanced and progressed in the last few years we cannot help but think of the time when our fathers and our forefathers moved into this and other provinces of this Dominion. When the county of Middlesex was first settled the older men came in there with their families, settled on their farms, lived in log houses, cleared their land, fenced it, drained it and they also, in the meantime, built roads. When taxes first came into force they paid their taxes and they or their successors have continued to pay their taxes ever since. They have built these roads, they have improved them, they have made them what they are at the present time, and they would rather continue as they have been doing, than to saddle their county with an enormous debt in order to have standard roads. Is it fair that these people should have to go into a system of road making which would increase their taxes year by year? However, I am glad that this government have shown a willingness to assist the farmers of Canada in this matter and I assure them that my people will greatly appreciate their efforts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I have anything further to say. The question to be settled is how this money is to be expended. I am in favour of this Bill. I have every confidence in the Minister of Railways when he has laid this Bill before the House and I am going to take much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few general observations regarding the Bill which is now before the committee. I suppose it is unnecessary for me to say anything as to the value of good roads, for I imagine that we will all be in unison upon this question. There is no doubt that highways have been the greatest element in the civilization of countries. Nothing can promote commerce to a greater degree than good highways, and, perhaps better still, nothing tends to give to a country greater social and national contentment than a good system of highways. The intrusion, however, of the federal parliament into a public service which has heretofore been cared for altogether by the provinces is, as has been stated, a new departure and it raises problems, many of which, I think, will be found by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) and the government, difficult to solve. However, I am sure that hon. gentlemen in this House will agree that if any workable method can be devised of assisting the provinces in securing good or better highways than they have now, the measure before the House will meet with commendation from everybody in it and from the country generally. Great care should be exercised in working out any system, and I think that on the occasion of the introduction of this Bill by the Minister of Railways he spoke as one who felt that it was a very difficult task to prepare a suitable Bill. If I may make a suggestion—not that I expect it to be carried out—I would say that the government might very well have taken the months which will intervene between the closing of this session and the opening of next session and devoted the time to the study of this question and to conferences with the several provinces, so that at the next session they would have been able to have presented to parliament a Bill containing a definite scheme. Had this been done it would have been more satisfactory to parliament and to the country generally. Of course, it was to be expected of the government that they would, at the earliest possible moment, implement the pledge which they made to the country during the recent campaign, namely, to grant financial aid to the provinces towards highway improvement. But I am sure that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and the country generally would have favourably considered a statement from the government to the effect that before introducing this legislation they desired time to consider the whole subject. It would have been very much in the interest of parliament and the country and possibly to the betterment of our highways, had the government devoted a little more time to the study of the question with its many problems and presented their decision at the next session of parliament. I think I can venture the statement that it is highly improbable that any work can be done upon the highways of any province during

the year 1912. After the closing of parliament, conferences must take place with the several provinces, and when these conferences commence many problems will arise which none of us perhaps foresee to-night. The discussion this evening upon this Bill discloses the fact that hon. gentlemen entertain many different views.

I therefore, believe it will be impossible for the provinces and the federal government to reach a working agreement and to form an organization which will carry out any scheme of expenditure ultimately agreed upon between the Dominion Government and the several provinces. I venture the opinion that there can be no expenditure of moneys by the federal government for the year 1912, which will go to the provincial governments. If there is, I do feel it will not be profitably expended for the reason that no well-thought out scheme will be possible of attainment in such a short time. While the expenditure of federal moneys upon the public highways is a new thing in this country, I do not think for my part that it will be objectionable. The financial strength of the several provinces is limited indeed and I think before many years the federal government will find that they must, for different reasons, augment the provincial subsidies. In the United States this matter has been frequently discussed. In the early days of the history of the United States, that country did embark in the building of trunk lines, notably one known as the Cumberland Road, starting from the headwaters of the Potomac River in Maryland, going through Pennsylvania and West Virginia to Ohio, and that road was completed in 1805. The federal government constructed ten or twelve other roads, but no great expenditure was made and after the Civil War that policy ended. These roads were constructed largely for military purposes, and while many requests have been made of recent years upon the United States federal government for expenditure on highways, so far nothing has been done. They have however a Good Roads Bureau in Washington which is doing excellent service. I would like to read from an article by a magazine writer, upon improved highways, the following short extract concerning the good roads work done by the United States Government.

Foremost of these outside agencies is the United States office of public roads organized in 1893 with an appropriation of $14,000, with offices in two attic rooms. This bureau has increased in usefulness until now it occupies a four story building of its own which includes within its walls, physical, chemical, petrographic and photographic laboratories and a machine shop, and has at its disposal an appropriation of $116,000. A staff of twenty-four engineers and superintendents of road construction are employed to teach the art of road building to any community that will take the trouble to ask for their services and provide the material and labour. A favourite feature of the bureau is the object lesson road project. This consists in assigning an engineer to supervise the construction of a short section of road to demonstrate the proper methods aand instruct local builders. Up to July 1st, 1909, 264 object lesson roads had been built in thirty-five states, demonstrating the proper methods of using crushed stone, sand, clay, shell, earth, bituminous materials and brick. Besides this, the engineers of the bureau give special advice, deliver technical lectures, introduce model systems of construction, maintenance and administration in counties and study and report on practical methods for a series of years.

That is as far as the United States have gone in the way of assisting public highways, although demands have been made for direct contribution to the several states as is contemplated by this measure. However, I believe that public opinion is travelling very rapidly in the United States at present upon the question of improved highways, and that the federal government will ultimately come to the aid of the states possibly in the manner contemplated by the Bill now before the committee. In other countries of the world in which the federal system does not prevail direct expenditures of moneys are made for the improvement of highways by the government. As has been stated by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) we find an illustration of this in France, which spends seven million dollars annually upon its highways. There are four systems of roads in France; the national roads which are built and maintained by the state; the military roads, which are maintained by the state; the departmental roads which would correspond to the county roads in this country, and which are maintained by the state and by the department themselves, and the communal roads, which correspond to the ordinary highways in this country, and which are maintained by the people. In England and Wales fifteen million dollars are spent annually upon highways, and, according to the magazine writer from whom I quoted a moment ago, one hundred and sixty million dollars annually are expended by fourteen nations of Europe upon their highways. Now, while the House will cordially support this measure and will give to the government every assistance to extend to the country the benefits of this measure, still in this departure of financial aid to the provinces for highway improvements we should exercise caution. Personally, I regret very much that the government have seen fit to deal with the Bill this year. I would never, for my part, have censured them for not presenting to parliament such a measure at this session. In

fact I will go as far as to say that they have hardly given us a measure at all because the Bill before the House is hardly worthy of the name of a Bill. I approve of the preamble and that is probably the best part of it. But I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite must agree with me that the Bill is very indefinite, that it discloses no plan and no matured scheme and that everything indicates that the government have so far, given little, if any attention to the principle involved in the Bill. I do not criticise the government for that. I recognize the fact that since their advent to power, they collectively and individually have been very busy, but I think they should realize that in embarking upon a policy of Federal expenditure in connection with roads in this country, they are adopting a policy which is new to Canada, which involves many important questions, and I think they might have well asked parliament and the country to give them a few months to enable them further to study the measure before presenting it to this House.

Now, let me point out some of the matters which should be considered in connection with this Bill. Section 3 says that the Governor in Council may grant money in any year to any province. That is hardly satisfactory legislation. It breaks every canon of legislation with regard to the expenditure of moneys. It is not the practice to give legislative powers to the Governor in Council in matters of this kind. Then I think we should know approximately what sum of money the government propose devoting to roads in the various provinces. It must be a very substantial sum or it will be of no use. It is important also to know how many years this expenditure will continue—whether it will be perpetuity or for a fixed number of years. I understand that the government of Nova Scotia propose to expend money on capital account for road improvement in the very near future; and if they knew definitely what sum of money they would get from this government, and over what period it would continue, I am sure that it would affect their policy materially. There are many other questions which it is important to consider in connection with the expenditure of money for the improvement of our highways. We should have some information as to the total mileage of the roads in the several provinces. There should be some classification of these roads. There should be some standardization of the work that is to be performed. There will be the question of maintenance, which is far more important than construction and involves more difficulties. I venture to think that it will require many months to develop a method of expenditure which will be acceptable to the government itself, to parliament, and to the country; it will take a long time to reach an agreement with the several provinces; and I am sure that if the government appealed even to their own supporters in parliament, they would find many varieties of opinion as to the form this expenditure should take. I trust, however, that if the government decide to proceed with the expenditure this season, which I very much doubt, they will be able to develop a policy and a system of expenditure which will meet with the concurrence of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I trust that they will not pay very much attention to the suggestion of a trunk line from coast to coast. We may possibly reach such a thing some day, but in view of the present condition of the ordinary highways of the country, I think I can say with considerable confidence that the suggestion of a federal road from coast to coast would not meet with very much favour. There is this to be remembered, however, that as our highways in the several provinces are improved by a better system of construction, reconstruction and maintenance, gradually the scheme of a national highway from coast to coast will develop itself. Neither do I favour the idea of giving this money to any municipality, for the reason that I think experience teaches that the expenditure would not be made by any municipality in such a way as to secure permanent results. If the money proposed to be granted under this measure were given to the municipalities, I believe that it would not be expended in accordance with any system. The provincial governments would be better equipped to make the expenditure, and they can better than any municipality rise above local considerations.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not given this matter very great consideration, but of all the municipal expenditures throughout the country nothing pleased me more than an expenditure for providing good roads. I am sure that the people are coming more and more every year to appreciate good roads.

The objection to municipal taxation for the improvement of roads which we heard in bygone days is gradually being removed. The advantages of good roads in country places is so much appreciated by the ordinary public that I do not think any objection can be found in Canada against the measure proposed by the government. I appreciate the efforts the government are making on behalf of the people to provide a good roads system. I want to endorse

their action, to give it my sanction, and to say that in the part of the country which I represent I believe their action will be heartily endorsed. Nothing so strikes our attention in the old land as the admirable roads, founded I suppose on a basis that was laid by the Romans in the olden times. These roads are repaired yearly, practically they are never allowed to get out of repair, and so the cost of repair is light, while the people always have good roads. It may be said that this measure is immature, but the government are making a beginning, people will begin to talk about good roads as they are proposed to be developed by the Dominion government, or through the provincial governments, or municipalities, whatever system may be adopted, and in that way the government will gradually get a great deal of information that will assist them in maturing their scheme. I, therefore, think they were wise in bringing down this measure at this early date. Very much cannot be done this year, but a start has been made, and I look forward in the near future to a great improvement in the scheme which is as yet only in its infancy. I have never known any measure to receive such cordial support in this House. There may be differences of opinion as to the time and methods of carrying out this proposal, but on the principle of improving the highways of the country I believe both sides of the House are unanimous in heartily supporting the Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This question affects almost every one in Canada. It must be satisfactory to the government to realize the approval that has been manifested throughout the country, and by those who have spoken on this question to-night. Since the most primitive times the highway has been of the most vital importance to every one. The foot-passenger in years gone by considered that when he was on the King's highway he was safe, and as time went on he was by statue compelled to go out and help to construct a highway that would meet the requirements of the country. We have reached the time when it is necessary not only for the provincial governments to do something towards building and maintaining the highways, but for the federal government to relieve the burdens of the people in this respect. It has been said to-night that the civilization of a people can be judged from the standard of their highways. This is quite possible. The hon. member for Rouville said that we have passed the railway age, and must now devote our attention to building better highways. It struck me at the time what a welcome such a system as this would have received from the people of 80 to 100 years ago, the system that has been advocated by several speakers, that is a provincial or federal highway, east and west from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Happily we are living in an age of progress, and I believe the day has passed when any such system as that is required in this country. The roads radiating from the different market centres throughout Canada are the roads that ought to receive the greatest attention. I believe the statements made here to-night to that effect are an echo of articles that have been appearing in the public press for some time past and that we may rest assured that those articles have been inspired by those who desire the construction of a great continuous highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific for a specific purpose. I do not believe that such a system would meet the requirements of the people to the same extent as roads radiating out from these different points. If that were the intention of the government in this Bill I would be opposed to it. If such a system of roads as that were to be constructed the government ought to buy a right of way and build a road of that kind because it certainly would be monopolized for three or four months of the year by the automobilists to the exclusion of those using horse vehicles. If such a system of highways were built it should be built apart from our present highways, it should be built on a right-of-way acquired for the purpose; where you could turn the automobiles loose and let them run as fast as they like, where they would not interfere with other people. I believe that such a road for the use of automobiles would have to be of different construction from any road yet built in the rural districts of Canada. The very best macadam-roads in our country have been absolutely ruined in three or four years by automobile traffic. On a dusty summer day an automobile travelling at the rate of forty or fifty miles an hour raises a cloud of dust that settles anywhere between twenty and forty rods of that road. The unfortunate people who live within a few rods of a highway are made very uncomfortable through having to keep their windows closed to keep out the dust. For that reason I contend that if such a system is intended it should be a road constructed of material that would not be drawn up by the suction of the tires of an automobile and sent broadcast over the country.

Now, I desire to say a word about the tourists. We certainly welcome the tourists to our country; we are glad to see them come here. And, as a rule they are people who have time on their hands and are not necessarily as much hurried as those who have business pressing upon them. You notice how the automobile is becoming very fashionable during the past few years. But the rage at present seems

to be not to travel over our rural roads, but to travel through the air. We do not know how long it will be before these tourists will not require our roads at all, and I do not know but that we ought to take that into consideration. Another feature of this road situation is this, that for four or five months in the year it does not matter what the nature of that road is. We have a coating over our roads now, and have had for months, which makes it not very material whether those roads are constructed of macadam, asphalt, clay or gravel. For about two or three months in each year it is important that we should have good roads, but for the balance of the season it is not of such great importance.

I believe the government are to be commended for endeavouring to relieve the pressure resting upon the people of this country for the building and maintaining of roads. I believe that a great deal of money has been wasted, and worse than wasted, through the manner in which it has been expended on our highways. If, through the influence of the government a more scientific mode of road construction can be adopted, a great deal will have been accomplished. But it is in the maintenance of the roads that the greatest work can be done. I believe our municipal councils, many of them, would do a great deal better if they would expend double the money they do in maintaining and looking after the roads. I believe also that the narrow-tyred wagons hauling heavy loads over our roads do more to spoil those roads than anything else. If the government would encourage the use of wide tyres on wagons—I suppose that is outside the scope of the federal government, but perhaps something could be done—a great step towards the better maintenance of our roads would be taken. These narrow tyres cut up the roads, let the water into them, and so the frost gets in two or three feet deep where there is an upheaval, and consequently the roads are thrown out of balance.

It is argued here that the government is too hasty, that there are bound to be delays before anything can be done. But is it not therefore, all the more important to pass this Bill, so that the initial stages of this movement may be accomplished? Then, when the Dominion and provincial government authorities get together they will find out what difficulties there are and how they are to be overcome. But I do not think any difficulty will arise that cannot be overcome. All the details will have to be worked out; and then it will come before the House and it will be time enough to deal with the question. I am heartily in favour of the grants to be made. I do not know that it is necessary for us to know at this stage, just how much is to be spent or how many miles of road is to be constructed. That will all come out in good time. The improvement of rural highways is something that needs encouragement. At the same time, I must express my strongest disapproval of the views that have been expressed by a number of members to-night with regard to trunk roads. I think the day has long passed, with our present network of railways, when anything of that kind is required.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (Translation). Mr. Chairman, representing as I do a thoroughly agricultural constituency, it is in order that I should, on behalf of the people who have sent me here, refer briefly to the bill now before the House.

I have carefully gone through the provisions of this Bill and I certainly cannot approve of it, for several considerations. In the first place it is not definite enough. After reading it through I am not in a position to give in connection with it an intelligent vote, not having been able to ascertain the manner in which the moneys voted by the House will be applied.

The preamble states that it is desirable to improve and extend the existing highways. Why not state which existing highways it is the intention of the Government to improve? Then we might be in a better position to vote in regard to it.

Mention is made also of opening great trunk roads, of assisting in the building of highways which it is proposed to build. Why not state what highways are meant? Why not locate them, why not state, for instance, in what provinces it is intended to build them? No, there is vagueness and indefiniteness about it all. Nobody knows anything as to the government's intentions. Well, whenever I am called upon to cast my vote, I like to know what it is I am voting for. When I agree to an expenditure of public funds, I like to be posted as to the use it will be put to, and not leave matters to be dealt with entirely at the sweet will of the minister and the government. Even the quota to be granted to the various provinces it not mentioned, neither is it stated in what provinces it is proposed to build those great highways. The minister will decide everything by himself. Well, to say the least, that is not of a nature to satisfy my constituents.

The government is desirous of making a new departure. This is the first time, we hear it said on both sides, that the Dominion government goes in for road-making in the various provinces. If the hon. minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) were in his seat, just now, I would enquire from him whether for such an undertaking a referendum is not in order?

We have had elections in 1908 and in 1911, and never has the question been raised before the electorate, at any rate

before the electors in my constituency, never have they been notified that Parliament would ask for an appropriation with the object of carrying out work which properly belongs to the provinces. That is why I am in favour of a referendum, of an appeal to the electorate. There is no more talk of referendum nowadays. How things must have changed in the meantime!

Which of the two parties was the first to think of improving our roads? The former government, for it was due to them that further subsidies, amounting to millions of dollars, were granted to the provinces, whereby the latter were enabled to adopt a policy towards the building of better roads and the improvement of those already in existence. It was owing to those subsidies, granted by this Parliament, at the request of the former government, to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and to the other provinces as well, that those provinces were in a position to help considerably and to a far greater extent than heretofore, in the improvement of roads and highways. For instance, the government of Sir Lomer Gouin, at Quebec, has quite recently appropriated millions towards the improvement of roads in the province. Now, how comes it that the Dominion government is meddling with the work entrusted to the care of the provincial governments, endeavouring to take the latter's place and undertaking to build roads, though refusing to state where it is intended to build them.

Reference is made to trunk roads, to the improvement of highways for automobiling. I am fearful of these new schemes. I fear there are trusts at work behind them. If the object was a good one, and one of which they were proud, the actual grounds underlying that new policy would be stated, the House would be apprised of them and enlightened as to the existing roads which it is the intention to improve and those which it is intended to build.

It is the intention to build great national highways, so is it stated in general terms, without defining or furnishing any particulars. I shall certainly withhold my support from any proposal of such an indefinite character.

New highways will be opened, it is stated, existing roads will be improved. In the county of Montcalm, there are no millionaires touring in their automobiles. There are farmers, tradesmen and merchants, and automobiles are not considered a necessity; we are content with driving about in the ordinary way.

There is no touring, the roads do not allow it. To my mind, existing roads should be improved before thinking of building those great national highways. What is needed is roads leading to school houses, flour mills, saw mills, agricultural fairs, and other meetings, to church, to ploughing matches, etc. Those are the roads which should be improved in the first place.

At the opening of parliament I was glad to read in the speech from the Throne that the government intended to extend further protection to agricultural interests. But I am altogether opposed to the building of those great trunk roads which are to run from the Atlantic to the Pacific, at any rate not until local roads have been improved in the interest of the country people.

The hon. minister will alone have the right to say where highways are to be built, in what provinces the money is to be spent. I for one am of opinion that if the government is desirous of improving the roads, it should do so in accordance with the policy laid down by the former government, that is br granting a subsidy to each province. For it is a known fact that the men who are entrusted with the management of provincial affairs are better acquainted than is the minister with the needs of each municipality and of each county. I shall say further: before building those great highways, it would be of greater importance, to my mind, to improve existing roads by improving the grades, the hills which are to be found throughout the province, widening and straightening the roads, having them provided with proper ditches, having them lighted at night, and replacing the old wood bridges, which are washed away every spring and nearly every autumn, by iron structures.

Let public funds be applied to the improvement of our county roads, by affording to the farmers greater facilities to reach, for instance, their county town, when the court is sitting, or the registry office, or else when they are drawing milk to the creamery or cheese factory; those are the roads which the government should improve.

Automobiles are mentioned. Those vehicles are nice to look at, they are fine for speeding, but at times the occupants are apt to break their necks. The automobile is suitable for a certain class of people: people whose business is rushing require an automobile; but the farmer can make a better use of time repairing his fences and buildings and buying more land, than touring in automobiles.

Automobiles are great speeders, but it often happens that thieves take advantage of them. As Crown prosecutor, I have some experience in this connection. Farms are raided by automobilists at night, and it is often very difficult to get hold of them.

Automobiles are modern inventions, and worthy of admiration; but I can assure you that they cost an awful lot for maintenance, and more than one young spendthrift may find himself before long under

the necessity of returning it to those from who he bought it. That craze has even got hold of our young country people. Farmers' boys occasionally apply to the "old gentleman" for the gift of an automobile. Rubber tires are no longer the thing; it must be an auto.

Well, that is an incentive to extravagance and most of the time has a demoralizing effect. People go in debt to keep up with the times; they have an auto waiting at the door, and sometimes creditors too. Therefore I say: let us have roads that enable the farmer to reach the market, the court house, &c.; that is all right. I realize that the farming community have undergone great hardships in the past, and it is only right that they should now have some reward. Country roads during dark nights should be lighted. That would be of greater usefulness than highways for autos.

Again I say that it is an encroachment on the rights of provincial governments. The representatives of constituencies, mayors, councillors, aldermen in the various municipalities, are in a better position than the Minister of Railways to know in what manner and in what localities, in connection with what roads, such improvements should be carried out.

Since the government is in a giving mood, and I rejoice at it, let us grant a subsidy to each province, to be expended as they think best, as was done by the former government. But patronage is a great thing; the minister alone will decide that such a province should be granted so much, while another province will go without it perhaps. The minister alone will decide; in the constituencies represented by friends of the government, lots of money will be spent, while in my county nothing will be spent, because I am a Liberal. I know how it works from experience; an amount had been voted for my constituency in last year's estimates, and this year it has been left out. I am afraid the same will happen again.

Let us build suitable roads leading to railway stations, so that farmers may reach them easily and send their products to market. Let us improve our highways, and in this connection, it is not necessary to build great national highways for automobilists and other swells. There is no hurry for improvements of that kind, it is preferable that we should help out the farmer. Automobiles are great at slaughtering people. Some time ago an unfortunate young lady, by the name of Smith, was thrown down and instantly killed, on Victoria bridge, by an automobile carrying four or five young men who were slightly intoxicated. I for one fear them.

Once more I say I cannot support that measure, considering that my constituents have not been consulted by means of a referendum, as requested by the Minister of Public Works whenever there is a new departure. I insist that this Bill should be rejected on the ground of its unfairness to parties interested.

Mr. J. P. O. GUILBAULT (Joliette) (Translation). Mr. Chairman, I have had great pleasure in listening to the speech of the hon. member for Montcalm, whose constituency adjoins mine. However one thing surprises me: his pluck which I thought was great and indomitable, has failed him entirely. He is afraid of automobiles; he considers them a calamity. I should have judged that he would welcome with joy the building of fine highways in the counties of Joliette and Montcalm. My wish is that the county of Joliette be provided with good roads, and even that visitors may be seen touring over them in their automobiles.

It rather confuses me to hear the hon. gentleman state that the bill under consideration is an infringement on provincial rights, seeing that while it provides granting assistance to the provinces, it is not until an agreement has been entered into with the provincial governments. I cannot see any encroachment when such a course is adopted.

The hon. member asks for a list of all roads which are to receive help from the government. However, has he considered that a great deal of work would be implied in such a task? To point out all the roads which require improvements throughout the country would be an impossibility; as that would actually mean almost a book, for the counties of Montcalm and Joliette alone.

No, what the government intends to do, I understand, is to improve existing roads, so that farmers may find it easier to move about in the wet season of spring and autumn. What the government intends to do is to put county towns in closer touch with the adjoining country, to help on agriculture by facilitating assistance at fairs and agricultural competitions, through the building of good roads.

If it were proposed to build a great commercial highway between Montreal and Quebec, I do not think it would be necessary, as suggested by the member for Montcalm, to have a referendum to find out whether the farming community would approve of such a plan. Well, that is exactly what the government intends to give us, with the approval and aid of the provincial governments. Automobiles may be safely met on such a road, and besides, I believe farmers' sons are not quite so anxious as the member for Montcalm suggested to be provided with automobiles.

I was pleased to listen to his address, and I think others were pleased also. I

shall be happy to give my support to the government's proposal. For a long time past we were met with the cry: What are you about, are you not going to do something towards the improvement of the roads? Now this government had pledged itself, at the very opening of the session, to introduce a measure to that effect, and I am happy to see that it has redeemed its pledge. When I visit my constituency, and possibly that of my hon. friend for Montcalm, I shall be happy to be able to state that all hon. members, whatever their party ties, have acknowledged the desirability of helping on the farming community and of developing the resources of the country through the building of good roads.

Mr. SINCLAIR. There are some points on which I think the minister ought to give us further information. I would like to know whether he is to define the classes of roads on which the money is to be expended. We are aware that in this country there are a great many roads on which provincial and municipal authorities are spending money. So far as I understood the minister's statement, he has not given us much information on that question. I think it is very material to know whether this money is to be spent haphazard on all kinds of roads, or whether the government intends to define the classes of roads on which it will be expended. Then with regard to the maintenance of highways after they are built, another question on which the minister has given us insufficient information. Is it the intention of the government not only to construct these highways but also to maintain them; or is it the intention to cast the burden of their maintenance on the municipalities? That is also a pertinent question. Again, the matter of bridges has not been referred to in the discussion; I do not know that it has been mentioned at all. In my province of Nova Scotia the question of permanent structures across streams is a very important one. The province of Nova Scotia has borrowed the sum of $2,000,000, and has expended that money in the construction of steel and iron bridges throughout the province. Now, is it the intention of the government to spend any part of this money in the construction of bridges across streams? These questions are all of interest, on which I would like to have the views of the minister before I am asked to vote. I may say that I am heartily in favour of expenditures of this kind on roads throughout the country. There is nothing so much needed in the county I have the honour to represent as good roads. The Bill, so far as it will tend to the improvements of roads, will have my hearty approval.

The clause that has been discussed a good deal this evening, namely, clause 6, is the one to which I take especial objection. I was disappointed that the minister did not adopt the suggestion of the right hon. leader of the opposition and frankly say that this money would be distributed according to the population of each province. There is another method that might be adopted, and that is the mileage of the roads and which I think perhaps would be the fairer method. At all events, we are accustomed to the principle that moneys given to the provinces should be given according to population, and I would suppose that on so elementary a matter the minister would have no hesitation in adopting that principle. I do not see why he refuses to adopt it. If money is to be awarded to the various provinces it should certainly be awarded on some principle, and that principle ought to be contained in the Bill.

Mr. BURNHAM. Does the hon. gentleman consider that mileage is a true basis? If so, why does he consider the other principle elementary?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would be willing to adopt either basis. But for my part, I would favour the mileage system. In certain localities the other principle would not work out fairly. At present I am not prepared to say which principle would work out best throughout the Dominion. My province is cut up with rivers and streams, which makes it necessary to build roads in many places on both sides of the river. In some counties there is great mileage of road compared with the size of the county; this great mileage is necessary, and perhaps such a county would not receive its fair share if the sum was divided according to population. But why should the minister refuse to place that in the Bill? We are told by the Prime Minister that the appropriation will define the amount that is to be given to each province. Now that is a very haphazard way of settling it. The appropriation is made every year. The government may divide the money on that principle this year, and may retain the principle of population; but some future government may not do that. It strikes me that one of the first things that ought to be laid down specifically in this Bill is the principle on which the money should be given to the various provinces. The provinces all contribute alike, I suppose to the revenues of this country according to population.

Mr. LENNOX. Surely the hon. gentleman does not suggest that all the present provinces contribute alike on the basis of population?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think so.

Mr. LENNOX. They do not.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think it will be admitted by everybody that the provinces contribute to the revenue of the country according to population.

Mr. LENNOX. The provinces mainly contribute according to the amount they consume, because the revenue is mainly made up from the customs duties.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Quite true, and taking the country all over, I suppose the consumers in one province consume as in a like proportion. A thousand consumers in the various provinces consume much as a thousand in another province. I do not think my hon. friend will deny that the provinces contribute according to population to the revenues of this country, and that if money is to be taken from the public treasury, and awarded to the provinces for the purpose of building roads, it ought to be awarded on that principle. Now, if it is a good principle it ought to be embodied in the Bill; otherwise the division will be made, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), would say, according to the rule of thumb. Then in order to be of service to the country, in order that we may know how much we can depend upon each year, there ought to be a stated sum. For example, at the present time the municipalities have to take the responsibility, or the provinces if you like, of maintaining and building roads. They would like to know how much they are to receive from the federal treasury in order that they might make their plans, and decide what improvements they can afford to undertake. Of course, if you are to build roads throughout Canada and make them permanent, it is a very large undertaking. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), stated that there were 50,000 miles of roads in the province of Ontario. He calculated that $2,000 a mile would build roads in that province. I do not agree with him at all, I think that figure is too low. In my own province I believe it would take at least $3,000 a mile to build and maintain a macadamized road, or to build a road that would be an approach to a macadamized road; it would take $3,000 at least. If that is true for the province of Ontario, you would require $150,000,000 to build roads over the province of Ontario, and make them permanent. You would require $60,000,000 in the little province from which I come; and taking the country all over it means that an immense sum of money would be required. It strikes me, therefore, that the government will not be able to grapple with this great question for a number of years to come. That makes it all the more necessary that they should define just what they are undertaking to do, that they should lay down some principle on which they propose to act, in order that each province may get its fair share of the benefit of the expenditure. As I said before, the question of bridges ought to be dealt with too. They are very much required in some of the provinces. The provincial governments are at present constructing these bridges. What does the present Bill mean so far as bridges are concerned? I trust that when the minister addresses the House again he will deal with that question, and inform us whether the government is going to undertake the construction of bridges.

But my main purpose in rising was to object to the provisions of clause 6. I regard that clause as very objectionable. In the first place, it involves a divided authority, it involves an expenditure of money by order in council under the control of this government. It also involves an expenditure under the control of the local government. Now, a divided authority is not good in the construction of roads. One party will be throwing it off on the other, whereas, the responsibility should be under one authority.

Mr. EDWARDS. But divided authority was all right when the hon. gentleman's party in power was appointing fishery inspectors throughout the province.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am not now dealing with fishery inspection. We have no divided authority in my province. But I wanted to say something to the Prime Minister, if he were present. In the province of Nova Scotia the leader of the Conservative party in local politics, for the last twenty years has been preaching to us that we ought to have the administration road money under one authority.

In that province we had the municipalities constructing the roads, we also had the local government constructing the roads and there was a conflict of authority which has not worked out well in Nova Scotia. Very recently the duty was taken from the municipalities and given to the local government with the exception of the expenditure under the statute labour law of the province. If we are to have money expended by the counties, by the provinces and by this government we will have three authorities in Nova Scotia looking after our roads. That is an undesirable system and if we retain clause 6 in this Bill we will have that system. I object to clause 6 because I submit that it will be a constant temptation to the government to use this money for an election fund. I see that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) laughs at that, but let me tell him that we have had the spectacle within the last few days of a minister of

the Crown wading through the snow banks of South Renfrew peddling out road commissions in order to get votes. I would not like to see this temptation placed in the way of this government because I am afraid that they would not have sufficient moral backbone to stand up against it. I do not think they will find it possible to make a fair distribution in that way. The pressure on them will be very great in order to get favours here and there—

Mr. BURNHAM. Does the hon. gentleman think it is fair to presume upon the moral rottenness of the people of this country?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I may say to the hon. member for Peterborough that I was much pleased to know that these corrupt proposals did not work in South Renfrew, that the people rejected them and that the leading Conservative paper in that municipality denounced and reproved the Minister of Customs for what he had done. I was much pleased to know that that was the case. If the government have the courage to make this a good Bill, a Bill that will have all objectionable features eliminated from it, a Bill that will give the money to the provinces according to the population, to be expended on the roads and not for election purposes, I can assure them that they will have the hearty support of every man on this side of the House and they will also have the support of the whole people of Canada.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Chairman, I think that the measure which the government has brought down and which is now before the committee for consideration should receive the unanimous approval of the members of this House. I believe that it will meet with the approval of the people throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. I must confess that I was somewhat surprised at some remarks which were made by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). He stated that in his judgment the government should have deferred bringing down this legislation for a year. Well, Sir, the hon. member for Halifax has been a member of the government of Nova Scotia and I presume he is somewhat familiar with the financial conditions of that province. I observed in an 'associated press' despatch which appears in the papers throughout Canada today a reference to the speech from the Throne at the opening of the legislature of Nova Scotia which makes particular allusion to the financial condition of the province. This is the statement which was made in the speech from the Throne with reference to the finances of Nova Scotia, as reported in the Ottawa 'Citizen':

The speech commenced by saying that the growing expenditures of the province in connection with the administration of the various services of the government necessitates provision being made for the obtaining of additional revenues to meet the requirements, and a measure dealing with this question will be presented to the House.

If that means anything, it means that the province is perilously near the time, if indeed, it has not reached it already, when direct taxation will have to be resorted to, in order to provide revenues to carry on the public service. Yet the hon. member for Halifax, when this government proposed a measure which will be a relief to the people of the province of Nova Scotia, in that respect, says that it should be deferred. I think that a statement of that sort, made upon an occasion of this kind, made when legislation of this nature is brought down to the House, shows that the hon. gentleman is exhibiting a spirit of partisanship, which, I think, should not be in evidence in considering a measure of this character. It would have been very much better, in my judgment, if he had accepted the situation, if he had endorsed this legislation and, if he desired to make any suggestions as to amendment, to have done so, rather than to have proposed that there should have been a delay in bringing down legislation of this character when the province from which he comes, stands so much in need of assistance in regard to the maintenance of its roads. One disadvantage which the province of Nova Scotia has suffered for a considerable length of time, and, I presume, it is one that is in a measure common to all the provinces of Canada, is in reference to the state of the roads. We in Nova Scotia have of late years, been endeavouring to secure an increase of immigration into that province. We believe we have there splendid opportunities for those who desire to secure homes in Nova Scotia, but one of the disadvantages we are confronted with, is the condition of the roads, and this legislation which proposes to assist very materially in improving that condition, unfortunately does not meet with a very hearty reception from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. What is the objection which they are urging in this connection? It is simply that the government at this time does not give details as to how this money shall be expended. I do not think that is a very serious charge. I do not think that the government should at this time, say how this money is to be expended, nor do I think it is necessary that particulars in connection with the expenditure of the money, which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), has requested, should be given at this time. The hon. member for Guysborough has said that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), who has charge of this legislation, should state to

this committee how this money is to be given to each of the various provinces of Canada. That was stated by both my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) and the Minister of Railways and Canals, when this legislation was introduced into this House. It was understood, and it is understood, by every fair minded man in this House, I think, that this money is to be distributed amongst the various provinces, practically upon the same basis as the subsidies to the provinces are paid. I do not think that any person who is prepared to consider the matter fairly can say that this is not a reasonable and proper manner in which to distribute the money. The hon. member for Guysborough finds fault because the Bill does not say that certain sums of money are to be expended upon the bridges of the various provinces. The Bill leaves that very largely in the hands of the governments of the different provinces to deal with.

Mr. LENNOX. A road would include a bridge, would it not?

Mr. JAMESON. I think that it would, but anyway, I take the ground that under this Bill the legislature of any province of Canada that desires to do business on business principles with the government of the Dominion, will have no difficulty whatever in securing its fair and reasonable share of the money that is proposed to be devoted to roads and these legislatures can do with that money, in connection with the construction of roads and highways that, which, in their judgment, under the agreement is fit and just.

But we find that there is a very distinct difference in the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite, upon the other side of the House, with regard to the cost of the construction of highways, and from the province of Nova Scotia we have had two opinions this afternoon with regard to that matter. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) considered that $2,000 per mile would be sufficient to construct permanent roads in the province, while my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) thinks that $3,000 per mile will be necessary. And although there is this diversity of opinion between these two gentlemen in respect to this one particular subject, yet they expect the government to come down now and say how every dollar of this money will be expended in all the various provinces throughout the Dominion. Nothing could be more unreasonable and nothing could more pointedly show the partisan spirit in which they are considering this proposed legislation. I have noticed that throughout this whole discussion every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, no matter in what state of mind he approached the consideration of this measure, always came to the final conclusion that he was not prepared to oppose it in any way, shape or form. Every one of these gentlemen came, so to speak, with the intention of cursing the legislation, but before they concluded their remarks we found them blessing it. There is not one of them who dares to vote against this measure, because they know that the fair-minded people of Canada are going to support it and to support the administration which has implemented one of its pre-election measures this early in its career. I believe that the farmers and those who are general users of the highways will declare that in the initiation of this legislation the government of this country has taken an advanced step. I believe that in submitting this Bill to parliament the government will meet with the unanimous endorsation of all reasonable and fair-minded people in Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE. I did not intend to join in this discussion, but the debate has taken such a trend that in justice to the people I represent I must make a few observations upon the measure. I regret that the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) found it necessary to drag political issues into the discussion of such a measure. He wanted the world to understand that Nova Scotia is in a deplorable state financially. Well, there is no evidence, public or private, upon which the hon. gentleman can base that statement with any degree of certainty. The only thing he could quote in support of his statement was a press despatch, which has no authenticity whatever. All I have to say to the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) and to this House and to the country generally is that the revenues and financial standing of the province of Nova Scotia are on a better foundation to-day than ever before. The observations of the hon. member (Mr. Jameson) compel me to review to some extent the relations of the party to which he belongs in that province towards the financial condition of Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia has the unique record of having been governed by Liberals for the last forty-five years, except for one four years of the Thompson-Holmes government, which stands forth as a bare spot in the desert, as a pelican in the wilderness. At the end of the four years of the Conservative government in Nova Scotia the revenues of that province amounted only to $500,000, while to-day, through the various legitimate means which were taken by the Liberal administration, the revenue is fast approaching the two million dollar mark. And, what is the record of the Tory party in Nova Scotia in regard to every measure taken by the Liberal government to put that province on a sound financial basis? When Mr. Fielding took steps to bring

about the consolidation of the mines and to raise the royalty on coal at different stages from seven and a half cents to twelve and a half cents a ton, the Conservatives fought that proposal at every stage; they said that the coal business of Nova Scotia would be runied if the royalty were raised in that way.

An hon. MEMBER. Cut it out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I fear that the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question before the Chair.

Mr. McKENZIE. Some hon. gentleman told me to cut it out, but I do not know what he means exactly by that, because I cannot cut out what I have said already, and I do not know by what process I could cut out what I have not yet given expression to. I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman, if you will pardon me. You were kind enough to allow me to go thus far, and I want to point out, that the revenue from coal in Nova Scotia was brought to its present excellent condition in the teeth of opposition from the Tory party. We got $675,000 from the eastern extension award, and that we fought for in the teeth of the Tory party, both in Ottawa and Nova Scotia. We got better terms for the province of Nova Scotia, as well as other provinces of the Dominion, through negotiations conducted by the Liberal government in Nova Scotia with the Liberal government in Ottawa. All of these things were fought by the Tory party, to which my hon. friend from Digby belongs. Therefore, if Nova Scotia has a good financial standing to-day, we have nothing to thank the Tory party for. That is all I have to say about the remarks made by the hon. member for Digby.

Mr. JAMESON. Does the hon. gentleman deny that in the speech from the Throne at the opening of the Nova Scotia legislature, an intimation was given that some means would have to be taken to raise additional revenue to meet the increased expenditures of the province?

Mr. McKENZIE. The province of Nova Scotia is going along at very rapid strides.

Mr. JAMESON. Will the hon. gentleman answer the question?

Mr. McKENZIE. And in providing for these new departures in which the province of Nova Scotia is launching forth, keeping the lead educationally and otherwise of every province in the Dominion, I suppose the Premier of Nova Scotia finds it necessary to take steps to add to the revenues of that province. But that is not because there is anything the matter with the financial standing of the province, if they choose to keep within the narrow compass which no doubt the hon. member for Digby would prescribe for them.

Mr. JAMESON. Does the hon. gentleman not admit that what I said is absolutely correct?

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not admit anything of the kind. I do not know what is in the address at the opening of the Nova Scotia legislature, I did not see it, and I am not going to commit myself or my friends to press despatches which do not give the text of the address at all. The Premier of Nova Scotia last summer told me in conversation that there were some sources in the province which should contribute something towards the revenue, and it is possible he is going to take steps to bring about such a condition as he had in mind, not because of lack of prosperity in the province, but in order to secure contributions to the revenue from sources which are not contributing at present. When my hon. friend comes to deal with the matter, I think he will find that this is not from any urgency for a fair distribution throughout the province of the collection of the moneys necessary for the different purposes which come within the purview of the provincial government.

Mr. JAMESON. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman favours deferring to another year the payment to the province of Nova Scotia of any portion of the money proposed by this legislation to be distributed amongst the various provinces?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am certainly in favour of a fair contribution to the provinces along the lines suggested in this Bill, but I am disposed to agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that the government should be in possession of some further information before dealing with this Bill. When the Bill is passed, as it no doubt will pass, and when the hon. Minister of Railways or some representative of his department goes with that Bill in his hands to negotiate with one of the provincial governments, I think he will have very insufficient and meagre material with which to negotiate. If the negotiations had taken place first and the conditions and circumstances had been known to the minister, I think a better Bill could have been framed. I do not think the passing of the Bill at this session of parliament will hasten things very much, if clause 6 is permitted to remain in the Bill, because it evidently contemplates some legislation by the legislatures of the different provinces before anything can be done. I think it is a fair assumption that before this Bill becomes law, the legislatures of the different provinces will have prorogued, and there

will be no opportunity of implementing this Bill by provincial legislation this year. If this is the case, there would not be very much lost if the government adopted the course suggested by the hon. member for Halifax. Some of us have the misfortune to be lawyers, and when we come to deal with questions involving constitutional considerations, we wish to keep as much as possible within constitutional lines. Some hon. gentlemen may think that it is not very difficult to take any amount of money and spend it on the roads of the different provinces. If the hon. Minister of Railways had come today with a Bill asking that a certain amount of money should be devoted to education in the different provinces, it would strike us at once that he was up against a difficult situation, because it is well understood that education is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces; but when you come to look at the provisions of the constitution under which we live, you find that roads and education are in precisely the same condition, both being under the exclusive control of the provincial legislatures.

Mr. HAZEN. If that is correct, how was it that the previous government was justified in appointing a commission for the purpose of investigating and reporting on the whole question of technical education?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is quite easy, and if this government had taken the precaution to appoint one of their numerous and prolific commissions to inquire into the condition of the roads, they would have been able to offer a better Bill. The outgoing government wanted to know whether it would be advisable or not to depart from the beaten path with regard to education, and to appropriate some money for the advancement of technical education in this country, and for the building of institutions devoted to technical education. I am proud to say that the province of Nova Scotia had blazed the way and had given the cue to the government of Canada in that respect, and that commission was appointed for the purpose of finding out whether or not the conditions of the country would justify this wide departure of taking the moneys of this Dominion and applying them to technical education. That is my answer to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I think it is satisfactory. But he, lawyer as he is, will not for a moment question my statement that this road question is entirely within the purview and scope and authority of the local legislatures. The hon. gentleman shakes his head; but I shall be thankful if he can find one line of authority in the British North America Act giving us power to devote the moneys of this country to be expended on public roads. There is nothing of the kind. But I am not finding fault with this measure. I am glad the government are taking this course, only I want it done in the proper way. We know that in the province of British Columbia, and some times in the province of Ontario, a great deal of difficulty has been experienced by reason of overlapping authority with regard to the fisheries. In those two provinces it appears that the local governments can issue licenses for fishing purposes, and the Dominion government can issue them also, so that there is always a conflict of authority. The Minister of Railways and Canals, by this Bill, is bringing about a condition which will cause a similar conflict of authority, and if he will follow the course suggested by the right hon. leader of the opposition, he will avoid that. It would appear to me that, as far as any political favouritism is concerned, or favouring one regulation more than another, the chances are that the division will be pretty well balanced for many years, perhaps always. We have nine local governments, some will be Liberal, some will be Conservative, probably they will be pretty well balanced at all times.

Mr. BURNHAM. Do I understand that this measure is, in your opinion, ultra vires?

Mr. McKENZIE. While I am not opposing the measure in any way if I were called on as a lawyer to give an answer on this as a question of law, I would have to say that I do not think that there is any provision in the constitution as it stands now which would justify this legislation. If the money thus voted would come as an addition to the subsidies to the provinces and within their control, I would endorse it, but if it is the intention of the government to keep this money under their own control and to work through officers appointed by this government, the Act is going to be a source of inconvenience and very difficult of operation.

In answer to the argument of the Prime Minister that this is analogous to the subsidies granted to railways, I would point out that whereas the subsidy granted to a railway company is hedged in by three Acts of parliament, the Act incorporating a railway company to which the subsidy is granted, the subsidy Act itself, and the general Railway Act, this is not hedged by any Act, it is entirely controlled by the will of the Governor General in Council. That is why we on this side want something in the statute providing that this money shall go to the provinces and shall not be expended according to the caprice of Dominion officers, or of whatever gov-

ernment may be in power here. I think that section 3 of the Act vests the title to this money in the provinces. Once you grant the money to the province, there is only one way that the province is represented and that is by its government, so when you grant the money to the province you vest it in the government of the province and that is the end of it.

What I particularly wish to point out is that what is required on this side is that provincial rights shall be observed. When we are giving this money to any province, we are not giving anything but what is their own. The people of this country are the people just as much in the right of the provinces as in the right of the Dominion; and we must not assume that we are giving gifts to paupers in making these grants. But when we give to the provinces it is our duty to leave it to the provincial authorities to deal with the money. They have the control in dealing with the roads through their representatives in the provincial legislatures and through the provincial government. The only objection I have to this measure is the mode in which it is proposed to carry it out. I am perfectly satisfied that a fair amount of money should be afforded to the different provinces for the purposes of roads, but I hope it will be put absolutely under the control of the different provinces, subject to the supervision by the department. As the Prime Minister said, it was analogous to the railway subsidies. And these subsidies are paid, I understand, on the certificate of an engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals that the railway is finished up to the standard set by certain well defined plans and specifications. All the Minister of Railways need do, if he wishes to keep control of it, is to pay out money to the provinces on the certificate of some officer of the department that the work was properly done according to the standards of the department. Beyond that the expenditures should be entirely under the control of the local government.

Mr. HUGHES. (Kings P. E I.). I wish to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals whether the appropriation made for each province will be the same year by year. I could see great objections to it if the amount were large one year and small the next. This point has not been touched upon before, so far as I know.

Mr. COCHRANE. I can give no promise or statement on that; it is a matter of policy.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) accused the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) of displaying partisanship. But it seems to me that the display of partisanship, if there was any, was made by the hon. member for Digby himself. He spoke of the provincial finances of Nova Scotia and mentioned a telegraphic communication from Halifax. As to what he read, I do not think anybody on this side could raise objection to it; but the inference he drew from it is what we object to. He said that the province is perilously near the time when direct taxation is at hand.

Mr. JAMESON. If the hon. member will pardon me, I think I said, it would seem from the speech from the Throne that such was the case.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). This bugaboo of direct taxation we have been hearing out in Nova Scotia for a quarter of a century, and we are no nearer it now than we were twenty-five years ago. The hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has well said that the finances of Nova Scotia are, taking everything into consideration, in a very healthy state. What I object to particularly is the insinuation that we on this side are opposed to this legislation and to assisting the provinces in providing improved roads. For myself, sitting on this side of the House, I am in hearty accord with any measure that would improve the condition of the roads in Nova Scotia and elsewhere in Canada. After hearing the discussion, I believe that this Bill, as has been charged, is a very crude Bill. Still, the object of the Bill is a good one—to assist in improving the highways. But when we examine the Bill we find that, stripped of verbiage, it means that this parliament proposes to assist the various provinces by giving them an additional grant for the maintenance and improvement of highways.

Mr. BURNHAM. Does the hon. gentlemas disapprove of that?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I do not say I do. But why sail under false colours? Why not put clearly in the enactment what is the effect of the Bill? It does look as if there were something behind the motives of the government in bringing in this legislation. It is true, they say, that this will implement the promises they made before the election. But the hon. member for Cape Breton and others have pointed out that so far as roads and bridges are concerned, these are entirely within the jurisdiction of the local legislatures. I had the pleasure of being present when the right hon. the Prime Minister received a delegation from Ontario on this subject of improved roads, and I remember distinctly that he stated that the fathers of confederation never expected that this parliament was going to deal with the maintenance of roads and bridges and that we were going very far when we proposed to assist the provinces in the manner we intend to do

this session. It does seem that you do not go very far if this parliament is not going to maintain the roads after they are built. Reference has been made to trunk roads. I agree with those hon. gentlemen who say that that is not what this country requires; what we want is improvement of the highways that are being used every day. The great trouble with us in the older provinces is that we have many roads but not enough money to keep up the roads we have.

Mr. LENNOX. Will not section 3, cover all that?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I am not referring to any particular section, I am merely referring to the conditions as they obtain in our province. Our roads were not laid out as systematically perhaps as they are in some other provinces, or as they should have been. There is no such regularity about our roads as there is in the western provinces. In Nova Scotia we have a greater mileage according to population than any other province in the Dominion, and we have to bear a heavier burden to maintain our roads than any other province according to population. The discussion this evening has shown that what will suit one province will not suit another. It has been pointed out that in some provinces the municipalities are bearing a certain proportion of the cost of maintaining roads, that in other provinces is borne by the provincial governments, I believe in the province of Ontario the municipality pays $\frac{2}{3}$ and the Local Legislature $\frac{1}{3}$ of the cost of improving the highways. In certain provinces the municipalities are prepared to bear a certain burden of taxation for the maintenance of roads. But in the province of Nova Scotia we are not prepared at present to tax the municipalities to the same extent that they are taxed in Ontario, our people have not been educated along those lines. Now in view of these different conditions in the various provinces, is it not better to hand this money over to the provincial legislatures, who can spend it more judiciously for the improvement of roads? The member for Digby (Mr. Jameson), remarked that my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean), had criticised the government because there was no conference provided for between the provinces and the federal government with the view of working out a scheme; he intimated that my hon. friend from Halifax was arguing in favour of delay, and that he was inconsistent in view of the fact that Nova Scotia required more money to enable it to conduct its affairs. But I want to point out that if the member for Digby is sincere in this matter, he will ask the government he supports to pass this money over to the province so that the roads may be put into good condition at once. The province has all the machinery now, we have engineers as good as this country can furnish. We have in the road engineer, Mr. McKenzie, as good a road maker as can be found in the whole of Canada. If the member for Digby is desirous of helping out the province of Nova Scotia and guarding against delay, he will urge the government to pass this money over to the local legislature.

Mr. JAMESON. Does the hon. gentleman disagree with the member for Halifax?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I do not. The member for Halifax made no appeal for delay, but he pointed out, what is true, this if this Bill passes now we are going to have delay. If this Bill passes there will be no improvement of the roads in Nova Scotia or elsewhere next summer, because this legislation provides practically for an agreement with the provinces. Why an agreement with the provinces? Because it is recognized that under the British North America Act any man who goes to work on a road in another province would be a trespasser and liable to indictment. If the Minister of Railways sent one of his men down to Nova Scotia to attempt to improve the roads, he could be indicted for interfering with the public highways, unless there was some previous consent obtained from the provincial government.

Mr. JAMESON. How does the hon. gentleman expect to make an agreement until he has authority to make it?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I say that the member for Halifax was not arguing for delay in the expenditure, but he was arguing for delay with a view of getting this government and the provincial government together so that everything could be made ready and the machinery could be put into operation for improving the roads as soon as an arrangement had been made.

Mr. JAMESON. Does the hon. gentleman think that a delay of a year in passing this legislation would mean an equal delay in the payment of any sum of money which might be made eventually under this legislation to the various provinces?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). What difference would it make if the Minister of Railways conferred with the provinces in the month of June, and made an arrangement for working out this scheme, this parliament would not meet again until November, so the Act could not be put into operation until the following year. Now I regard clause 3 also as rather suspicious. In the marginal note it states that it is a grant of an annual subsidy for highways. I

say the marginal note is misleading, it is not an annual subsidy at all. In the Act itself, it says that the Governor in Council may, in any year, and upon such terms and conditions as are prescribed, grant to any province. It does not say that this grant shall be actually made, it is an appropriation made at such time as suits the Governor in Council. I have no doubt, that in an election year, you will find there will be a grant, but the year after election there will be no grant.

Mr. LENNOX. You ought to know.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). It is practical politics, I suppose; but this is too big a matter to be used as a political question. On this side of the House, we think this matter could be better worked out if the money was given to the various provincial legislatures to expend. It is also to be noted in this clause, that the grant may be made to any province; it does not say to the various provinces, but to such province as the Governor in Council may decide. The whole Act seems to have been framed with a view of having more patronage to distribute.

That is exactly what one would conclude from reading the Act. It is true the Act speaks about highways, but the desire is to get the money for election purposes. This is the construction that one would have to put upon the Act from the way in which it is drawn. I do not wish to be taken as criticising the Act. I am strongly in favour of the principle, but I think that the provinces could get far more and the roads would benefit to a much greater extent if a certain amount were apportioned among the provinces either according to mileage of road or population. It is time that there should be an increase in the subsidies to the various provinces. Since 1896 the subsidies to the provinces have been increased twice under the Liberal administration, and I think it is time there should be another increase. After 1896 the amount of the subsidy was doubled. I think it was $4,500,000 and it was increased to $9,000,000. Another increase is due and, as my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) said, it is only what the provinces are entitled to.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Guysborough called the minister's attention to what is unquestionably an omission from section 3 in regard to the question as to whether or not the aid that is proposed to be given by this government shall be extended to bridges. It must be manifest to the minister that it is absurd to talk about improving existing highways or constructing new roads if you are not going to have power to improve old bridges and to construct new ones. That I need not argue, because I am quite sure that the hon.gentleman will agree with me that the government would have no power to make any expenditure under this Act for the improvement or construction of a bridge as distinct from a highway.

Mr. EDWARDS. Why not take the bridge to be part of the road?

Mr. BELAND. Sometimes it is not.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) may dispose of it in that easy way.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am not disposing of it, but as we understand it in our part of the country a bridge is part of the highway.

Mr. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman looks up the legislation in the province of Ontario dealing with the question of roads, he will find that the legislation deals specifically with bridges in addition to roads. There is no such thing as a grant of money to roads without dealing specifically with bridges at the same time.

Mr. EDWARDS. Certain bridges.

Mr. MACDONALD. No, not certain bridges.

Mr. COCHRANE. Up to a certain extent.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. LENNOX. In Ontario it is provided that if a bridge exceeds a certain length it is within the jurisdiction of the county council, and in other cases it is under the jurisdiction of the township council.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is what the minister means. There has been a great deal of discussion as to the general principle of this Bill, and it has been very interesting to hear what hon. gentlemen have had to say with regard to it, but I am free to say that I think a good many of them have taken a great deal for granted in the discussion and in the speeches which they have made. I want to look at this measure in a careful manner, and I submit my hon. friend could not spend money upon bridges unless he put in an amendment which would entitle him to do so.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think so.

Mr. MACDONALD. He may have some familiarity with the practice in Ontario but the legislation in other provinces is different. Bridges are one thing and highways are another. They have been dealt with in many provinces of the Dominion as being entirely apart one from the other. Legally they are entirely apart when it comes to a question of liability in regard to the repair of highways. I do not have to go into this question or to make any

very elaborate legal argument about it because in the constituency from which I come there was a leading case on the question of liability for non-repair of a highway—the case of Gerdert vs. Municipality of Pictou county which went to the Privy Council and in which the municipality raised an issue in regard to the maintenance of the highway which had never been raised in any part of the Dominion before. We are here to legislate seriously and if the Minister of Justice, who must take the responsibility for legislation of this character, were here I would go into the question with some degree of elaboration for the purpose of showing that my hon. friend under this Bill could not deal with bridges either for their improvement or construction unless he includes in the section the words which I propose. My hon. friend surely can take no objection to it. It is extending the principle of his measure and I apprehend that if the proposition is to be a working one, if it is intended that we are going to have anything at all in this measure, we want to get it in such a proposition that can be worked out.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not object to putting it in.

Mr. MACDONALD. I rose for the purpose of suggesting an amendment which I thought should be accepted.

Mr. COCHRANE. It does not have reference to clause 3.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes it has. I propose:

That clause 3 be amended by inserting the words 'or bridges' after the word 'highways' in the fourth line and the words 'or bridges' after the word 'highways' in the fifth line and by striking out the words 'both' in the fifth line and inserting instead the words 'all or any.'

Mr. OLIVER. What is the contemplated policy of the government under subsection 3? Does the government contemplate aid to local roads, to trunk roads, or to colonization roads? That is important in deciding as to the merits of the Bill as respects each individual member's vote upon it. If the policy of the government is to use the money for the improvement of local roads, that is a matter of general interest, and I think everybody in the House would vote for it. If it is for the improvement or construction of colonization roads, then certainly those of us who represent the provinces where there is new country to be developed, would, of course, be strongly in favour of that. If, however, the proposal is to expend any large proportion of this money in the establishment of what might be called trunk roads, for the benefit particularly of the automobile section of the population, I am not so sure that every member of this House would be prepared to strongly support the measure. It is important that the minister should give us some information as to what policy the government has in mind.

Mr. COCHRANE. This will be largely a matter of policy to be determined on between the local governments and the federal government. I would hope, in dealing with the different provincial governments, to lay down a policy that could be worked to from year to year, so that we would not have checker-board improvements. In my opinion the scheme will be largely worked out in connection with the local governments of the different provinces, probably one province might prefer one scheme and another province another.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that is any explanation at all. The Bill is couched in very general terms, and that being so, it is only fair that the members should know what policy the government proposes to pursue. Of course, if the minister says the Federal government is going to pursue any policy that will suit any of the provincial governments that would be quite intelligible.

Mr. COCHRANE. Probably the roads in the provinces represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) would require different treatment from the roads in Ontario or Quebec, and I have had no hesitation in saying from the very beginning that we would work in connection with the local governments.

Mr. OLIVER. If it is understood that what is done will be on the responsibility of the local governments, then we can understand where we are, and I would be willing to accept that position, but if the Federal government is going to exercise jurisdiction in the distribution of the money it is only fair the minister should say what particular class of roads he proposes most to favour.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I did not propose speaking on this question, but the hon. gentleman from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), in reply to what I thought was a respectful question, took occasion to make a personal reference to me. I asked him if he thought there would be any danger under the arrangement proposed, of the money advanced by the Dominion government to the provincial government of Nova Scotia, being garnisheed by creditors of the provincial government, and, for want of a better answer, the hon. member stated that perhaps I had in my own experience, suffered from the garnishee laws of my province. Now, I do not pose as a millionaire; I am not wealthy at all; I am not in the fortunate position of some gentlemen opposite in that I have not received offices

of emolument from the government, and I have not had an opportunity of laying by money in that way. I have not fed extensively on the public treasury nor do I expect to do so, and consequently, I am not a millionaire, but my assets have never been garnisheed, and I never expect that they will be. I want to say that if I had been as prodigal with the expenditure of my income as the province of Nova Scotia has been, I would expect such a procedure. I want to say further that in the carrying out of the provisions of this Bill, I hope the minister will exercise a great deal of care, in respect to the province of Nova Scotia. Hon. gentlemen opposite who come from Nova Scotia have advocated that the money be paid over directly to the province and that the Dominion authorities part with any control over its expenditure. Well, judging from the history of the Nova Scotia government in the past, with regard to road construction, that would be a most dangerous policy to follow. Several years ago the province of Nova Scotia borrowed some $600,000 for the purpose of constructing permanent roads, and they used this money, not to make roads, but to make votes, and to-day there is not a foot of permanent highway in that province.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Is that the policy you propose adopting now?

Mr. DAVIDSON. That is a policy I do not propose adopting. I advocate that the Dominion government working in conjunction with the provincial government, should be thoroughly satisfied that every dollar is being expended in making roads and not in making votes. These gentlemen opposite do not seem to have any conception of making roads; their idea in reference to the Road Act is something to make votes with for themselves, and consequently you see them divided as to how this money shall be expended. The hon. member from Welland (Mr. German) says: Don't give this money to the provincial government. And why?

Because the government of Ontario is Conservative he says, give it to the municipalities. The hon. member for Halifax, the hon. member for Antigonish, and the illustrious member from North Cape Breton say, give this money to the provincial governments, because they know that the provincial government in the province of Nova Scotia is in a very difficult corner, and they want this money to be expended to make votes for themselves in the coming elections. My hon. friend from North Cape Breton represents a constituency in which there was a good deal of jobbery in connection with the expenditure of the $600,000 to which I referred, and he should be the last man on earth to advocate giving the provincial government a free hand in the expenditure of this money. I sincerely hope that nothing of the kind will be done. A few years ago the federal subsidy to the province of Nova Scotia was materially increased. It was hoped by some admirers of the provincial government that it would use those funds for constructing highways; but instead of doing that, they used it to increase their own salaries and appoint certain zealous officials. I venerate to a large degree the hon. member for Halifax, and on most matters would be inclined to take his opinion, but I cannot but remember that he sat for some years in the provincial government of Nova Scotia, and if he had any knowledge of roads he did not show it then, and I do not think he is in a position to instruct this House on that subject.

Mr. McKENZIE. There is no one in this House who is more willing to give a respectful reply to a respectful question than myself. I would be the last man in this House to give any other than the most respectful reply to the hon. member for Annapolis if he had asked a respectful question; but I leave it to the judgment of any hon. member whether it was a serious or respectful question to ask a representative of the fair province of Nova Scotia if I did not think it was a dangerous thing to pay money over to the credit of that province for fear it might be garnisheed. There is an old saying and a true one that it is an ill bird that befouls its own nest. Let the hon. member for Annapolis think what a reflection he has put upon the province that has given three premiers to this Dominion. The province of Nova Scotia is proud of having given to this Dominion the present Premier. Yet the hon. member for Annapolis stands up in this House and says seriously that the financial condition of that province is such that any moneys paid to its credit are liable to be garnisheed. I want the province of Nova Scotia to know that that is the reputation which the hon. member wishes to give to the province of Nova Scotia in the presence of this House. Every province of this Dominion has been represented in this discussion, but not a man has said anything disrespectful of the credit and standing of his own province except the hon. member for Annapolis. I want the good people of Annapolis to know that they have sent a gentleman here who thinks it his duty to speak in such a disrespectful manner of the fair province of Nova Scotia. The hon. member says there was jobbery in my county. I do not know to what county he refers.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Victoria.

Mr. McKENZIE. I defy him to produce the record to show that there is a word of truth in that statement. It would not be parliamentary to say that the hon. gentle-

man uttered a falsehood, but I do say that he was born with a predisposition to strike the truth at an impossible angle.

Mr. DAVIDSON. The hon. gentleman is very bold in challenging me to produce records that are about a thousand miles away. He knows very well about the circumstances. He says that I spoke against the reputation of the province of Nova Scotia. He must know that that is incorrect. I never said a word against the reputation of the province of Nova Scotia, and I want to say, in justice to the reputation of my province, that the good people of the province intend at the very earliest opportunity to put out of office the men who have put the province in debt and have given it nothing but bad government.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Clause 3 of the Bill provides that the Governor in Council may in any year grant to any province in aid of improvement of highways; that is, it may grant to any one province and leave out all the others. The language bears that construction, at all events. I do not think we should allow the clause to pass in that shape. I think we should assert the right of each province to participate in any grant that is made. I know that the Prime Minister has stated that he will observe that principle in the distribution of the money that is proposed to be spent under this Act. The Minister of Railways has also made the statement that the money will be expended according to the population of the various provinces, but they will not be here forever, and my objection to the clause is that it does not express that idea. As it reads, it simply gives the government power by order in council to grant money to any one province. Therefore, I beg to move that the following be added to clause 3:

Provided always that when any such grant is made to any one province each of the other provinces shall be entitled to a proportional grant based on the population of such province.

Mr. MACDONALD. I desire to second this resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friends are calling 'lost' as if this discussion had been carried on altogether by hon. gentlemen on this side. Quite as many have spoken on the government side as on this side, and there is no desire on the part of the opposition to obstruct or delay this Bill. What objection can there be to putting in the Bill what the Prime Minister to-day said was the policy of the government. It would not be fair for the government to say that in one year all the grant would go to one province. That is surely not the intention of the government.

Mr. HAZEN. The adoption of the amendment proposed would render the Bill useless and abortive. The Bill is based on the idea that the money is to be spent by arrangement with provincial governments so that if we adopted this amendment, then if the government failed to come to an agreement with Nova Scotia, for instance, no money could be spent in New Brunswick or any other province because of this amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD. There is nothing in section 3 in regard to agreement with the provinces, that is fixed by subsequent sections.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not see that it would make any difference whether that is fixed by section 3 or a subsequent section.

Mr. SINCLAIR. We are not saying you must spend money in the province, but, that you must appropriate a similar sum.

Mr. HAZEN. Which means that unless you make an arrangement with every province the whole scheme will fail. The matter may be safely left to the good sense of the government and to the good judgment of the people who would not tolerate any injustice as between the provinces.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister's argument is erroneous as a matter of law and of interpretation of this Bill. There is not a line in section 3 which makes the voting of the money contingent upon the making of an arrangement with a province. Sections 4 and 5 control section 3 and limit the power of the government and prevent them making an expenditure except under the conditions contained in the agreement arrived at with the provincial governments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When the Bill was introduced some days ago the minister stated that the money which was to be appropriated every year should be apportioned among the different provinces as the subsidies are now apportioned. The object would be to work in with the different local governments. In order to make the intention surer, I said:

I was asking the hon. gentleman to tell us if there was any basis of allotment among the provinces. The provincial subsidy is based on population.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, I explained it was to be on the same basis as that upon which the subsidies are granted to the provinces.

When the Bill was distributed and I came to read it I found no such disposition in it.

Therefore, in order to make the matter certain, I moved an amendment to insert this in the Bill. But the Prime Minister said there was no necessity for that, because the Minister of Railways in intro-

ducing the Bill, had told us that such was the intention, and upon this he asked the House to vote down the amendment. I supposed then that matter would be disposed of in Committee of the Whole, and that words would be inserted to carry out what was declared to be the intention of the law. But that has not been done. Surely, so important a matter is not to be left simply to the good-will of the government. As I have said, governments do not live forever and a succeeding government may not agree with the disposal of money in such a case as this proposed by the government it replaces. And even the same government will sometimes change its mind. So, if it is the intention of the government that this money is to be divided among the provinces according to proposal, surely that should be incorporated in the Bill. The amendment of my hon. friend, I think, does not convey the idea. Therefore, I move, in amendment to the amendment, that the following words be inserted as subsection 2 of section 3:

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

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. MACDONALD. Before that vote is taken, it is surely due to the committee that the government should state why they decline to implement the policy stated on the introduction of this measure and on the second reading. We have discussed this measure assuming that at the proper time the government would express their policy in the Bill. Why is it not done? Hon. gentlemen onposite are saying 'lost,' but there is no explanation.

Mr. ROGERS. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) heard the right hon. leader of the government this afternoon make a clear and distinct statement that when parliament was being asked to vote this money the money would be appropriated an amount for each province in Canada, and there is no purpose to be served by the amendment of the right hon. leader of the opposition. The motion was rejected this afternoon, and I am sure it will be rejected again to-night.

Mr. BELAND. That is not the intention as explained by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). He just intimated to the committee that an agreement could be made regarding one province only, and an appropriation made for it while the rest of the provinces would be left out.

Mr. HAZEN. No, no.

Mr. BELAND. What, then, is the contention of the hon. minister?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. BELAND. Hon. gentlemen opposite say 'lost.' But we want to know why this amendment should be rejected. That is all we ask. We propose that the money be distributed according to population. The Prime Minister has said that it is the intention to do so. We want that put in black and white in the law. And not only is that refused, but we are refused an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MACDONALD. Surely a proposition of this kind, a serious proposition, and one involving a new departure is not going to be disposed of in this fashion. Hon. members opposite cannot complain of captious discussion on the part of the opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen who have been here all evening know that more members spoke on the government side than on this side. And they spoke at length. They lauded the government for this Bill. One hon. gentleman wanted to see a great federal highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Others on the same side opposed that, and propounded all kinds of theories as to how this money should be spent. After listening for three hours to a discussion of these academic problems, we come to the details of the Bill. We ask the government to incorporate in the measure the statement made by the Minister of Railways in introducing it and by the Prime Minister on the second reading. And the only answer we get is the cry of 'lost.' That is not a dignified way to deal with a great question, and one in which this parliament is entering for the first time upon an expenditure of road money, dealing with a matter which seems to trench upon the sphere of the provincial authority. And we have this anomaly that while the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), is the third minister to state that the government is to divide this money among the provinces, according to population, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), tells us that that is not the policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD. On the contrary the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen) argued against the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) by telling him that it would have this effect, that, if the government should

vote money for expenditure in any particular province, having made an agreement with that province, the amendment would compel them to vote money for expenditure in other provinces where they had no agreement.

Mr. HAZEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald), must know that he has misconstrued me, or, I should say that it is evident that the hon. gentleman has misunderstood me, and I am sorry I did not make myself clear. I said that the effect of the amendment of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair)—which by the way, was not accepted by the leader of the opposition——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was an improvement.

Mr. HAZEN. —the effect would be that if the government made an agreement with the government of one province for an expenditure of a certain sum in that province and failed to make an arrangement with some other province, they would be precluded from spending money in any province; just the reverse of the position stated by my hon. friend from Pictou.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am glad the minister has succeeded in getting himself into a position which, he thinks, in some degree consistent with that taken by the other ministers.

My hon. friend has reaffirmed his attitude. The committee has not forgotten the discussion we had a few moments ago in regard to that matter, when I showed him that the amendment of the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) would not have the effect which he anticipated. Do I understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say now that it is the policy of the government, when they take a vote in any one year, to take a vote for all the provinces at the same time?

Mr. HAZEN. That is the policy laid down by the Prime Minister, to which I adhere.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that was the policy of the government as stated by the Prime Minister this afternoon, and as stated now by the Minister of Railways and Canals, but the hon. gentlemen opposite who are responsible for carrying out this Bill will not put it in the law. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) seems to be the boss of this administration. He stated—I remember his words very well —after the Prime Minister spoke and said that was the intention of the government, the member for Simcoe made a general demurrer. Oh no, he says, I don't think that is the proper principle, to expend this money according to population, there are some localities that should have more than others. That was the view taken by the hon. member for Simcoe, and he is the real master of the administration. Now, the government will not put into the law what the Prime Minister declared was his intention this afternoon, because the member for Simcoe objects to it. I congratulate my hon. friend on his power over the present administration.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Sinclair) negatived.

Amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) negatived.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is time to adjourn now.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, finish it up, it won't take us long.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You cannot do it. It is not fair at one o'clock in the morning to ask us to sit here any longer.

Mr. COCHRANE. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. COCHRANE moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will we take up the same thing on Monday?

Mr. COCHRANE. No, the Grain Bill will be up on Monday, and other government Bills, and then estimates of the Department of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.58 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 26, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

EDUCATIONAL BILLS.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I wish to call attention to two Private Bills, No. 68 and 69, relating to Queen's University, Kingston. These are both educational Bills and I think properly belong to the province of Ontario. It would be well to refer them to the Minister of Justice before proceeding with them.

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved the adjournment of the House in order to discuss the rules of the National Rifle Association and their effect on the status of Canadian riflemen competing at Bisley.

He said: The matter to which I wish to call the attention of the House is one

which I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me is of considerable importance. The distinction which has been won by Canadian riflemen in competition with the other militiamen of the empire at the Bisley meet, particularly during the last five or six years, has attracted a great deal of attention in Canada and elsewhere; and the desirability of having our militiamen expert in rifle shooting, together with the interest that attaches in a sporting way to these very important functions of militiamen, is one in which the House is deeply interested. Any rules or any regulations which might be adopted which would interfere with the success of our riflemen in the future, or prevent them from succeeding in the future, as they have done in the past, is of great consequence to the country. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Hon. S. Hughes) had occasion in 1910 to call the attention of the House to the matter of the rules of the National Rifle Association, and their unreasonable character as they were attempted to be applied that year. As a result of the representations which were made at that time by the then Minister of Militia, through, I assume, the proper channels, the difficulties were removed, and it was hoped an end had been put to any captious quibbling such as existed at that time, or any interference with the full right of Canadian militiamen to use the prescribed arm of the Canadian service in competition in the mother country. My hon. friend's efforts at that time, as I say, were crowned with success. But, unfortunately, the difficulties of which he complained then have been renewed in another form, and a very annoying form, to everybody connected with rifle shooting. Now the original rule of the National Rifle Association, section 98, with regard to the rifles that could be used at Bisley, reads as follows:

> Any 303 rifle as issued by the British government or the government of any British colony or dependency for the arming of the troops, including the Charger Loading M.L.M. and M.L.E. rifles, or similar rifle of private manufacture of bona fide government pattern and bearing the government viewer's mark.

Our riflemen had been using the old British Snider rifle, and sometimes the Martini-Henry, and rifles of that character, until the Ross rifle was adopted by the Canadian government as the service rifle in Canada. Immediately it was adopted our riflemen began to meet with unprecedented success at home, so much so that in 1909 efforts were made in a private way by those connected with the National Rifle Association to endeavour to induce our riflemen, when they went over, to use the English rifle instead. Those efforts failing, it was intimated that steps would be taken, on account of the superiority of the Ross rifle, to prevent its full and free use in subsequent years. As a consequence, in the year 1910, there was promulgated a rule in the following words:

> The council have decided that no service rifle of any pattern other than the official pattern in use by the British army be admitted in the service rifle competitions unless on officially certified specimen of such rifle be deposited with the National Rifle Association at least three months before the commencement of the Bisley meeting and approved for use at the Bisley meeting.

That was the rule to which the present Minister of Militia took exception in this House two years ago. There was an imputation contained in this rule to the effect that the rifle which was being used by the militiamen who went home to shoot was not the regulation rifle, and under that pretext this rule was promulgated by which it was declared that every rifle used there should have a preliminary examination through a sealed pattern having been deposited some months before the meeting at Bisley. The result, as I have said, of the agitation which arose at that time was that the National Rifle Association withdraw the objection and withdrew that rule. The year 1910, was one of great success at Bisley with the Canadian riflemen, and the desire to use the Ross rifle by other people who were competing there became very general, and the agitation in regard to the subject continued. Now, that agitation was not based upon any sound reason. As a matter of fact, the evidence which has been submitted to me in regard to that, shows that the men of the National Rifle Association Council were aminated by peculiar motives. For instance, here is a letter written in August, 1910, by a member of the council :

> Well, I am a member of the N.R.A. Council and my duty is to the N.R.A. competitors. These latter pay some £15,000 a year in entrance fees and win £13,000 in prizes; they pay £2,000 towards expenses.
>
> Naturally they desire conditions to be the same for all.
>
> Our Canadian friends come over, to the tune of about 20 each year, and if they subscribe as do our people they pay £200 a year and ought to win £180. Being picked men they, on equal terms in 1906-7-8, averaged £420 a year winnings and no one grudged it to them.
>
> In 1909-10 they shot with a new rifle and averaged £825 (alternatively £860) winnings. It is noticed: poorer men grumble: they say that conditions are not equal. They also notice that a very few of our best men use this new rifle and are very successful with it. They grumble still more.

Now, apparently that is the basis of this frank statement made in that letter, which is not an official one, as to the reason of all this nagging and quibbling on the part of the National Rifle Association.

Canadians with the Ross rifle win too much to suit these sportsmen over there. Here is another letter written on the subject in the same year:

Some people are evidently afraid that if the Ross rifle wins many prizes at Bisley it will debar or frighten competitors who have only Lee-Enfields, and who cannot afford a second rifle from attending the meeting. The N.R.A. can scarcely insist on the Canadians using Lee-Enfields in the Kolapore and Mackinnon matches, and if members of the Canadian team are permitted to use Ross rifles in the S. R. matches, the other competitors must also be allowed. But the N.R.A. has to make ends meet financially and the council is seriously frightened at present about the outlook.

Now, these letters contain within themselves the evidence that the exceptions that were being taken by the National Rifle Association to the use of the Ross rifle by Canadians were not based upon any substantial reason, nor indeed could any good reason appear where you had a government arm, properly certified, being deposited for examination by the National Rifle Association people, and when the rules from time immemorial had been such as I have read. But this difficulty continued, this pin-pricking towards our Canadians went on, and consequently in 1911, there was another rule made to the following effect:

It has been decided that in service rifle competitions the rifle shall be the British service rifle, but troops armed with other than the British service rifle may use the rifle with which they are armed. This will admit the use of the Ross rifle to members of the Canadian team.

So apparently there was a desire to lead the public to believe that they were actuated by some generous motives on this subject. But the meaning of that rule was this, that while Canadians could use the Ross rifle, it was not permitted to be used by any other corps or laymen from any other country. Last year our riflemen won great praise and an unprecedented amount of prizes, and easily led the whole empire in the success of their shooting. The grumbling went on, and the pin-pricking continued. I have some evidence under my hand which I am satisfied the House will regard as being of a very surprising character, indicating the attitude which those gentlemen over there have adopted towards our Canadians who shoot at Bisley.

Last autumn the National Rifle Association published a new rule dealing with rifle sights. It was not pretended that there could be anything said with regard to rifles, but the regulations prescribe the conditions with regard to rifle sights. The regulations, which are extremely technical, I need not read in detail to the House, but there is one clause which I will read, because I want to refer to it later on:

A substituted backsight must be attached to the rifle solely by the removal and re-insertion of the method of attachment of the long range aperture backsight used on government rifles, and must be so attached, when used in any competition.

Interpreting the technical language that is contained in this regulation into every day plain English, it means that if you use a backsight on any rifle you must attach it to the rifle in the way in which the back sight is attached to the English rifle, and if you do not attach it in that way you cannot use a rifle with that sight attached to it at all. While on the face of this regulation it would appear there was some issue being raised with regard to sights, as a matter of fact, there is no issue being raised here at all. The despatches with regard to the matter indicate that. You find in the English 'Daily Mail' of January 29, the following:

A special despatch of the Montreal 'Star' from Toronto says that information has reached there that the executive of the National Rifle Association of England has decided to recommend the prohibition of the Ross rifle. On the strength of this statement representations are being made to the government that as the Ross rifle is a service arm of the Canadian militia it should not be debarred.

The 'Star's' despatch intimates that the agitation is due to the success of Canadians at Bisley with the Ross rifle and also to the hostility of the British rifle makers.

It would almost seem to me, without drawing any deductions which are unfair or unwarranted by the evidence, which is available to any one who cares to investigate it, that the statement in that despatch that the hostility of the British rifle-makers was an important element in this pin-pricking and quibbling which have been going on in regard to this matter is absolutely correct. Let us see another despatch which appeared in the Montreal 'Star,' published on February 12:

At the National Rifle Association meeting to-day Lord Cheylesmore read correspondence between the association and Captain Birdwhistle, at Ottawa. Lord Cheylesmore declared that the allegation regarding the prohibition of the use of the Ross rifle was without the slightest foundation. The Council of the National Rifle Association was giving the Dominion authorities opportunity for altering the Sutherland sight, and had accordingly extended the time for submitting these sights till the end of April.

There were no comments from these at the meeting on this statement, although one member remarked that rifle shooting was dying out in England, while in the Dominion it was promoted in every possible way.

I want to say that the statement there attributed to Lord Cheylesmore, that they were giving the Dominion Rifle Association an opportunity of altering the Sutherland sight is absolutely incorrect. There is nothing in connection with any sight involved in these regulations. It is not a matter of sight in any manner whatever. The Sutherland rifle sight is a sight which has been made in Canada, it has been adopted by the Militia Department, and it has turned out to be a great success. But, when I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no possible provision in these regulations that in any way interfere with the use of the Sutherland sight, you will see that I was warranted in my language when I spoke of the Chairman of the National Rifle Association being entirely wrong. The same objection which is urged to the attachment of the Sutherland rifle sight applies to what is known as the B.S.A. No. 9 sight, or No. 7 Martin sight, or Parker sight, or any sight whatever that may be used in England or which has been prescribed by the National Rifle Association rules. The impression has gone abroad in Canada among those who have not looked into this question, that it was something in connection with the Sutherland rifle sight that caused the National Rifle Association to interfere to prevent its use at Bisley. That is not so. They have adopted a resolution which provides a method under which a rifle sight can be attached to the rifle. This is the method which they have adopted at home. They say that unless you attach the rifle sight to the rifle in that way you cannot use the sight. That is the whole proposition, and that is the cause of the quibbling and pin-pricking on the part of the National Rifle Association. This rule was framed especially to bar out the Ross Mark 2 xx, the reason being because the sight when it lies over in a forward position covers in some part the loading part.

If you were to take the B.S.A. sight, the No. 9, the No. 7 Martin, or the Parker, and attach it to the rifle in the same way as the Sutherland rifle sight is attached to the Ross rifle it would clearly cover the loading part in exactly the same way. Any of these sights under the rule are attached to the War Office rifle in the most unserviceable manner, and hung down over the left side. The question is whether the rifle sight would be attached by some contrivance which is peculiar to the purpose on the left side of the rifle or whether it would be where it is now on the Ross rifle. They say that if you attach it as it is now in Canada you cannot shoot with that rifle, that you must attach it the way they attach it to the other rifle which is the most unserviceable way ever dreamed of, and which would expose the sight to the liability of destruction at any time. That is the ground they take, and the Dominion Rifle Association, through its secretary, in calling the attention of the National Rifle Association to this fact pointed out to them that the Ross rifle was the service arm of Canada, that the rule with regard to the sight was especially provided for the purpose of barring the Ross rifle, that there is no question of sight involved at all, that under these circumstances it is most unfair and that, in so far as the Dominion Rifle Association is concerned, it is questionable whether it would send a team to Bisley this year unless this difficulty is removed. Therefore, I submit that this proposition is a very serious one and one that is worthy of the attention of the House, the government, and the country as well. This last quibble, this last pretence, absolutely without any foundation, puts a bar and a ban upon a certain rifle sight, which is acknowledged everywhere to be a first-class rifle sight, in order to debar this rifle from use.

The facts are exactly as I have stated them. Let us see, however, how this new rifle which it is proposed shall be the one and only thing to be used at Bisley is regarded at home. Take the London 'Gazette,' of January 18, 1912; speaking about this very rifle that is prescribed, with the attachment which is said to be essential before you can use the rifle sight, the 'Gazette' says:

> The new rifle that is shortly to be issued to the infantry of the line is summed up as 'a failure from the start' by those who have had an opportunity of examining it or witnessing the tests that have been carried out with it at the School of Musketry at Hythe and elsewhere.

Hon. S. HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence). That is not the Ross rifle that is referred to there; that is the new British rifle.

Mr. MACDONALD. I know that. I am speaking now of the British rifle, and this is a statement published in regard to it in the 'Pall Mall Gazette.' It is the new English rifle and the attachment is made obligatory under this new rule:

> It is, admittedly, an improvement upon the short rifle now in use by the troops, with its terribly weak bolt-action, but it lags far behind the rifles in use by almost every continental army, and this despite the time that has been devoted to its consideration.
>
> The one great thing that can be said in favour of the new rifle is that it will be comparatively cheap to produce, and that much of the machinery laid down for the construction of the present pattern rifle can easily be adapted for its manufacture. Against this has to be set the sportsman's old maxim that

a 'poor gun is dear at any price.' It has admittedly a flatter trajectory than the present service rifle, especially when used with the new pointed weapon. Its ranging qualities, however, leave a good deal to be desired, and it is asserted by those who have handled the rifle that the old, long Lee-Enfield had a longer range. At the present time the sighting would likewise appear to be defective, but no doubt this is a matter that can be rectified.

There is a general feeling among the musketry experts of the army that the manufacture of the new rifle should be 'hung up' until it has been further tested, especially in comparison with the Ross rifle of Canada. This is regarded by many well qualified to judge as the very finest all-round small-arms weapon that has ever been evolved, and surprise is expressed upon all hands that the military authorities should seek further for a rifle for our troops, or, with such a rifle already in existence, should proceed to manufacture an admittedly inferior weapon.

One well-known soldier, interviewed upon the subject of the new weapon, summed up the situation rather neatly. 'The rifle is obsolete before it is issued,' he remarked, 'and so soon as the entire army at home and abroad has been armed with it, the fact will be officially recognized.

That is the opinion of a leading organ of public opinion in London of this new English rifle.

We are, therefore, in this position that an absolutely unserviceable method of attaching the rifle-sight to the rifle is made obligatory upon Canadians who go to Bisley to shoot. Under a pretext they attempt to lead the public to believe that there is something the matter with our rifle-sight, and that unless you can attach their rifle-sight to the rifle in the way they prescribe our men cannot shoot at Bisley at all Now, it is impossible on account of the construction of the Ross rifle to attach the Sutherland rifle-sight or any of these other sights in the method prescribed by the National Rifle Association regulations. The evidence to my mind is conclusive that there is another attempt for what reason we may infer one way or the other, on the part of the people of England, and whether they are interested in English small arm factories or not to attempt to exclude Canadians from using the service arm of Canada when shooting at Bisley. They tell the Canadian militiamen that unless they find some scheme of performing the impossible feat of attaching in the manner prescribed the Sutherland rifle sight to the Ross rifle before the first day of April next, the Canadians cannot shoot at Bisley. This is another evidence that the National Rifle Association is not in good faith in the reasons given for its action. I feel sure that the Minister of Militia is very much interested in this question and I hope he will take the matter up. If financial conditions are at the base of the action of the National Rifle Association, it is a question for the War Office to consider in their contributions to that association, and for all the other militia departments of the empire to consider whether or not a trifling matter of finance is going to interfere with the cultivation of rifle shooting amongst the militiamen of the empire. That is a question that ought to be settled very readily. It seems to me that it is very unsportsmanlike for Englishmen to say that because Canadians have won and are winning year after year more and more money at Bisley, that they should take some way to prevent them from so doing. Unless Canadian militiamen are allowed to shoot with the Canadian service arm, the supremacy of which is recognized everywhere, it seems to me the Dominion Rifle Association should take some drastic action to bring the matter to a head. But, this is not the only difficulty in connection with the Bisley rifle shooting that deserves the attention of the Minister of Militia. Every one will remember how proud Canadians were to hear last summer that Canada had won the King's prize. There were at the same time mutterings here and there of the ill-treatment of the Canadians by the officials of the ranges at Bisley, but perhaps in the excitement of the elections these complaints were overlooked. It is, however, a very serious thing for the riflemen of Canada, and I have here a declaration made by Private Clifford who won the King's prize last year at Bisley, and which I shall read for the purpose of explaining to the House and the country the difficulties with which our riflemen were surrounded. This declaration reads:

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Ontario.
To Wit;

In the matter of the treatment of the Canadian rifle team at Bisley at the National Rifle Association meeting in the year 1911.

I, William J. Clifford of the city of Toronto, in the county of York, do solemnly declare;—

1. I attended and competed at the meeting of the National Rifle Association at Bisley in the month of July 1911 as a member of the Canadian Rifle Team.

2. That during the first week of the competition in shooting in a sweepstake competition at two hundred yards, I had five shots on score when I was interrupted and stopped by the range officer who claimed that my position with the butt of the rifle resting on the ground was against the rules. I asked to be allowed to finish my score under protest but the range officer refused and stopped me while he consulted with another range officer and looked up the rules, and after considerable delay and discussion found that my position was quite correct when they allowed me to complete my score. I understand that this was immediately brought to the attention of the executive of the N.R.A. and my position upheld, as it is clearly defined and allowed by the rules

and the executive promised that such interference would not be allowed again.

3. That notwithstanding the above I was afterwards several times interfered with and stopped and delayed in my shooting during the meeting on account of the position of my rifle, which was clearly allowed by the rules and upheld by the executive.

4. That during the second week of the competition at the six hundred yards range of the King's match my register keeper in the middle of my score and while I was aiming pulled my arm and stopped me from shooting, claiming that my position was not allowed by the rules. I had been interfered with so much previous to this on that account that I had the exact number of the rule in my mind ready for the occasion, so I referred him to the exact number and as ordered by him waited, he looked it up, when he had looked it up and found that I was right he gave me instructions to carry on which I then did without further delay and fired well within the time limit allowed from the time I was told to shoot. Upon my firing and making the bull's eyes the register keeper scored it in the usual way on the block board but one Major Silverthorne, a range or executive officer who had been standing by took the chalk and scored out the bull's eye on the blackboard saying that he would not allow that bull's eye as it was not fired within the time limit. He had counted the time which I had been prevented by the register keeper from shooting while looking up the rules which I explained to him could not be counted and also that the register keeper had no right to pull my sleeve or interfere with me in the act of aiming which the register keeper denied but which my two competitors in their statements to Major Silverthorne bore out and for their pains were told to mind their own business. The bull's eye was not at that time allowed to me and Major Silverthorne said that I was on his butt all day and threatened that he would watch and catch me yet. Under the circumstances I finished my score with an outer and the bull's eye that had been scratched off was afterwards allowed me.

5. When I shot the next range of the King's 500 yards this Major Silverthorne was waiting behind my target for me to come up. When I was shooting my score he sat behind me with his watch out and timed every shot I fired.

6. At the next range 200 yards he was right after me and repeated his actions of previous ranges.

7. I understand that the adjutant of the Canadian team put in a protest against the treatment I had received at the 600 yard butt and the executive of the N.R.A. said that they would look into the matter again.

8. During the second stage of the King's match this same Major Silverthorne hovered as closely behind me at each range during the whole shoot, although he was without his official badge on his arm, and I and the Canadian competitors were of the opinion that he was there officiously and not officially but had been relieved from duty.

9. During the whole of my shooting in the first and second stages of the King's, Major Silverthorne watched and timed me and appeared to entirely neglect the other competitors in the neighbourhood, although some of them took more time to shoot each shot than double that taken by me.

10. It appeared to me that this Major Silverthorne and a number of the range officers were watching the Canadians much more closely than the other competitors (in fact almost entirely) and interfering with our shooting unduly from time to time.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me at the city of Toronto in the county of York this 23rd day of February, A.D. 1912.

J. P. WHITE.

W. J. CLIFFORD.

I have no less than five other affidavits corroborative of this story. I do not want to take up the time of the House further than to make clear that these complaints are not made in any captious way, but are made under oath. Here is a declaration made under oath by Mr. Charles D. Spittal, of the city of Ottawa:

I, Charles D. Spittal, of the city of Ottawa, in the county of Carleton, do solemnly declare:—

1. I am a commissioned officer in the Canadian Army Service Corps, was a member of the Canadian Rifle Team of 1911, which attended and competed at the annual meeting of The National Rifle Association at Bisley in the month of July, 1911.

2. As I had had previous experience in the way of unnecessary interference by officious range officers, I went to the adjutant of the team, before the commencement of the meeting, and asked him to go to the National Rifle Association officials and have a perfect understanding in regard to the matter of the shooting position assumed by some of the Canadians and undue interference on the part of their range officers; I also asked him to make sure that said range officers were made perfectly acquainted with the rules and regulations. I understand he went to the National Rifle Association people; however he came to me later and said he had settled the matter and that there would be no trouble this time. I informed the other members of the team, and we were all delighted to know that it would be plain sailing.

3. The meeting had only commenced when different members of the team began to complain about interference, and I did my utmost to adjust matters by informing the adjutant and requesting him to see to it further. Nevertheless, the interference occurred right along at intervals, and the most glaring offence happened when Private Clifford was shooting at the 600 yards range in His Majesty the King's match. He was making a good score when the register keeper interrupted him, and by using physical force prevented him from firing his next shot. Clifford thereupon told him to look up rule 40 and he would see that his position was legitimate. This argument took up more than 45 seconds (the time allowed a competitor to fire each

shot) and when the register keeper was satisfied that Clifford was right, he allowed him to proceed, but a certain Major Silverthorne, the executive officer of the Century Ranges, came up to the score board and crossed out the bull's eye which Clifford had made, claiming that he had exceeded the time limit. Clifford very politely informed him that he could not shoot and argue at the same time, but Silverthorne would not listen to reason, and partly lost control of his temper with other competitors who endeavoured to explain. He afterwards allowed the bull's eye but, looking at Clifford's ticket said 'Never mind young man, you will be on this range all day, and I will look after you.'

4. After the above occurrence I again requested the adjutant to make another complaint, which I understand he did. During the day I paid particular attention to what was going on while Clifford was shooting, and again at the 500 yards range Major Silverthorne appeared, brought a chair and seated himself directly behind Clifford with his watch in his hand, evidently timing his shots. Clifford had four bull's eyes on score when several members of the National Rifle Association council came along. I could hear Major Silverthorne telling them of the trouble with Clifford at the 600 yards range, and he drew their attention to his shooting position, whereupon they all gathered about him on both sides while he was actually shooting. For this shot he scored a magpie. I thought this was really persecution, and when Clifford arose I shouted to him 'Hail, hail, the gang's all here'. Silverthorne looked at me with a scowl, and came over my way to give some orders to some soldiers who were beside me, but the sergeant in charge informed him that they were not under his charge; he turned, then some one laughed audibly, and then he came back towards me with a wild look in his face and asked me to tell him what remark he heard. I politely told him that I did not have his ears on my head and could not say what he might have heard. We had quite a set-to, and for this he followed me up until it came to my turn to shoot. When I took my position he brought a chair, seated himself and took out his watch and stayed there until I had finished.

4. That, during the Kolapore Cup match, I was a coach; upon the commencement of firing Major Silverthorne brought his chair and took up a position immediately to the left of Corporal Mortimer. Another range officer was with him. Mortimer called me and complained about these range officers talking and commenting upon his position, and asked me to have them removed. I then went to Silverthorne and told him that their conversation was bothering the competitors and requested them to move a little farther away. He replied that I should not trouble myself, that he was alright there. Later on Mortimer again complained and the adjutant requested him to move.

5. That, when the final stage of the King's match was reached, Major Burland and I proceeded to the 1,000 yards range and took up a position behind private Clifford, actually prepared to fight any one who interfered or attempted to interfere with him, as the situation has become so desperate, and unsatisfactory from a Canadian point of view. It was quite apparent that there was a dead-set against the Canadians, and I did not see, nor did not hear of, a British competitor being interfered with.

I have declarations of a similar character made by Mr. H. R. Roberts, of the city of Toronto, Mr. Bayles, of the city of Toronto, and Mr. George Mortimer, of Quebec, all well-known rifle shots, who were at Bisley last year. When the facts were called to my attention, I could hardly believe the conditions to be as they are; but the evidence is overwhelming that for some reason the officials of the National Rifle Association have made a dead-set against Canadians in this matter of rifle shooting. The statements under oath showing the unfair treatment accorded to the Canadian who had the distinction of winning the King's prize must have caused a feeling of resentment on the part of every one in Canada interested in this matter. When we realize that year after year, by petty quibbles and pin-pricks which have no merit whatever, the association has been attempting to prevent the use at the Bisley meet of the Canadian service arm, which is conceded by public opinion, expressed by the leading newspapers in England, to be the best arm of its kind extant, it does seem incredible that that kind of treatment should be meted out to the greatest colony of the empire. The last treatment accorded to the Sutherland rifle-sight, by which the impression has been attempted to be created that there is something the matter with that sight, was based on actual mis-statements, a method of attachment having been prescribed which the men who made it knew would prevent the sight being attached to the Ross rifle at all. These are conditions which I think warrant me in calling the attention of the House to this matter. I know the interest which the minister takes in rifle shooting. I recall the occasion two years ago when, dealing with a similar rule, which had no foundation in merit, and which was afterwards removed, he addressed the House on the matter; and I would ask him to look into the facts which I have brought to the attention of the House, and to take such steps as are within his power or the power of the Canadian government to see that the rights of Canada in this matter and the rights of the men who go to England to shoot are safeguarded in future. If not, let us have a clear understanding on the matter, and let the Canadian boys not go home, and let it be well understood all over the empire why they do not go.

Hon. SAMUEL HUGHES (Minister of Militia). Mr. Speaker, the subject matter

of the discourse of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is not new to the House. For a number of years, ever since the long Ross rifle has attained the high standard of perfection which it has now reached, our riflemen have been subjected at the Bisley and National rifle ranges to such obstruction and annoyance as the hon. member has referred to. In the first place their declaration was that the Ross rifle as shot at Bisley was not the arm with which the Canadian troops were universally armed. Well, Sir, it was pointed out on that occasion that the rifle which the British riflemen used at Bisley was not the arm which was furnished to the British army. The British army is supplied with the short Lee Enfield rifle, and not one weapon of that kind has been fired through the matches at Bisley. We had the short Ross rifle for Canada, many of which were in the hands of our troops, and the disadvantages arising from the use of any short rifle—disadvantages which I shall not enter upon here to-day—were patent, and so our government decided to use the long rifle. When the Canadian riflemen appeared at Bisley with this rifle objection was taken to it. However they fired with it through the matches and came out winners—three years ago. Then the National Rifle Association passed the rule which my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) has referred to, that no rifle other than the recognized arm of Britain—either the long Enfield rifle or the short Enfield rifle—could be used at Bisley unless it had first been submitted to, and had received the approval of, their committee. The object then was patent. After the success of the long Ross rifle three years ago, thousands of these rifles were ordered by the British rifleman as well as riflemen from other colonies. Therefore, something had to be done to stop this sale of Ross rifles to the riflemen of the empire. Accordingly the National Rifle Association issued this order which threw a doubt upon the fact as to whether the Ross rifle would be permitted to be used the following year or not. However, Sir, the Ross rifle was used the following year subject to more or less restrictions on their part. Then came the rule for the next year that none but Canadians could use the Ross rifle; and then, following the great success that has attended the use of the Ross rifle for three years, came the very objectionable treatment of our men at Bisley last year. I shall not go into details of the treatment which our men with the Ross rifle received on the ranges at Bisley during the last three or four years. Let me point out the injustice with which our men on those ranges who adopted what they called the Clifford position were treated. Yet Lord Kitchener himself highly commended the Clifford position inasmuch as it keeps a man's head much closer to the ground in firing than does the ordinary prone position. Lord Roberts, I understand also commended the position, and I know that Lord Grey also sent for Clifford, had him show the position and commended it most highly. Then, Sir, while in the very act of shooting our men have been subjected to all sorts of annoyances, not only over the Clifford position; but again and again remarks have been made by register keepers after a man had made a bull's eye, such as, 'Were you shooting with British or Canadian ammunition?' evidently designed to annoy the rifleman, for any one who is familiar with rifle shooting knows what annoyance it is to have any one whispering and murmuring behind his back, much less interfering with him. The climax has now come in the action of the National Rifle Association. They now propose, Sir, the rule that:

> Except in competitions restricted to 'sights as issued' an additional or substituted backsight may be used provided it complies with all the conditions set out in subsection (e) and that, whether in use or not in use, it does not interfere with the charging of the magazine or the working of the bolt when loading and unloading and that, when not in use, it does not interfere with the use of the leaf backsight, as issued, no part of which may be removed from the rifle.

Now, Sir, the British rifle has a special place where an attachment is made and held by a screw to the side of the barrel but the Canadian has not. Thus you will see that unless this special fixture which is on the British rifle is also on the Canadian rifle, the Canadian rifleman is ruled out. The National Rifle Association therefore, take advantage of that technicality and the Canadian rifle is not to be used. Then section 3 says:

> An additional backsight may be attached to any part of the rifle provided that this be done without alteration of or damage to any part of the rifle.

Now lest we should be able to overcome these technicalities they go on and provide:

> A substituted backsight must be attached to the rifle solely by the removal and re-insertion of the method of attachment of the long range aperture backsight used on government rifle, and must be so attached when used in any competition.

Now, I maintain, Sir, that in so far as the National Rifle Association is concerned their needs would have been equally met by one of two rules; by saying no Ross rifle should be used in the competitions, or that only Lee Enfield rifles should be used in these rifle competitions at Bisley. I am not speaking here on behalf of the Dominion Rifle Association, which has the

matter under consideration, but there is a great deal to be said in favour of the contention of my hon. friend, that when the Canadian Government send their men out armed with a certain rifle it does not rest with the National Rifle Association to pretend to define for this country any form of rifle its riflemen shall use so long as they comply with the general requirements of the military sight. We know what is at the bottom of this matter: this is an agitation on the part of the English rifle manufacturers. A few years ago five thousand Ross rifles were ordered in less than two days on the ranges and the English manufacturers stood aghast. Later the order came out cancelling the use of any rifle excepting under the conditions I have referred to, and then the story went abroad that the Ross rifle could not be used at all. Accordingly all these orders were cancelled. because between the 1st of April and the time of shooting one could not possibly manufacture such a number of rifles in time for the competitions; the thing is an absolute impossibility. In other words it is practically prohibitive for the Ross rifle. But that rifle has attained the proud position of being recognized not only in Canada but the world over, as the best military rifle to be found anywhere today, has caused the British government to take action, and for a number of years they have been perfecting the rifle which my hon. friend referred to in the extract which he read from the 'Pall Mall Gazette' of London, the extract which I also have before me, where they demand that the Ross rifle shall be used by British troops. I might say incidentally, in passing, that the colonies, so far as I can learn, have not been consulted directly or indirectly in regard to the issue of this new British rifle. For years not only Canadians, but riflemen the British Empire over have demanded that the calibre of the Ross rifle shall be reduced down from ·303 to ·280, or even less. The British government, we understand, although we have no official authority yet, are reducing it down to ·276 and are changing the weapon in many ways. As this article quoted says:

The rifle in advance is condemned.

As the article which has been quoted says the rifle is condemned in advance. While in Washington last winter to my surprise I learned all the details of the new British rifle. In Germany this summer, in conversation with German officers, I learned the details of the new British rifle. I visited Great Britain and consulted the authorities there, but could learn nothing whatever of the new British rifle, it was an absolute secret in England six months after the United States officers could tell me all about it. That is a strange way to treat those of us in the colonies who are interested in military affairs.

In order to get over the difficulties in the way of young British soldiers or soldiers from other colonies who naturally felt handicapped in using their obsolete Lee-Enfields as compared with the long Ross rifle, the Canadian government have offered to loan to the British National Rifle Association without charge any number of rifles they may wish, up to 10,000 if they desire them, for this competition. So far there has been no acceptance of the offer.

It is unnecessary to go further into the rifle-sight, that matter is being considered by the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association. It has only recently been brought to my attention.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the minister agree in my statement that there can be no possible imputation against the Sutherland rifle-sight?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is not the Sutherland rifle-sight that is concerned; it is any sight. I may explain the matter. The British rear aperture sight is attached on the side of the rifle, the Ross rear aperture sight is attached to a bridge which is used also as a clip loader, attached across the bridge of the rifle. All you have to do with the Ross rifle is to remove a pin holding the back sight in the middle position, take off the back-sight and move it back to the rear. The one sight does. With the British rifle they must have two sights, when they use the rear aperture sight they must use a second sight which is attached to the screw-hole on the sight; a very awkward thing, much more awkward than if it were attached to the bridge as we attach it. I maintain that of the two the Ross rifle position is much better. It is true that when the Sutherland rifle-sight is turned down the end projects over the end of the receiver, but that is a mere detail, and the point is taken advantage of in order to bar out our rifle. This was recognized by British riflemen who have pointed out to me again and again that the whole question is a financial one on the part of these rifle companies and the riflemen of the old country feel handicapped in having to use their obsolete British rifles as against the Ross, and I do trust that the offer of the Canadian people to loan them 10,000 of our long Ross rifles, which will place them on a par with our boys, will be accepted, because there is no doubt that men shooting with the Ross rifle have a great advantage over men shooting with the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. NORTHRUP. After listening carefully to the remarks of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) I must confess that I was unable to hear one word that would show any justification for holding up the House during this discussion unless it be the urgent need of advertisement for the

Sutherland sight or the Ross rifle. I would join my hon. friend in one respect and ask the Minister of Militia when making his appeal to the Home authorities to do one further thing, to take steps not merely to protect the rights of our marksmen in the old country but also—and I make this request in all sincerity—to take the necessary and proper steps to protect the reputation of Canada, which, rightly or wrongly, has suffered very much in the old country owing to the conduct of some people in connection with the use of the Ross rifle at the Bisley ranges. I am not here to make charges, I am here to state facts and I state that not only in England but in Canada there are a great many people who very gravely doubt the truth of a certificate given by the late Minister of Militia at a time when a question was raised on the Bisley range as to the use of the Ross rifle, and I venture to think if some of the marksmen from Canada who have been interfered with, as apparently they have been from the declarations read, could investigate to the bottom of their troubles, they would find in all probability that the reason they were interfered with was the want of confidence on the part of people in the old country in the honesty of Canadians in using the particular Ross rifle they were then using and representing it as the service rifle in use in Canada. The Minister of Militia says that the Ross rifle, is the noblest arm this world has ever seen, and I am not ready at this moment to contradict him—but he must remember that he used almost the same language in describing the primitive Ross rifle which was so hopelessly stupidly conceived that the Militia Council declined to receive it until five or six changes had been made, and although it was foisted on the country at an enormous expense, some $600,000 before 30 of them were delivered to the militia, 90 changes had to be made before it could be accepted. The Ross rifle that is being used at Bisley is a long barrelled rifle. There is one rifle called the Ross rifle with a long barrel and another with a short barrel. It was stated in England and I believe in Canada that there were practically no Ross rifles in use in Canada of the style then used on the Bisley ranges. There were Ross rifles with short barrels but the great advantage of the Ross rifle, as has always been alleged in this House and in the investigations was its lightness, whereas the rifle for target practice was too heavy to be an effective service rifle, and I am informed that it was not the service rifle in Canada, that our troops were not armed with it, that it was not known in Canada unless possibly a favoured individual here or there had been presented with one. Under those circumstances a question arose at Bisley as to whether Canada would be allowed to shoot with a rifle that might not comply with the requirement that it should be a service rifle. A certificate was given by Sir Frederick Borden, then Minister of Militia for Canada over his own signature that the rifle used there, the long-barrelled Ross rifle, was the service rifle used in Canada. I am appealing to the Minister of Militia to take the trouble to ascertain and give the House a statement showing how many rifles of that character were purchased and how many had been distributed to the militia of Canada at that date. That information might go a long way towards removing a very serious suspicion both in England and Canada that the so-called Ross rifle used at Bisley, while certainly manufactured by the Ross Rifle Company, and while no doubt an excellent rifle as proved by its shooting, was not a rifle that should be used there by honest competitors because it was not a service rifle. I have not a word to say against this rifle which has been so well advertised, but I would like for the reputation of Canada that these grievances of militiamen in Canada should be thoroughly investigated, and the suspicions cleared away by seeing whether or not the long barrelled rifle manufactured by the Ross Rifle Company was then or is now in the hands of the militia of Canada.

Mr. HUGH CLARK (North Bruce). My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has referred to the mutterings that were wafted across the water some time ago, with respect to undue interference on the part of range officers with Canadian riflemen. He has quoted affidavits and declarations made by Canadian riflemen which prove that there was such interference. The Minister of Militia I think has corroborated this. The member for Pictou is privileged to read these affidavits in this House. The Ottawa 'Journal', on the other hand, not long ago published an article in which it gave voice to these mutterings of the annoyances and penalties that were imposed by these range officers on Canadian riflemen. As a result of that, a libel action has been entered against the Ottawa 'Journal' which must be brought in England, and which is bound to be an exceedingly expensive piece of litigation for the Ottawa 'Journal', whether it wins or loses. That article was written in good faith, and was written on behalf of Canadian riflemen. It was merely giving voice to the charges that have been made to-day by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). If the Minister of Militia believes that these charges are well founded, then I think that the Department of Militia ought to come to the assistance and defence of the Ottawa 'Journal;' at any rate, if the Militia Department is not able to do that, I believe the Ottawa 'Journal' should receive tangi-

ble and substantial sympathy and support from the Dominion Rifle Association.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know to what my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) refers in his remarks when he repeats a statement that the rifle was rejected, after I gave my certificate in its favour. There is not a tittle of fact in the statement to which the hon. gentleman refers. I was not present at the time the committee first adopted the rifle. At that time I was investigating the conditions of the rifle at my own expense, in every arsenal in the United States of America, and getting information, and I have defended the rifle as an old and straight arm through all these years; until we find almost every gentleman in almost every country, who formerly opposed the principle and the use of the Ross rifle, has been forced by the sheer success of that rifle, to bow to the inevitable, and to acknowledge that the rifle has proven itself the best weapon in the world. As to the question of the honesty of the Canadian government, I have nothing to say. But I do know, that whether the certificate was given or was not given, by my predecessor in office, at that very moment, there were 1,000 of these rifles ordered, and they were nearly all in the hands of volunteers in Canada. I want to point out that that number is fifty per cent higher proportion in the hands of volunteers in Canada, considering the number of troops we have, and the number of volunteers, than 10,000 would be in the hands of British soldiers, and 1,000 is the usual number put into the hands of British soldiers to test a new rifle. The libel suit against the 'Ottawa Journal' is a matter with which I have nothing to do, either in my personal capacity, or as Minister of Militia, or as president of the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association. I may point out that the libel suit is brought by reason of one statement in the 'Ottawa Journal' that Major Silverthorne was suspended. Now I know as a matter of fact, it was current rumour all over the range that he was suspended for his conduct in interfering, and I have no hesitation in saying here, as I would tell Major Silverthorne to his face, that if he was not suspended he should have been, for his action towards our riflemen on that occasion in Bisley. The British riflemen do not wish to use their own rifle, and I do not blame them a particle for not wishing to use the Lee-Enfield rifle. It is true that there was a public offer made to these people of the loan of 10,000 rifles, if they wanted 20,000 I could furnish them, of these long Ross rifles, so that the British riflemen may have an opportunity of competing in the coming matches, and in order that Canadian boys in future may be armed with the Ross rifle, and that there may be no more friction in the matter. For unless this is done, in the first place, I doubt if the association will send them over again, and in the second place, I doubt if the riflemen will go.

Mr. MACDONALD. Notwithstanding the doubts from my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup), as to the wisdom of my bringing this matter before the House this afternoon, I have no apology to make for my remarks or for bringing the matter to the attention of the House. My hon. friend from Hastings seems to be in bad humour this afternoon, and some choleric movement has induced him to take a curious position in this matter. He suggests a doubt as to the accuracy of the statement when the Minister of Militia, in 1910, sent the certificate home to England in regard to the rifle that was being used by the men who shot at Bisley. But as a matter of fact, as the present Minister of Militia has pointed out, not only was this arm used at that time in great numbers among the militiamen of this country, but the Militia Orders and Minutes of those dates will show conclusively that at a period long anterior to the rising of this issue by the National Rifle Association, that particular arm had been prescribed as the service arm of the Canadian militia. My hon. friend tells us that Private Clifford, the winner of the King's prize, an act which won him great distinction, has no ground of complaint, because Major Silverthorne or some other gentleman had a right to interfere with him when he was shooting, and suspected he was using a rifle that was not of the prescribed pattern. Complaint was made by Private Clifford in 1911, of his treatment by the authorities in England, a period long after the time when Major Silverthorne or any other gentleman had expressed any doubts whether these gentlemen were using the prescribed Canadian rifle in the old country. It does seem to me that this House and the country generally have every right to treat with absolute credence, and give full weight to, the statements made by the gentlemen whose affidavits I have read. They are men of standing in this country, who are engaged in rifle shooting as a part of their business as militiamen, men whose words can be accepted. When this evidence was first submitted to me I did not know that any issue had been raised in a libel suit. I do not know what the libel suit is about. But I say that when you have Canadians who have done honour and have brought credit upon this country as militiamen abroad, and when you find men making statements as these men have made, this parliament would be recreant to its duty if it did not take notice of it. I hope the minister will take steps to see

that the rights of Canadians in this regard are vindicated.

CHANGING NAMES OF POST OFFICES.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I desire to ask the Postmaster General with regard to a report appearing in the press that the name of the Post Office at Stony Point has been changed to Pointe à la Roche, and that the names of River Canard and Belle River, in my county, have been changed.

Mr. PELLETIER. This is a matter of which I would like to have some notice.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I will let it stand.

Mr. PELLETIER. I may tell my hon. friend that there is not a word of truth in what the 'Globe' said. Let him renew his question to-morrow.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Will the hon. Postmaster General answer to-morrow in regard to this matter ?

Mr. PELLETIER. Certainly. I would have answered to-day if the hon. member for Algoma had been allowed to go on.

MANITOBA BOUNDARY EXTENSION.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. May I ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) if he will give me his attention for one moment ? I am thankful to him for the information which he has sent over to me with regard to the resolution on the Manitoba boundary. I would have expected that we should have also had a statement of the number of acres of swamp land which had been dedicated to Manitoba.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I shall have pleasure in bringing that down.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 112) for the relief of James Denny.—Mr. Aikins.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

DISMISSALS.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Was Laurence G. Powers, superintendent of the lobster hatchery at Arichat, N.S., dismissed?
2. If so, what were the charges alleged against him, and who made them?
3. Who was appointed in his place, and on whose recommendation?
4. What is the age, and what are the qualifications of his successor for the position?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Political partisanship. J. A. Gillies, K.C.
3. Captain Constat P. Terrio has been appointed as caretaker. J. A. Gillies, K.C.
4. Seventy-one. Usual qualifications required of a caretaker.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Was Arthur Brymer, fishery officer at Lower L'Ardoise, N.S., dismissed? If so, when and for what reason?
2. Who asked for his dismissal?
3. Was there an investigation? If so, with what result? If not, will an investigation be granted?
4. Who has been appointed as his successor, and on whose recommendation?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes. 5th February, 1912, for offensive political partisanship.
2. J. A. Gillies.
3. There was no investigation. Mr. Gillies having stated he had personal knowledge of such partisanship.
4. Anthony Sampson, of L'Ardoise, has been employed for the present as a Special Fishery Guardian, on the recommendation of J. A. Gillies.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Who made complaint in order that an inquiry should be made with reference to Messrs. Léon Rivest, Jean Baptiste Lachapelle and Louis Dubois, lighthouse keepers at Repentigny?
2. What was the nature of the complaints brought against these persons?
3. How much did the inquiry made in these cases cost?
4. Who acted as inquiring commissioner?
5. What was the result of this inquiry?
6. Since what date was each of these lighthouse keepers in the government employment?

Mr. HAZEN.

1. Joseph Morin, C.R.
2. Political partisanship.
3 Nothing has been paid up to date.
4. J. G. H. Bergeron, B.C.L.
5. Reports not yet received.
6. Leon Rivest, April, 1894. J. B. Lachapelle, February, 1861. Louis Dubois, April, 1903.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Was Mr. Joachim Godbout, of St. Laurent, Ile d'Orleans, in the employment of the government on 21st September last?
2. Has he been dismissed? If so, why?
3. Was this dismissal asked for by any one? If so, by whom?
4. Was this dismissal requested verbally or in writing?
5. If in writing, what is the date and the tenor of the writing?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. (a) Yes.
   (b) Active political partisanship.
3. (a) Yes.
   (b) Sir R. Forget, M.P.

4. In writing.
5. (a) 6th December, 1911.
(b) The tenor of the letter is to the effect that Godbout was an active political partisan.

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Has Madame, the widow of A. S. Marlin, postmistress at St. Louis de Bonsecours, county of Richelieu, been dismissed?
2. If so, at whose request, and who complained about her?
3. Has there been an inquiry? If so, by whom was it held?
4. What is the name of the new postmaster?
5. On whose recommendation was he appointed?
6. Has information been furnished as to the competence of the new postmaster? If so, who furnished it?
7. What annual remuneration does the postmaster at St. Louis de Bonsecours receive?
8. What is the annual revenue of this post office?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2, 3. The postmistress has been dismissed as a result of the investigation which took place before J. G. H. Bergeron.
4, 5, 6. Joseph Proulx. The Postmaster General appointed him because he thought he was qualified for the situation.
7. $92.
8. $147.55.

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Has Doctor Dupré, postmaster of St. Robert, county of Richelieu, been dismissed? If so, at whose request?
2. What is the name of the new postmaster?
3. On whose recommendation was he appointed?
4. Has information as to his competence been obtained? If so, who furnished it?
5. What is the remuneration of the postmaster of this parish and what is the annual revenue of this post office?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2, 3, 4. Mr. Dupre has been dismissed and Joachim Cournoyer appointed in his place by the Postmaster General.
5. Remuneration, $116; revenue, $170.26.

Mr. CARDIN:

1. At whose request was Mr. Francis Péloquin, postmaster of St. Joseph de Sorel, county of Richelieu, dismissed?
2. Who complained against Mr. Péloquin?
3. What is the new postmaster's name, and by whom was he recommended?
4. Has information as to the competence of the new postmaster been obtained? If so, who furnished it?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2, 3, and 4. Mr. Peloquin has been dismissed and Elphege Champagne appointed by the Postmaster General, because he thought he was a fit and proper person.

POST OFFICE OF DOUGLAS ROAD.

* Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. At what date was the post office at Douglas Road, Annapolis, county, N.S., opened to the public, and upon whose advice was it established?
2. What distance is the said office from the nearest post office previously established?
3. Was a report of the post office inspector for the district asked for in this connection? If so, was it favourable to the opening of the office?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. (a) Opened 19th September, 1911.
(b) On the recommendation of Mr. S. W. W. Pickup.
2. Two miles.
3. (a) Yes.
(b) The report contained no specific recommendation.

MR. R. S. LOWE.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. At what date was Robert S. Lowe appointed to the office of pavement expert, and does he now hold the position?
2. If so, what remuneration does he receive, and what are his duties?
3. Did the said Robert S. Lowe procure leave of absence in the month of August or September, 1911? If so, upon what grounds was said leave of absence granted?
4. How was the said Robert S. Lowe employed from September 1, 1911, to September 22, 1911?
5. Did the government grant him free transportation from Ottawa to Pictou, Nova Scotia, during the month of August and September?

Mr. MONK:

1. There is no such position as pavement expert in the Department of Public Works. Mr. R. S. Lowe has been employed, in this department, in varying capacities, since May 15, 1911.
2. (a) $150 per month; (b) at present, in charge of repairs to roof of Royal Mint.
3 and 4. Mr. Lowe applied for leave, without pay, from September 2, 1911, to return to his former home, Sydney, Cape Breton, to settle up his affairs preparatory to making his residence permanent in Ottawa.
5. No.

POST OFFICE AT SEAMAN STREET.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. At what date was the post office at Seaman street, Annapolis county, Nova Scotia, opened to the public and upon whose advice was it established?
2. What distance is the said office from the nearest post office previously established?
3. Was a report of the post office inspector for the district asked for in this connection? If so, was it favourable to the opening of the office?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. (a) September 15, 1911; (b) on the recommendation of Mr. S. W. W. Pickup.
2. 1¼ miles.
3. (a) Yes; (b) the report practically recommended that a rural mail delivery service should be inaugurated and no post office opened.

POSTMASTER OF ST. ANGELE DE LAVAL, QUEBEC.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

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

Mr. PELLETIER:

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

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT—REFERENCE TO PRIVY COUNCIL.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Are the provinces to be represented by counsel in the case to be submitted to the Privy Council on the marriage question?
2. Has the province of Quebec been notified as regards the wording of the reference now submitted to the Supreme Court.

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The provinces have been invited to appoint counsel to represent them if they deem it advisable to do so.
2. The questions referred have been forwarded to the Prime Minister of Quebec.

MANITOBA BOUNDARY EXTENSION.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask if there will be an answer to question No. 15, relating to the Manitoba boundary, some time during the day? It is important, in view of the discussion which will come up to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring the attention of the Minister of the Interior to it when he comes in. The Prime Minister will not be here to-day.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence relating to the incorporation and operations of the Provident Trust Company, of Montreal.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all papers, correspondence and documents in connection with the case of D. Raymond, petitioner, the Queen's Hotel Company, Limited, respondent, and Guillaume Narcisse Ducharme and others, party defendants.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all reports, petitions and correspondence in the possession of the Department of Public Works, relating to the improvement of Port Dover harbour in Norfolk county, Ontario; together with all papers or documents relating to the connection of the Grand Trunk Railway Company therewith. —Mr. Charlton.

For a copy of all documents, letters, requests, reports and recommendations relating to the dismissal of Louis Deschesne, an employee of the Marine Department, on the river Ouelle wharf, county of Kamouraska.—Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska).

For a copy of all documents, letters, requests, reports and recommendations relating to the dismissal of Luc Lizotte as postmaster at St. Pacôme, county of Kamouraska.—Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska).

For a copy of all documents, letters, requests, reports and recommendations relating to the dismissal of Auguste Hébert as Postmaster at St. Pascal, county of Kamouraska. —Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska).

For a copy of all documents, letters, requests, reports and recommendations relating to the dismissal of Wenceslas Lebel, of Kamouraska, as preventive officer of the Customs Department.—Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska).

For a copy of all letters, evidence taken under investigation by superintendent Sharp, reports and other documents connected with a claim for damages occasioned by fire to the property of Angus J. McAuley, of Tracadie Prince Edward Island, on the 16th day of July, 1911.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

For a copy of all letters, petitions, reports, charges or other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to the dismissal of J. D. McFarlane, postmaster at Southwest Margarée, Nova Scotia, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all letters, documents and memoranda from the government of British Columbia, and all other papers relating to negotiations affecting the exportation of salmon, the boat rating in canneries, the system of issuing licenses and the restriction of licenses to Asiatics in the province of British Columbia, and all orders in council made in regard to any of these matters since October 1, 1911.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

For a copy of all papers and documents in the case of Rex. vs. Sheldon and others.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all letters, documents and correspondence relating to action by the government in regard to the relief of the shareholders and depositors of the Farmers' Bank, and of the order in council appointing Sir William Meredith as commissioner, and all correspondence in relation thereto.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

For a copy of all papers on file with the government and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence between the Labour Department and the Board of Conciliation in relation to the strike now and for some time past existing on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway west of Winnipeg.—Mr. MacNutt.

For a copy of all reports, surveys, plans and maps made or prepared during the year 1911 or this year, in respect of or in connection with the Hudson Bay railway or the suggested ports at Nelson or Churchill on

the Hudson Bay, or relating to the navigation of the Hudson Straits.—Mr. Aikins.

For a copy of all documents, letters, requests, reports recommendations and evidence taken under investigation, by Dr. Shentliff, relating to the dismissal of Anson Sheltus, of St. Armand station, county of Missisquoi, a preventive officer of the Customs Department.—Mr. McKay.

For a copy of all documents, letters, requests, reports recommendations and evidence taken under investigation by Dr. Shentliff, relating to the dismissal of Charles O. Jones, postmaster of Bedford, county of Missisquoi.—Mr. McKay.

For a copy of all documents, letters, requests, reports, recommendations and memoranda relating to the dismissal of Allan Kennedy as general government telegraph repairer at Inverness county, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all documents, letters, telegrams, requests, orders in council, reports, recommendations and memoranda relating to the dismissal of Dr. A. G. Carmichael as superintendent of salmon hatchery at northeast Margaree, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Chisholm.

For a copy of all documents, letters, requests, reports, telegrams, recommendations and memoranda relating to the dismissal of James McPhee as Customs officer at West Bay, Nova Scotia, and the appointment of a successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all papers, documents, &c., concerning the incorporation and operations of the Fidelity Trust Company of Montreal. —Mr. Lemieux.

THE GRAIN ACT.

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

On section 124—hospital elevators,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The first subsection provides that a hospital elevator shall be situated only at a terminal point. There does not seem to be any reason for that limitation. A hospital elevator is for the treatment of sick grain, and if at any time large storage elevators are erected at Winnipeg or in the interior, it will be economical to have the hospital elevator nearer to the central point where grain is brought for large storage purposes and have it treated there. I propose, therefore, to strike out these words, so that the subsection will read as follows:

There may be such number of hospital elevators as may be determined by the board, which shall be governed by such regulations and restrictions as are imposed by the board.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 99,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). In subsection 3, providing that no grain shall be allowed to pass inspection except on a lower grade, I propose to add, 'subject, nevertheless, to the provisions of section 99 and' before the words 'subsection 5 of section 115.'

Mr. OLIVER. I do not suppose it is the intention of the minister to meet the point I raised in the former discussion of this section? If it is, I do not think these words meet it.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They are not for that purpose. This seems to be a sort of governing clause, and I wanted section 99 included.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection to that, but I would like to ask if the minister has considered the point I raised as to the necessity of providing specifically that sound grain shall not be mixed with sick grain in the hospital elevators?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have gone over that carefully with the officers of the department, and I have had the advantage of having Mr. Horne here for a few days, during which I have gone over the matter with him, and it does not seem to me that it would be fair to do that with reference to the hospital elevator, if you wish to nurture and keep up an institution of that kind. In a time of great fatality and wide sickness, a hospital elevator has a great deal to do. Grain may come in, part of which is sound and part being mixed with oats or seeds, and this will be cleaned and separated. Then, when there is not this large amount of diseased or mixed grain to be treated, if you took away the storage privilege from these hospital elevators, they would be left bare of work, and it would be almost impossible to keep them in operation from year to year.

Mr. OLIVER. That hardly is the point. The hon. minister is arguing as though the contention were that good grain should not be stored in the hospital elevator. That is not the contention. The contention is that there should be a specific provision that sound grain should not be mixed with unsound grain in the hospital elevator. If the intention is to prevent such mixing of sound with unsound grain, then as I read the section it would be desirable, to say the least, that that idea should be more clearly expressed. If, of course, it is the idea to permit the mixing of sound and unsound grain in an hospital elevator, then the section is all right as it is.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto). As a matter of fact in the hospital elevator at Fort William no mixing has been done.

Mr. OLIVER. I assume that.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). And it has been carried on in that way because supposed to be contrary to the provisions of the Grain Act.

In no case, whether in a terminal elevator in the western inspection division or in a public elevator in the eastern inspection division, shall grain of different grades be mixed together while in store.

Now this is subsection 8 of section 126 and it refers to a terminal elevator. Well the hospital elevator is a terminal elevator.

Mr. OLIVER. When you read subsection 3 of section 124, which governs the action of a hospital elevator, in my reading it would permit of grain being mixed as a necessity of the operation of the elevator.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is in the second part of the subsection?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That seems to me to refer to the shipping out of the elevator.

Mr. OLIVER. So it does.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). For instance suppose you should take any grain there which was of a rejected grade, and that grain is treated in the elevator and is made into a good grade. What reason in the world is there, that when it is so treated and renovated it should not get the grade upon inspection?

Mr. OLIVER. No reason whatever.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is what it is meant to do, it seems to me.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the minister say specifically that it is the intention to prevent the mixing of sound grain with unsound grain in the hospital elevator?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). That is prohibited to my mind at the present time.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER North Toronto). Now clause 2, the interpretation clause, will have to be amended in order to bring it into accord:

'Hospital elevator' includes every elevator or warehouse situated at a terminal point——

I move to amend that by striking out the words, 'situated at a terminal point.'

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Now come back to section 92 which, after the amendment in section 124 needs to be amended also. I propose to drop the words from the beginning to the end of the word 'elevators' in the seventh line and commence the section with the words:

All grain shipped——

Then drop the words:

For eastern points.

The rest of the section remains. I think that makes still more clear the point we spoke of a moment ago.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. While you are on this section there is a case which has been brought to our attention by wire, and perhaps the minister would not object to considering it in connection with section 91, at least I think that is where it would properly come in. The telegram to which I refer is as follows:

Car 142982 loaded with wheat was inspected at Winnipeg, February 8, and unloaded at Fort William February 12. Grade lowered two grades causing loss of 20 cents per bushel to shipper without notifying shipper or inspection department at Winnipeg of such change. Grain Act should provide some protection in such cases and shippers be given an opportunity to dispose of grain before identity is lost.

(Sgd.) RANDALL, GEE & MITCHELL, LTD.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am informed that that occurred from mistake. The Canadian Pacific railway clerk made it No. 6 instead of No. 4, but the error was detected and the Canadian Pacific railway has arranged the matter.

Mr. OLIVER. That incident has been dealt with?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to delay the committee, but I thought it might be desirable to make such provision as is suggested in this telegram, that in such case the car should be held for some portion of time, the shipper should be notified so that he might make other disposition of the car before the identity of the grain was lost.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am informed that has always been done, and the grain either turned into a special bin or some other provision made for it.

Mr. OLIVER. Then the identity of the carload is preserved until the question is settled?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The identity is maintained until an arrangement has been made and a settlement reached. However, I will look into the matter and see if anything is necessary to be done.

On section 145,—hospital elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I move to amend this by striking out in line 29 the words 'at the same terminal point.'

Mr. ROBB. How will the minister prevent the grain inspector from running that

grain back to an elevator west of the point where he found it out of condition. It should be so arranged that the grain would at least work its way towards the seaboard.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If for any reason it is not possible to treat it at an elevator in its course of transport, why should it not be sent back? No inspector would do that if it could be avoided.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 150,—seed elevators, &c.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The millers have requested to be placed on the same footing as seed elevator men in regard to elevators used solely in connection with their business. I, therefore, move the following as section 150a:

On application by the owner of an elevator which is part of a plant engaged in the manufacture of grain products in the western division stating that he does not wish to engage in the business of storing grain and that such elevator will only be used for the storage of grain owned by the said applicant and used in the process of the manufacture of such products, the board may exempt such elevator from that part of the Act which relates to the storage of grain for the public. The license issued shall be a special license for such class of elevator and the bond required, if any, shall be at the discretion of the board.

2. Any owner who violates the conditions under which such license is issued shall be guilty of an infraction of this Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that is quite clear in providing that it is intended to apply only to elevators at the point where the mill is situated.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Then what would be the objection ?

Mr. OLIVER. The mill for its own special purposes gets all the general protection and advantage that is given the elevator for the general and public good. The mill would be able to demand the right to erect an elevator for its own private purposes on railroad property, and would get for its own private purposes all that protection and special legislation which is only justifiable when it is absolutely for the benefit of the public.

Mr. TURRIFF. Then, too, all the big milling companies buy millions of bushels of wheat which they do not grind. They all have their system of analysing wheat and sell all wheat which, while it may grade well, does not make good flour. If they are going to engage in that business I do not see why they should not have a different license.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The application was made simply for the elevator run in connection with the mill itself. Perhaps this would define it:

On application by the owner of an elevator which is connected with and part of——

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will these people be under bond the same as in any other elevator?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. Has any organization been asking for this?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The Dominion Millers' Association have been asking for it.

Mr. KNOWLES. Who are they?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They are Dominion millers, a very important organization.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does it include the western millers in such towns as Saskatoon and Calgary? The Dominion Millers' Association is a very important organization spread all over the country.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I only know it by the name of its organization. They appeared before me, through their officers, at the same time that the Grain Growers' Association were here. I move that section 121 be adopted. This is one of the clauses that stood.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, I think there was a very special point in connection with this clause when it was allowed to stand. Would the minister be good enough to tell us why he has come to the conclusion that it ought to be adopted in its present form? The minister's attention was called to the fact that there is a very radical difference between this clause and a similar clause in Bill (Q) of last year. According to this Bill certain privileges are to be given to the operators of terminal elevators east of Fort William and Port Arthur, in the eastern inspection division, that are not to be given to the operators of terminals in the western inspection division. If it is any disadvantage to mix grain and depreciate grades thereby in the terminals in the western inspection division, why should that privilege be given to the operators of terminals east of the western inspection division? It is a very serious proposition that the minister asks us to adopt. He ought to be able to give us some satisfactory reason why that special privilege should be given to operators of terminals further east than the western inspection division.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). What privileges does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. NEELY. If he has given this matter enough consideration to ask that this section be adopted as it stands, the minister will understand the difference there is between this clause and a similar clause of Bill (Q) which was before the House last year. Section 121 reads:

In sections 122, and 125 to 150, both inclusive, unless the context otherwise requires.

And so on. Sections 123 and 124 apply only to terminals operating in the western inspection division. The minister, by reading sections 123 and 124, will see that terminal elevator operators under very heavy penalties are prevented from doing certain things.

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

And so on. Penalties are provided for the violation of this provision. Why should that section apply to operators of terminals in the western and not to operators of terminals in the eastern inspection division? In the second place, the minister must have had some reason for making this change. At whose instance was it done? The same officials of the Department of Trade and Commerce undoubtedly assisted in the preparing of this legislation as assisted in the preparation of Bill (Q) last year. If there is a radical change of this kind between the two Bills it must have been at somebody's suggestion, on somebody's initiative. On whose initiative? The minister's? If not the minister's, then whose? That is information that we are entitled to when we come to this very important change from the Bill of last year.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). So far as I am informed section 121 is the same as that in Bill (Q) that was passed by the Senate and that was introduced into this House last year.

Mr. NEELY. Has the minister not a copy of Bill (Q) in his possession, because I can read him section 121 from Bill (Q). It says:

In the following sections of this Act, from section 122 to section 143, both inclusive.

Section 121 in this Bill omits sections 123 and 124.

On section 122—terminal, public and hospital elevators,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). One clause of this section provides that the board may revoke a license upon summary proceedings before the board. It gives an appeal to the Governor in Council, and it says that pending the hearing of that appeal the revocation of the license shall continue in force. That seems not only a drastic interference with business, but it may possibly lead to dislocation and confusion in the grain transport, because pending the decision on the appeal everything is stopped on the elevator. I propose to substitute for that provision the following as subsection 4:

Upon complaint by any person in writing under oath, setting forth the alleged particular violation of law, rule or regulation, the board shall forthwith examine into such complaint, and may require such proof as seems necessary, and if the allegations made are proved to the satisfaction of the board, it may recommend to the Governor in Council the revocation of such license, accompanying such recommendation by the evidence on which it is based, and the Governor in Council may thereupon, in his discretion, revoke such license.

Thus, pending a decision by the Governor in Council, the business of the elevator will not be interfered with. We suppose that the board would probably be right, but if there is an appeal provided, it implies that the board may make a mistake, and until final judgment is given and the revocation confirmed, business may be carried on as usual.

Mr. NEELY. This is one more absurdity that we are discovering as we go along in some of the most important working sections of this Bill. One is inclined to ask what authority and power this board is really going to have under the provisions of the Bill. Now, we have what is supposed to be a board of experts on the ground, and that board is asked to make an expert investigation into a charge laid against the operations of a terminal elevator, and after a most thorough investigation they render their decision, saying if the charge is well founded, that the license should be revoked. Surely that is not a case for hanging up the operations of the board or any one else by reference to the Governor in Council. We quite understand that the decision of the board holds good until the further decision of the Governor in Council is obtained, but in the name of common sense why should there be any reconsideration of the decision of the board. They are on the ground, they have the authority, they have everything that will enable them to make a thorough and first-hand examination into the facts of the case.

They have the witnesses before them, and the hearing of evidence at first hand gives the man who is the judge, an advantage in deciding whether or not a witness is telling the truth. It appears to me that every argument is against any appeal from the minister to the Governor in Council. The fact that this provision is similar to the one in Bill Q of last year

does not affect the argument. That Bill, with the exception of two or three clauses, was not considered either by this House or by the Senate. If the license of a terminal warehouse is revoked by the board, I think their decision should stand as final. I am free to say that I do not like the appearance of this proposition at all. If this board are to be free and independent to do what they think is right in every instance, I think their judgment should be untrammelled. If the matter is to be referred to the minister, there might be instances in which the minister might consider it advisable to give special consideration, where an independent board might think otherwise. For these reasons I am opposed to this provision.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the board decides that any elevator has been guilty of wrongdoing, there is very little doubt that it has. Take the case of an elevator at Fort William which got into trouble a couple of years ago, and was heavily fined for wrong-doing. Should that elevator in a similar case be allowed to go on, and do the same sort of business after the commissioners had found them guilty, until the Governor in Council should go over the evidence? It seems to me that there is no good ground for going beyond the decision of the board of commissioners, who are supposed to be experts, and who ought to be in a better position than the council to come to a just decision on the evidence brought before them.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I suppose that similar reasoning might be applied to upset the present jurisprudence of this and every other British country. Whatever else you may say, a man whose property rights or liberties are at stake has a right to a thorough trial, and I think to a thorough revision of the trial. At the present time there is an appeal from the subject all the way up to the Crown, it may be through half a dozen intermediate processes. This subclause 4 was embodied in Bill Q; and such independent and assiduous consideration as was given to the framing of this Bill and to the basis upon which it is framed, has seldom been given to any Bill that has received the assent of this House. After having gone over the whole subject, the framers of the Bill proposed to give the board the right to revoke the license. Then they evidently felt that that was drastic, and that a man who had a million or a million and a half dollars, and vast business interests which could hardly be weighed and estimated by the amount of fixed capital in the business, ought to have a chance for an appeal, and they provided for an appeal. As the clause stands, I do not think there is any doubt that it does not meet what the business sense of this country would consider to be just and fair. If you are going to allow an appeal at all, surely after the first court has adjudged a man guilty of murder, it is not right to say that you will hang him on the first judgment and then allow him an appeal to a higher court. Let the man have the breath in his body until the final court reviews his case. It is true, this is not a case decapitation or hanging, but it involves a vast amount of money and vast business interests, and in looking to a man's property interests we give him all the protection that the law can give. It seems, therefore, absurd to say that the commission should revoke the license, that is, put the punishment into effect, and then allow an appeal to a higher body. To make this provision reasonable and logical you should knock out the proviso. Then we would come back to where my hon. friend says he stands, and make the commissioners' decision the final judgment of the court from which there would be no appeal. They are on the ground, they have heard the evidence, they are the men who ought to make the judgment, and it should not be appealed from. The same course of argument could be made with reference to all appeals. The first court has the atmosphere of the case, it has the evidence, it has looked into the eyes, and seen the demeanour of the witnesses; and yet we do allow appeals. For my hon. friend and myself, who have not a million dollars or a great interest in an elevator, it is easy to say, let the first judgment take off the man's head or take away his property rights; but if he or I were in the position of the elevator man, with all the interests involved and the business responsibilities that he has, we would be disposed to take the other argument and say: Give us a chance for a review; we are not saying anything against these three commissioners, but we are saying that the matter involved is too important; it is not a matter of a hundred or a thousand dollars, but it concerns all we have; therefore give us a chance at least to have the case reviewed by a higher court. I think it would not be reasonable that in giving effect to the verdict, we should stop all operations, and then allow an appeal. If the original decision were set aside, and after a week or a fortnight, or a month, you would say to the elevator man, now start up your business again, it would seem to me that he would have a good claim for damages.

Now on both these counts it seems to me that the proper business view to take is to let this board investigate, and when they have investigated and taken the evidence and all other necessary proceedings, we give a chance to appeal to the

next court, and let that court decide whether or not the person adjudged of being guilty in the first instance is, in its opinion to be held guilty and the penalty is to take effect.

Mr. McKENZIE. The minister draws an analogy between appeals in this case and appeals in other courts. But it is well understood and well defined machinery exists in connection with appeals in other courts in many cases, where the rights of the appellee are protected. Is there any machinery provided for an appeal under this Act, defining how it shall be brought about, and so on? What is the procedure under the Bill?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am not a lawyer and, not taking the legal ground, it seems to me to be a very simple and very common-sense business. The commissioners have heard the case and said: Your license is revoked. These gentlemen make their appeal to the Privy Council, and that body calls for and reviews the evidence which has been adduced and the report of the commissioners. It does not need a group of lawyers or a court of justice, or anything of that kind, to carry that simple process to its simple conclusion.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). What objection would there be to substituting an appeal in the ordinary course in our courts instead of to the Governor General in Council.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). In that case there would be very long delay. A matter of this kind, it seems to me, ought to be quickly adjudged. If the license were revoked and an appeal were provided to the judges of our courts, it might take months and months before the revocation became effective, after you had the judgment of the first court against these men, and before you got to the final court, and there is the added expense which is involved. I suppose if the matter went to one court, it could go to another court in the way of further appeal?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the minister in his argument, does not apprehend the situation exactly. This is not a matter simply between the elevator owners and the government, it is a matter between the elevator owner and the people who are storing grain in the elevators, whose business is being handled from the elevator; and the owner of the elevator is there to a certain extent as a trustee under bonds to the government. Therefore it is not a matter of whether he is in any degree breaking the regulations which the government has laid down. That is not the question. The question is, what is he doing with the property of other people, which is contained in his elevator? The section as it stands was not prepared for Bill (No. 32), as I understand the matter, but is part of the existing Grain Act, and has been on the statute-books for some time, at any rate since 1908.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, it has been the law.

Mr. OLIVER. The very purpose of it, in the case of this man who is handling other peoples' property, is that action can be taken on the moment to protect that property. That is the purpose of the section as it stands, and in my judgment, it is desirable that that should continue to be the position.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. At six o'clock I was drawing attention to the proposed amendment to subsection 4 of section 122. The section is taken from the Grain Act as amended in 1908, as a result of careful inquiry by a commission especially appointed to look into that Act. The minister has said that the provision is drastic. It is drastic but it is an extraordinary provision to meet extraordinary cases, and it is not to be presumed that the warehouse commissioner, in whom that authority has heretofore been vested, would exercise it lightly or without due consideration. So I think the minister is taking a doubtful course in the amendment he proposes. It is essential that action should be taken promptly, otherwise the interests of the third parties, innocent parties, might be swept away before anything could be done. Surely it would be safe to entrust to this highly-paid, responsible and competent commission the authority which has heretofore been vested in the warehouse commissioner. While, of course, it is not likely that occasion would arise for the exercise of this drastic provision, it is possible, and the section is intended to meet the extreme and extraordinary cases that might arise. The minister has increased the authority of the Board in the matter of car distribution and it seems to me that their authority in this instance might very well be maintained.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think I said all I have to say before six o'clock. I would point out that under the existing law the right is given to the warehouse commissioner to revoke the license and then there is an appeal to the Governor in Council. The principle of a higher authority is therefore recognized in the old Act. That makes my hon. friend's position different from that of the hon. gentleman who sat by him this afternoon, and who did not want any appeal at all. I think my hon. friend's course is the more reasonable, be-

cause he has some regard for the widespread and British idea of having a review of the case from the court of first decision.

Mr. OLIVER. While I put a different line of argument before the committee from that of the hon. member from Humboldt (Mr. Neely), it was not because I disagreed from his view, but because I was arguing for the section as it stood. For my part, I wish to say here that in many cases justice delayed is justice denied.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There are many other cases where justice performed too quickly is the rankest kind of injustice. Lynch law is an example of that, and we get as far away from that in this country as we can. So I will still credit my hon. friend with favouring an appeal. It does not seem to me a sensible thing to stop, say, a seven million bushel elevator on the decision of a board or commission, to hang it up perhaps in the very midst of a busy season, when cars are rushing down, and all the elevator facility possible is requisite; it does not seem to be the sensible way of carrying out the law, if you are going to give an appeal, to stop the whole operation of that immense factory until the appeal is heard. The appeal is heard, it is decided in one way or another. If the appeal is favourably considered, then the court of first instance made an error, and still you have stopped the whole operation of the elevator. But it does not merely take away some of the profits of the elevator company, it inconveniences the whole grain trade of the country to a large extent. A third party comes in there. The man who wants storage, the whole transport business, the people who own the grain that is to be transported—all these come in, and you hold that up before you have had the case finally decided. That, I say, does not appear to me to be a businesslike method. You say, and rightly too, that it is not a matter simply between the elevator man and the commissioners, but that the elevator man has interests in trust, he has the grain in storage. That is just what gives a great deal of force to the legislation as I propose it. He has other people's interests in his hand. If the appeal in the end carries out the decision of the commissioners it is proved that he has been doing what he ought not to have been doing, with property not his own.

But how does the mere revocation of his license make reparation to the man whose properties he has misused? There is other reparation to him. We look for reparation to the man who has been misused, to the penalties attached—the revocation of the license is only one—to the bonds that the elevator company gives, which I am going to make very heavy bonds so as to make that part of the security just as valuable as it can be made. There are securities for reparation to the individual, there is the penalty, which is what you may call a fruitful penalty. The revocation of a license is not a fruitful penalty in the way of restoring rights of which some other person has been defrauded by the elevator man. So I think we are sufficiently safeguarded by those other securities and penalties so far as the interests of the third party are concerned that have been confided to the elevator man. Then again I think there is this in it. This is to be a case which will never occur, it is a penalty which we hope will never be invoked, because we hope there will be no violation which will make it necessary to invoke it. It is an extreme penalty that can be invoked on the elevator company or the warehouseman for any misdirection of his effort and for any violation of the law. The very fact that it is there will prevent the thing being done in a maximum of cases, and maybe in all the cases. There is held out before him the revocation of his license. He does not feel that the penalty is one whit mitigated to himself, he is not encouraged one whit to a violation by the fact that there will be a court of appeal. He does not want to be brought into it at all in that way. It will be just as effective a penalty by having an appeal as it is if there is no appeal. You have it more in the one instance, but it is not a healing penalty in any way by its being immediately inflicted. You cut off a man's head, you revoke his license, you stop the whole business, but there is no fruitfulness in that penalty, you have to look for that in other directions. Why then not go the length of not penalizing the public, of not stopping the operation of a great factor in transport? Why not go that length, and let this alone until the appeal is heard, for it is possible that things will happen during that time.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the very point.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My view is this, that if a man who violates the law knows that the revocation of his license is likely to take place, he will not mix wheat. But suppose he mixes 1,000 bushels, he is liable to a revocation of his license, and the penalty of revocation may be put upon him. Once that issue has been raised, and information has been laid against him, and his case goes before the board, do you suppose that man is going on in the same careless way, or the same wilful way to a second, third, fourth and fifth violation? I think not. I think the tendency will be for him to say: Well, I have been caught once, it is my neglect, I think maybe it is by connivance, maybe it is by wilfulness; I have been caught once, I am not going to put myself in the position to

be caught again. It will make him extraordinarily careful, and it will do another thing. The board is there all the time, the officers of the board are there all the time. Here is a violation of the law which they have discovered. Their oversight will be all the more keen and careful, and in both these ways it will operate to make a second violation almost impossible. I think that the whole business, the information laid, the action of the first board, the penalties, the bonds—all those put together seem to make an accumulation of penalties and cause a maximum of carefulness that you will scarcely find in any other legislation we have upon the statute-book. You may say this is extraordinary legislation, and I think we ought to be guided by a common-sense rule in not applying a penalty over and above what is necessary to correct the offence.

Mr. OLIVER. I have been unable to get my idea before the minister. An elevator is full of grain. That grain is worth a great deal more than the elevator. It is worth more than the bonds that the elevator man has given. It belongs to a dozen different men. The elevator man, we will assume, is dishonest. We will assume this to be an extreme case. He is found to be dishonest in some part of his work, in mixing grain, or in selling grain, if you like. A charge is made against him before the board. The board, under the present arrangement, decide that the charge is sustained. At once they may shut down the elevator; that is to say, take control of the elevator. It does not necessarily mean that the elevator will stop; it means that the license will be withdrawn and the board will take the responsibility of handling that elevator and thereby absolutely save the rights of the people who have grain in the elevator. But, as proposed, they can only hear the evidence. The dishonest elevator man has warning. While the case is passing from the board to the Governor in Council and waiting the action of the Governor in Council, the elevator man is still in absolute control of the elevator.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Under supervision.

Mr. OLIVER. Under supervision—and he makes such disposition of the property of others within that elevator as he sees fit while the case is going on. I submit that is not good business and it is not in the public interest, assuming such a case to have occurred. This man is handling a vast amount of property which is not his own, but the property of other people, being of more value than his own property and if he is found to be in the wrong to the extreme degree, it is common sense and plain business that his authority over the property of other people which he is using dishonestly should be turned over to the board and that the responsibility for the exercise of that authority should be assumed by the government through the board.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend's argument would be very strong if it were the case, we will say, of a cashier in a bank who had charge of all the money, documents and securities of the bank.

Mr. OLIVER. The case is very nearly parallel.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will follow that out and see whether it is or not. That cashier is found guilty of having forged a cheque for, we will say, $125. He is brought up on that, you give him his trial and you give him an appeal. You continue him in the office of cashier.

Mr. OLIVER. No, no; it is not done in that way.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). But suppose you did it.

Mr. OLIVER. But you do not; no such thing ever occurred in the history of a bank.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend must allow me to carry out my own reasoning. You keep him in his office of cashier and let him do the business—keep an eye on him as much as you like. It is possible for that man to make away with securities and cash, to get them out of the bank, but it is not the same with the elevator man. The cash with the elevator man is in his elevator —the wheat—every bushel of it is inspected in under grade and not a bushel of it can go out unless it passes the eye of the inspector, the same weight, the same quantity and the same grade. The cash is all kept in the bank. What can the elevator man do with the wheat? He will not burn it, he cannot sell it, he cannot take out of his elevator one single bushel more than the warehouse receipt calls for having reference to the proper numbers in the register and under the supervision of the inspector.

The millions of bushels are kept there, except what goes in the regular way and it can go in no other way. He might steal a little good grain from one bin and put it into another, but that is a trifle in comparison. My hon. friend is not right in saying that should not allow him to continue in operation under supervision because in the meantime he might get away with the goods. He simply cannot get away with the goods.

Section agreed to.

On section 123—buying and selling of grain by owners, &c., of terminal elevators,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I want to add there before the word 'western' in the third line the words 'eastern and'.

On subsection 2,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). After the word 'which' I wish to insert the words 'with the approval of the Governor in Council'.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand my hon. friend is putting the words 'eastern and' before the word 'western' in the third line of the first clause?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). 'Eastern or.'

Mr. OLIVER. I think I understand the idea that my hon. friend wants to convey, but I do not think this is the place to put those words. The buying will take place in the western division, but the man who owns an elevator in the western division, as the clause stands and as I understand my hon. friend wishes it to read, with the addition of the word, 'eastern', still shall not buy grain in the western division.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The object of the clause is, first, to separate the terminal elevator operator from the business of buying and selling grain. If the terminal elevator operator is in the western division the clause as it was would cover him. But if there was a terminal elevator operated in the east it would not cover him. You think the words do not carry that idea out?

Mr. OLIVER. They are not in the right place to carry out that idea.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). What is the suggestion?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that if, in the second line the words 'public or' were inserted before the word 'terminal' it would cover the case.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, we do not propose to extend it to public elevators—only to terminal elevators.

Mr. KNOWLES. Why?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that either a public or terminal elevator comes under the supervision of the board for the storage and handling of grain, but that the owner of that elevator should be divorced from the business of buying or selling grain.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No, simply as regards the terminal elevator; that is the public elevator at the terminal point.

Mr. ROBB. This legislation has been drafted largely at the demand of the western grain growers. Has the minister considered that in making the restrictions and regulations so strict at Fort William and Port Arthur he is running the risk of diverting the trade of the west down to Duluth, where they can handle grain without being subject to such strict regulations. After all, the men who put money into buying the grain are going to handle it at the point where they can get the most profit out of it, and if we tie them up by hard and fast rules at Fort William and Port Arthur the business will be diverted to Duluth, because they will be able to secure freight rates just as cheap to Duluth, and the rates east of Duluth will be just as satisfactory to the man who is shipping grain as they will be from Fort William. It seems to me that the government should take carefully into consideration the fact that they are probably making legislation that is going to drive the business away from our own Canadian routes.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Robb) that I have given a good deal of consideration to that side of the question. I have heard all the arguments pro and con from the different interests, and I think I have read every scrap of evidence there is extant with reference to the matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Robb) started by saying that we are making this legislation largely in the interests of the western grain growers.

Mr. ROBB. At the demand of the western grain growers.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I will acknowledge that the legislation would not be as it is if it were not that the west was there, and that the western demand was there; but at the same time we are a Dominion House of Parliament and I think we have to look to the interest of all Canada as well as to the interest of a part. That is the reason this legislation does not go as far as some of the western grain men would like it to go, because, when we are asked to bind this around and around with restrictions and with regulations which will inevitably hamper traffic to a certain extent, we ought, I think, to be wise enough not to go so far as to strangle the growing child and in the end find that we did not conserve for this country the whole strength of its manhood's powers. I think it is a very important point to consider whether or not we are going so far that we will make it a preferable thing for men with western grain to ship it through another country than our own. I think we have not gone too far in that direction in our legislation up to the present. I think the members of the House, no matter what section of the country they come from, whether it be east or west, ought to face that part of the problem, and be very care-

ful in that respect. It is said that we have advantages in certain respects which will keep the grain in our own routes. I am not foolish enough to-night to stand here and say that we are going to have this year, next year, or the year after, or for many years to come, or perhaps for ever, the handling through Canadian routes of all the grain that grows in our northwest. There will be preferences and there will be conditions which will take a portion of our grain by the southern routes no matter what may happen in the way of our legislation or of our development.

But, proper and conservative legislation, joined with good and increased storage and the multiplication of methods of exit which are as cheap as they can possibly be made, will I think keep the great majority of that western grain in our routes, and maybe draw some of the grain from the western United States into that channel. I for one would be very sorry to bind up the whole business so that it would have the effect of precluding capital from going into that western country and into the grain business; capital from the United States; capital from Great Britain, or capital from our own country. I know there are men in the west who say; hang capital, we don't want it; we want this thing made hard and fast. But, if any part of this country wants capital, it is the west. I am glad to see it coming in, no matter whence it comes. There is an outcry raised against American capital that is coming in, building terminals, building line elevators, and there are some men in the west who would burn up the whole shebang, and keep everything that has that sort of development in it out of the country. I do not think the majority of the west would do so; I do not think sensible thinking people, taking the whole case all around, would do that. I think, for the development of storage capacity in the west, (storage capacity which is sadly lacking and which that country is crying for), you have to make some concession to capital, and you have to give it fair-play and maybe something more than fair-play in the early part of the development of that country, in order to get the required storage facilities. I do not want to put restrictions in this Act which would drive that capital out of the deep interest it has taken and the large development it has made, but at the same time we don't want any monopoly in the west and control will keep monopoly in bounds. And, a little patience and the cultivation of good feeling, and a little sensible action will I think make matters much better than they have been for the last few years. The point brought up by my hon. friend (Mr. Robb) is an important point and none of us should allow it to escape attention while we are considering this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not just see the point my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) makes. The premise which he bases his remarks upon is that we are able to get in the west the same rate to Duluth that we are able to get to Fort William. We are not. It so happens at this very moment, or it very soon will happen, that we will have it, but we do not have it as a normal thing and everybody in this House is aware of that. For my own part I am not afraid that the influence of the grain growers is ever going to be so great on this government, and probably not on any government, that the interests of the moneyed people, the great capitalists to which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has referred, will have any violence done them in this House. We need not stay awake late at night being afraid that the pressure will be so strong from the farmers that this government will be driven in a moment of reckless calamity to put its foot on the neck of the capitalists. Another point, especially with reference to what the minister has said is that his remarks struck me as being rather incongruous. He says with one breath that if there is any place that wants capital it is the west, and in the next breath he says this Bill is going to be framed for the whole of Canada. Both statements are true, but I could not see any co-relation in the two statements. If, as he says, the Bill will be passed for the benefit of Canada, he means there will be that protection to the eastern interests which my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) has referred to. The coming of capital for storage purposes at our great terminal elevators is a matter—if you speak of it from a sectional point of view—is a matter of absolute indifference to us. Looking at it from that point of view it is indifferent to us where our wheat may find its storage on its way to Liverpool. Speaking of it in the sectional sense we would not care whether we found facilities at Duluth or at Fort William, and I mention that because I think I see in the remarks of the minister a certain inconsistency in his commencing by saying that the Act should be framed in the interest of the whole of Canada and then, in a gentlemanly way, lecturing us because the west wants so much capital. It is true we do want capital, but I do not see how it is of concern to the west whether this particular capital is located at Fort William or at Duluth. For that reason I am not able to follow my hon. friend's reasoning as far as I usually do.

Mr. OLIVER. I would still like to have from my hon. friend a clear explanation of the insertion of these words 'eastern or' before the word 'western.' I would like to know what he understands the effect of that to be.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). What I have in mind is this. We are legislating for terminal elevators. They are such public elevators as are located at what may be denominated a terminal point. If a principle is right to be applied to a terminal elevator at Fort William or Port Arthur, it is right to be applied to a terminal elevator doing the same kind of work east of Port Arthur or Fort William or wherever it may be. If, for instance, we come to have terminal elevators at Vancouver, if that is declared by the Governor in Council to be a terminal point, then the same principle would apply to them. I do not see any argument on the ground of consistency which would apply to one terminal elevator and not to another, because one was a few miles east or west of the other.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend speak of terminal elevators in eastern Canada—for instance, on the Georgian bay or at Montreal?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They are not now terminal elevators in the sense of the Act, but it might be that the Governor in Council would declare St. John or Montreal a terminal point, and then the same principle would apply to them that applies to elevators at Fort William or Port Arthur.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not think there was any question as to the purchase of grain in the eastern inspectional division, but only in the western.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It was in the west that the question arose and that the necessities were pressing; but if the necessity arose in the east, we would have the power to apply the same principle.

Mr. OLIVER. It is the purpose to put the purchase of grain in eastern Canada on the same footing as in western Canada?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not see why this provision should not apply to public elevators as well as to terminal elevators. A public elevator is on all fours with a terminal elevator, except that it is not at a terminal point. It is under government supervision, under the control of the board, and subject to the provisions of the Act. In every particular, except as to the granting of warehouse receipts, it is in the same position as the elevator at the terminal, and my contention is that, being of the same kind and character as the terminal elevator, so far as the provisions of this Act are concerned with regard to the mixing of grain, the owner or operator of that elevator should be prohibited from the buying and selling of grain just the same as if he were the owner or operator of a terminal elevator. The principle may be right or it may be wrong, but if it is a sound principle, it is just as sound and just as necessary in the case of public elevators as in the case of terminal elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend may be right on the question of principle, and yet there is a difference between what we call a public elevator elsewhere and a great terminal elevator at Fort William or Port Arthur. What we are trying to do in this legislation is to cure what is said to be a very great evil that is concentrated at Fort William and Port Arthur. We are making what my hon. friend says is very drastic legislation, and does he not think that we have gone far enough in confining it to the terminal elevator? What would happen if we attempted to apply the same principle to public elevators? No need has yet arisen, and in legislation of this kind we should not be ahead or needs. If it becomes necessary in the future to apply this principle to public elevators, this House, I suppose, would be prepared to do it; but this House will think a good deal before it does. You go a long way when you eliminate the interest of an eastern man from your western field in the buying of grain. After all, who does the buying of grain, and what is the reason for all this machinery? The love of gain, the speculative interest, on the part of the buyer; yet behind it all is the farmer with his grain to sell. He wants every buyer and every storage facility he can get to ease his position and increase his profit. We do not want to interfere with that more than is absolutely necessary, and the government does not think at the present time that a case has been made out for applying this principle to public elevators.

Mr. OLIVER. If public elevator meant only an elevator in the eastern inspection division, I could appreciate my hon friend's argument, and, for my part, I would be quite willing to agree to the clause being framed to give that effect, but, as a matter of fact, there are at the present time, I understand, and the number may be greatly multiplied, public elevators at Winnipeg and at St. Boniface, public elevators that are west of the terminal elevators, and unless these elevators of which I speak are put under the same control as the terminal elevators, the whole position that is in view in the making of this resolution applicable to terminal elevators is lost.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not think so.

Mr. OLIVER. It is really of no serious effect. It was proposed to be brought in last session in the Bill which was discussed before the Senate and came down to this

House. It may be that it is not a proper principle, but if it is to be embodied in the Act as a principle I am urging that it be made effective with a declaration that it be carried out in fact, not that it will apply only to one section of the trade and not to the other, although the trade will be affected practically just as much in one case as in the other. I do not speak particularly of the public elevators east of Fort William. I am quite willing that they should be excluded on the argument my hon. friend has given. But that is not the case in regard to such elevators west of Port Arthur, and I would still urge that this provision be made applicable to them.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is one other point that I want to call the attention of the committee to, and I think it is a pretty important one. We may call for railway openings. It takes an immense amount of money and a great deal of time to increase our railway openings from the west. They will come in time, but it will be long, while there is one thing that can come in a very much shorter time, and that is storage facilities. Now the building of storage facilities for western grain has, to a large extent, been at a standstill for the last few years. Why? Because people did not know the ground upon which they were standing, because capital was not willing to put itself into the building of storage elevators. The railroads themselves had not been adding to their storage facilities because they did not know what was going to happen. They have not been building large elevators as they otherwise would have, because they did not know what was going to happen. What was the use of building elevators if the government was going to take these elevators away from them, by expropriating or leasing them and until that doubt is settled you will not have a move forward in the efficient multiplication of storage facilities where large capital is to be invested in order to secure them. Now I think we have gone as far as we possibly can go when we apply this principle, this drastic principle, in an experiment to the terminal elevators only. I would not like to go so far as to apply it to public elevators.

Mr. OLIVER. Either west or east?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I look for an increase in the coming year of from seven to ten millions of capacity in the public elevators in the west. That is outside of private enterprise, outside of government elevators in the northwestern parts, outside of the combination or co-operative elevators, whatever you are minded to call them. I want to see them all for my part and I believe everybody in the west wants to see that storage. I would like to see storage elevators at all the great strategic points. That matter is now being considered. What will eventuate I do not know, but I think my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) will agree with me that if we could have four, five or six big elevators at strategic points in the west, scattered here and there, it would be a great insurance against what is taking place there this year, and against what may take place other years as the productive facilities increase with such rapidity in a ratio greater than the transport facilities themselves can possibly increase. My hon. friend behind sounded in our ears a note to which we might very well listen and restrain ourselves from attempting to go too far all at once.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have the same ambition and the same hope for the increase of elevator storage that the minister has. I do not think, however, that we are going to affect the matter detrimentally by putting the trade of handling and storing grain on a strictly well defined basis. Representations have been made to the government that those who handle grain now, and store it, make their money not out of storing grain and handling it, but out of manipulating it. Naturally people may have hesitated in the past few years in putting further capital into this business. I have been told on what I consider good authority that the storing of grain at the prices which are charged, does not pay, that grain and storage men make money out of dealing in grain, and not out of the storing of it. That is what I have been told by an authority as high as there is in any railway company in Canada practically. Now we are going to make it more inviting for men to put their money into the storing and handling of grain by providing that it shall be carried on as a business separate by itself. I think we will make it appeal to the ordinary hard-headed business man better if we divorce that business entirely from the business of trafficking in the grain itself. In any other commodity which railways handle for example, they handle it by itself. I think the grain trade is unique in this: That the interests that handle it, that transport it, and that take care of it on its way to the market are the same interests to a certain extent that make a business of buying and selling the very commodity which is in their custody and in their hands so much of the time. I have understood, and I still understand, that it was proposed to divert these two businesses, to make the storing and handling of grain a separate business from the buying and selling of that grain. I think it will do more to invite capital into the construction of public elevators if you make this a strict business proposition so that those who engage in it will not have to compete with men who

are skinning and manipulating the grades. It may be there has been a standstill in the past with regard to the increase in our storage elevators. There has been the question, as the hon. minister has said, that it was not known whether these elevators would be expropriated or not, but I have not heard very much talk about public elevators being expropriated. And these are the elevators of which the hon. minister has been talking to-night. Naturally for a year or two there may be some uncertainty about this business, just as there was when the Bill was brought down, as there was last winter, since the present Prime Minister went throughout the country saying in most unmistakable terms that he was going to put into effect the public ownership of elevators now.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Does it not occur to the hon. gentleman that a grain firm engaged in a very large way in the purchase of grain for shipment to the old country, will, from the very necessity of the case, require an elevator of its own. There is a case in Midland where a firm has an elevator with a capacity of 1,250,000 bushels. Probably 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 bushels pass through it every year, but the bulk of this is owned by the company owning the elevator, although it is true they handle grain belonging to other people.

Mr. KNOWLES. No one has asked that this should apply to the eastern division, which would eliminate the case mentioned, and I do not think any one would object to placing in the section a clause that it would not apply to elevators handling their own grain.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). I said simply that the bulk of it is owned by them.

Mr. STAPLES. How would that work in practice? In the west the farmers are building many elevators and they are putting their own buyers on the market. If you applied this you would prohibit them from doing that and thus deprive the farmers of the very best service and protection they are getting. Then the large milling companies afford a great deal of storage capacity to the farmers, but this would prevent them from handling grain for others, and so you would decrease the storage capacity of the west to that extent. This clause would not work out to the advantage of the farmer.

Mr. KNOWLES. It has not been suggested that this should affect the country elevators.

Mr. STAPLES. Would that apply to a firm like the Ogilvies?

Mr. KNOWLES. If they own terminal elevators, it would. I do not believe the same people would have the custody of the grain after inspection and also ownership of it.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). Subsection 2 of the section covers the case of millers like Ogilvies.

Mr. KNOWLES. Subsection 2 of section 123 reads:

> 2. Subsection 1 of this section shall not apply to any person who owns, manages, operates or is otherwise interested in any terminal elevator,—
>
> (1) which has been leased to the board for operation, or which has been leased to any person, firm or company for operation with the approval of the board or which is managed and operated by persons approved by the board; or—
>
> (2) which is used or operated in connection with any flour mill situate at the same terminal point as such elevator.

That means that once an elevator is leased, and many elevators are leased, then if that lease is approved by the board any one who owns or manages or operates it escapes from all penalties of that section. It is too wide altogether. The board must approve in practice of any proposed lease of an elevator. If a man is operator and lessee he is permitted to go out and buy millions of bushels of grain. If the clause means anything it means that once an elevator is leased and the lease has been approved the lessee or any person interested in the elevator can go out and buy and sell all the grain he likes.

Another point affecting the legal interpretation of the section. It says it shall not apply to any person interested in the ownership, management or operation of any elevator the leasing of which has been approved by the board, but it does not say that this immunity is only with regard to that elevator. Suppose a man is interested in the ownership of elevator A, and that is leased to a company. He has only a small interest in it, but he would go into court if charged with breaking this Act and say that subsection 2 says that this shall not apply to him because he is interested in the ownership of an elevator, the leasing of which has been approved by the board, although he may have a mammoth interest in other elevators. The clause should read so that it protects him only with regard to that one elevator; as it reads he can commit any infraction of the Act so long as he can prove that he is interested in an elevator which has been leased. I would move the following amendment:

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

Subsection 1 of this section shall not apply to any person by reason only of the fact that he:

(a) owns or is otherwise interested in the ownership of any such elevator leased to the board for operation, or which has been leased to any person for operation with the approval of the board;

(b) is an owner or holder of stock or shares in any railway company which owns or operates such elevator and which does not as a business buy or sell grain;

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

My first amendment with regard to immunity is meant to apply to those who are interested in the ownership, management or operation of an elevator, the leasing of which has been made. I have made this immunity so that a person shall not come under the penalty of 123 by reason only of the fact that he is interested in such ownership, that shall not be sufficient to penalize him, he shall not be prosecuted for that reason alone. Then there is this further remedy when I say 'owns or is otherwise interested in the ownership of any such elevator.' The clause as it now reads 'owns, manages or operates' should not apply when he is only custodian of the grain. He can buy all that grain he likes because he has divested himself of the management or control of the elevator. I put in the clause about owning railway stock for the reason that those who own money in the country, many of them, have stock in railway companies as well as own the elevators; consequently they are interested.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman think that, were his last exception eliminated there would still be any application to the person who held stock in the railway company?

Mr. KNOWLES. If the company owned or operated the elevator, I think he would be indirectly interested.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does he contend that under the wording of the Bill he would be held to be interested?

Mr. KNOWLES. I think under a strict interpretation of the clause a man who owned or operated an elevator would be debarred from buying or selling grain.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Could not the whole clause be avoided simply by the same company organizing again under another name, that is to say, might there not be two companies taking out separate charters and calling themselves different names? Then Company A, being engaged in the purchase and handling of grain, and B engaged in the storage of grain, would not that means avoid all the effects of his amendment, and would not it avoid the effect of the clause as it stands?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is difficult at first sight to tell just what the effect of the amendment would be. I think 123 is meant in the first place, by a general provision, to prevent any one who owns, manages, operates or is otherwise interested in a terminal elevator, from buying or selling grain at any point in the western inspection division. That is a general prohibition of the double interest in grain buying and elevator operation. The board itself can insist on that absolutely, and, therefore bar out any person so interested from dealing in grain in the west. Whether it will do that entirely or not depends upon how far the subsections that come after may vary the effects of that prohibition. If the government comes to the conclusion to lease or expropriate the different terminal companies that are there, suppose that it undertook to lease them all, then these men have no longer any interest in the operation of that elevator. It is manned by government officers, that is, by the officers of the commission, it is supervised by the commission, tolls are arranged by the commission, and the company that owns the elevator which was leased by the commission gets nothing out of it but the amount paid in compensation for the lease year by year. That divorces them from their business in the elevator itself, which is more than the simple storage of the grain while it is in the elevator.

That is all, with respect to the divorcing of interests, that is asked for. It would have been asked for if there had been nothing in the operation inside of the elevator, either actually or supposedly, beyond the mere proper storage of grain, and the fee that would be paid for that storage. If that is carried out, and in so far as it is carried out by the government leasing through the commission these elevators, the separation of interests is actually made in all these cases. The government undertake to put into operation the principle of government ownership either by construction or leasing, but to what extent the government will go is not yet determined. We may determine in the end to lease one, two or three of the elevators that are there at the present time and thus apply, to a certain extent, the principle of government operation and give to the people of the west a choice between the elevators at that point that are run by corporations or individuals and the elevators that are run by the government themselves either as the lessees or the owners, and, in both cases,

the operators of the elevators. I am not going to say to-night on behalf of the government that we propose to lease all the terminal elevators there, or that we propose to take absolute charge of all for the present year. I am going to say that we do not. There is no use talking to this committee otherwise than frankly of what we propose to do. We may lease two of these elevators, we may lease three of them, but we do not intend to undertake the financial or experimental responsibility of taking the whole terminal elevator system at Fort William and Port Arthur under government operation for the present. We propose to apply the principle and to undertake the experiment to see whether or not the claim on behalf of that peculiar type of operation is well founded. If it works out well it will be for the government and this House, if they think it wise, to apply the principle still further but I want to guard against its being stated that because this much has been said the government propose to take the whole of the terminal facilities under their operation. In so far as the government leases some of these elevators the separation is absolutely made. In so far as it does not lease them it has this hold over the others that remain not leased by the government that it has the absolute power of saying what persons shall be allowed to operate them. That is to be done with the approval of the board and with the subsequent approval of the government. In that way you have a hold over that class of terminals that you never had before. Heretofore, we have simply had supervision. After this Act has passed we will not only have supervision but we will also have the power of direction. If those who propose to run these elevators should own them their management has to be satisfactory to the government. If they lease them the lessees are to be to the satisfaction of the commission and the government. In that way it seems to me that we get a hold added to the supervision that we already have and that we propose to maintain and we get these elevators on the basis of absolutely honest and straightforward work. That is all that the west asks and that is all that any section should ask. The demand of the west is that their grain shall not be manipulated at the terminals. That is the thing they want. It does not matter a pin as to how that is brought about so that the thing itself is accomplished. He is a hard headed man who will say: I want a certain thing done, but there is only one way in which it can be done and that is my way and if you do not do it that way I do not want you to do it in any other way. There are men who are so constituted and so fully seized of the belief that their way is the best—and honestly so—that they would rather see a thing not done at all unless it is done in their way. After all, am I not right in saying that the thing itself that the west wants is the non-manipulation and honest treatment of their grains in the elevators at the terminal points? In this way we propose to make the experiment. We do not relax one single iota of their supervision. We shall either lease or construct some elevators at terminal points and have them managed by the government, and have absolutely clear test of government operation on a large enough scale to make the experiment a good one. Then we have this added power over the elevator interests that are there and besides that we are making the bonds stronger and greater. Now, I say this and I say it upon the testimony that I have had that, although in the earlier work of these elevators I am not free from the belief that they did manipulate and wrongfully use the property of others—I do not know that I can say I am absolutely convinced of it, but I will go far enough to say that I am not free from that belief—I have yet to find, from what has happened in 1910, any instance of them having done so. From the uniform testimony I can get on all sides, in the business, of actual grievances and complaints, and in the observance and knowledge of the officers of the department, I have come to the conclusion that in 1910-11 these terminal operations were carried on with due regard to honesty and efficiency looking to the rights that were given to these men under the law. I believe that that statement can be substantiated. Add this other to these things and I believe that under the present supervision a system will be formed that will make the operation of the elevators at Fort William such that every man can entrust his interests to them with the full belief that these interests will be safeguarded. The government has given the best attention it could and has framed what it considers a piece of machinery that will carry their idea out. It may be that others have a different opinion. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has his and he has embodied it in the shape of an amendment. All I can say, without going into the legal argument for which I am not very well fitted, or without taking more time of the committee, is that this embodies about what the government thinks it can do, and if you place this machinery in the hands of the government we propose to make a trial honestly and carefully during the next year and we hope to bring out the result which we believe will be brought out—the honest treatment of the grain of the people in its passage through the terminals at Fort William.

Much as I hate to do it I think we will have to oppose the amendment of my hon. friend. If he presses it to a vote, as I suppose he will, we will have to stand up

like little men on each side and vote for and against.

Mr. ROBB. Having admitted that the government are going to either construct or lease some terminal elevators, is the minister prepared to say what charges will be made in the rates for winter storage at government elevators?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Why, bless you no. We shall have a commission that will look into that and come to their conclusions from their knowledge. That will be all arranged by the commission with the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. KNOWLES. The minister (Mr. Foster) has been good enough to make a few remarks on this matter, but they are either above or below the points to which I drew his attention. The point I most emphasized was that the Bill, as at present drafted, permitted men who would be interested in the operation of it, to be also interested in the buying and selling of grain, and he did not refer to that. In his remarks the minister gave us a general essay on human nature and uttered a great many valuable truths but I noticed he very carefully kept away from the task of trying to show us any real effect that the present Bill will have as he recommends it to the House. He has not shown us that the present clause will touch anybody. He has given us a few kindly words in commendation of the honesty and efficiency of the men who controlled the great terminal elevators during the years 1910 and 1911. I cannot understand why the minister will not tell me wherein my argument is wrong when I say that his drafting of the Bill leaves it open to men who operate elevators, once the lease is approved by the board, to go in and buy and sell grain, and once you do that you virtually take all the good effect from clause 123 away. I would like to say that I rather deprecate the way in which the government is announcing to us their policy of the government operation of elevators. The Prime Minister went through the country last summer and he told the people that he was going to get them government ownership and government operation. It is his own business whether he sees the thing in the same light to-day or not, but I do say that now after parliament has been in session for a long time, and after we have discussed this Bill which goes right to the root of the whole matter, he should have enlightened the House on what his present view is. We are to-day without any light as to whether the Prime Minister is still of the same opinion now as he was when he went through the western country last June. The right hon. gentleman did have a little glimmer of light on the matter one day about a fortnight ago, when a political pet of his, Mr. Frederick William Gordon Haultain, being pressed with his back to the wall in the Saskatchewan legislature, and having no other help and succour, went to the telegraph office and wired in his distress to the right hon. the leader of the government here to send him a telegram saying if he was going to have something in the supplementary estimates for that purpose. And the same leader of the government who refuses us in this House any information, hurried to the telegraph office in Ottawa and replied: yes, it will be in the supplementary estimates. And, in a few days afterwards, when I asked the right honourable the leader of the government whether it had been decided to place a sum in the supplementary estimates for this purpose or not, he said: no, it has not yet been formally considered. Then I read the telegram, and I asked him if he had sent it to his political pet, Frederick William Gordon Haultain, and he said yes, he sent it, but he said: the estimates are not all completed yet. And, in this House, in which there is in power a body of men who are proud of their British connection, they do violence to the first principle of British government, which says that the House of Commons shall be informed first of the policy of the government and of any contemplated expenditures. And to-night, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has handled this Bill very politely throughout, tells us with a nice flow of language and with nice epigrams, a great many truths about human nature, and quite a few other things worth remembering, if we had them at the proper time and place. But, we are not concerned this evening about what the Minister of Trade and Commerce may think about human nature and these things that would fit very nicely into an essay. We want to know more about his policy of government ownership and government operation of elevators. This is the time and this is the place, not to moralize and not to generalize as the minister has done, but to tell us something about the government policy for the ownership and operation of terminal elevators. We know less about the intentions of the Prime Minister to-day than we did when he was leader of the opposition ten months ago, and I doubt very much if he knows as much himself, or if he is as clear on it now as he thought he was then. We want the Minister of Trade and Commerce to tell us to-night whether he will give us any explanation of the fact that Frederick William Gordon Haultain got information ahead of this parliament.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Are you sure you have all his name?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, Frederick William Gordon Haultain, and if the minister wants further identification, I will say he is the man who said that reciprocity was a great thing for the country once upon a time. Frederick William Gordon Haultain is British born, and as loyal as the next man on the government benches, but for eight months he supported reciprocity, and on the eve of the election when the whip was laid on his back, the same Frederick William Gordon Haultain came and supported a policy that the people of to-day are finding has put them in the position of being losers of millions of dollars. That is Frederick William Gordon Haultain. I think I have a right to ask, as a member of this House, why that information was sent to Mr. Haultain before we were given the same information, and why, three or four days after the telegram I have referred to was sent, when I asked whether there would be an appropriation for this in the supplementary estimates, the Prime Minister told me as a member of the House that it had not been considered.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). What was the question the hon. member asked?

Mr. KNOWLES. Whether it had been decided to place a sum in the supplementary estimates for the taking over of the terminal elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Where can I find that?

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not remember the page, but the minister will find it in Hansard, and I would ask the explanation now which I think I have the right to ask.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to see how you put the question to the Prime Minister?

Mr. KNOWLES. Well, there are lots of your friends around you there who will find it for you in a few minutes; they are not busy; they are not taking very much part in this discussion. I am sorry to see that the western members on the Conservative side are not taking the part they should in trying to get this Bill modelled up as they know the great majority of their constituents would like to have it modelled. However, it is not passed yet and I hope they will give us their opinions before the final stage. Wherein does the Minister of Trade and Commerce think my argument was wrong when I said that this Bill would leave it open to anybody who was operating a terminal elevator to buy and sell grain.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not intend to make any reference to the celebrated personality who seems to hover around the imagination of my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), and I apprehend that if he were present to-night that gentleman would be able to take care of himself quite as well as would the Prime Minister, were he present. However, as to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Moosejaw, personally, in so far as it differs—which is not by a very wide margin—from the Bill as it stands, I would have no objection to it.

It seems to me that it would be well to move very cautiously in this matter. If men wish to evade section 123, I cannot see how they can be prevented from doing so, either under the amendment as moved by the hon. member for Moosejaw or under the Bill as it stands. For instance, suppose five men desire to go into the grain buying business and also in the business of a terminal elevator. They know that under this clause they cannot do it in their personal capacity, nor can any one of them. All they have to do is to form two joint-stock companies, calling the first the Brown Elevator Company, and the other the Brown Storage Company. Under these two names these five men can, in defiance of both the Bill and the amendment, conduct the joint business.

Mr. McCRANEY. Does not my hon. friend think that the words 'or otherwise interested in' would cover the case of holding stock in both companies?

Mr. MEIGHEN. No. The five men are stockholders in both companies, and they own all the stock. 'A' cannot buy and sell grain while the Brown Storage Company is storing grain because he is interested in that company. But the joint stock company which 'A,' 'B,' 'C,' 'D' and 'E' form, called the Brown Elevator Company, is not interested in the Brown Storage Company, directly or indirectly, and the Brown Elevator Company can go into the field and buy and sell grain. I am thoroughly convinced that the whole object of the Bill can be evaded in that way. No individual who is interested in a company doing one line of business can himself engage in the other line of business, but a joint stock company might be formed which as a company had no interest in the other, and it could do the business. Nor can you get away from that difficulty unless you have legislation that will prevent the interlocking of both directors and shareholders; because, while you might say that no company owned by one set of men could under the name of another company owned by the same set of men perform the two businesses, you would have to say that no man could be interested in two companies which performed as part of their business both of these lines. And suppose we went so far as to legislate that no company which had a shareholder owning even one share of stock could do business as an elevator company if he had also one share of stock in a company doing a grain

business. That would be of course absurd legislation on its face, but we would have to go that far at least to get over the difficulty; and even if we went that far, all they would have to do would be to put their stock in trust, and the wit of a legislature could never get over that difficulty. By means of a trusteeship the law could be evaded in spite of us. I only say this to urge that we had better go slow and see how this works out in practice, and if we find that it is absolutely worthless, we might as well quit. This is not the first time that this difficulty has been encountered. The practice of the interlocking of shareholders and directors is at the bottom of the biggest difficulty in the republic to the south of us. That is the reason of the difficulties in regard to what is called the money trust, which it is so far impossible to get over. The same difficulties exist here in a smaller way. While I appreciate the purpose of the government, and hope that they will have some success, I have great doubt whether the clause as it stands or as proposed to be amended will have very much effect.

Mr. NEELY. I am sure that we have listened with great interest to the very frank statement of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Do you think it is true?

Mr. NEELY. In the last parliament my hon. friend was very much interested in what he and other western members considered to be the only effective remedy for the evils that existed or that were supposed to exist in the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur. If the hon. member for Portage la Prairie is so frank in expresing his opinion that this clause, or even the amended clause proposed by the hon. member for Moosejaw, will not remedy the evil that we seek to remedy, why does he not state with equal frankness what he thinks would be an effective remedy?

Mr. MEIGHEN. For the simple reason that that is not under discussion now, and I try to stick to the point.

Mr. NEELY. I think it is under discussion. I think the minister by his statement has brought it under discussion. The whole question of the government's intention in regard to taking these elevators out of the hands of the present owners, or rather the operators, is very much the question before us at the present time. I myself was responsible in the last parliament for making certain statements in regard to the situation at Fort William and Port Arthur that brought me a certain amount of criticism, because, like the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, I was somewhat frank in dealing with the subject, and I said on one or two occasions that I could hardly understand why the present system of supervision of the terminals could not be made effective if it was not effective. Hon. gentlemen opposite found great fault with the position I took at that time—insinuated that I was not fairly representing the farmers of the west. The hon. member for Souris, the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, and other gentlemen thought the government should immediately place a sum in the estimates for taking over the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur.

It must be done. The farmers said it was the right thing to do, they declared it was the only remedy, and they were the people who knew. And these gentlemen stood right at the farmers back at that time, Mr. Chairman, and they refused to have anything to do with the government legislation until the government of the day would make a pronouncement as to their position on this question of taking over these terminal elevators. Now, look at the situation to-day. The Minister of Trade and Commerce makes a statement to-night as to what so far as he knows, he considers the intention of the government to be. He tells us that they propose to make an experiment, and that experiment is to take over, either by construction or leasing, one or two terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and operate them for a year or two alongside of the elevators that are being operated under present conditions, and see by this experiment whether or not this method believed by the farmers of the west to be the effective remedy will have any value or not. In the very next breath the minister tells us that so far as he knows those elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur in the year 1910-11 were operated in a manner that was absolutely above suspicion, and that so far as he knew no fault could be found with the method already in vogue as to government supervision of them. That was the effect of his statement—that in 1910-11 those elevators were operated without reproof or without cause of complaint. What brought about that change in the year mentioned from preceding years? We did not hear anything of that in the last parliament. The minister may say that we had not an opportunity because the session was not closed until very nearly August, but a great part of the information as to the operations of 1910-11 at the places in question was available before the close of the last session of parliament, and if the minister and hon. gentlemen from west of the great lakes did not have that information they could have obtained it. Yet that did not make any difference in their attitude of opposition to Bill Q. They said that Bill could not be passed unless the government put so many millions of dollars in the estimates for the

taking over of the terminals. Now, what does the minister propose to accomplish? I am looking for light, I am looking for information. What does the minister propose to accomplish by taking over simply one or two terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur? The shipping season begins in the fall of the year, the government will have one or two of these elevators, and the first thing we know is that the elevators are full. The other ten or twelve elevators are there waiting to do business; and the farmers who cannot get their grain in the government elevators are going to be compelled to send it to the other elevators. How does the minister expect that the operation of one or two elevators at the terminals will enlighten the public as to the benefits to be derived from government operation, especially when he tells us that so far as he knows in 1910-11 there was no fault to be found with the present system? That is a sort of piecemeal proposition. My view is that the government should go either all the way or go no way. They should either perfect the present system, or else go the distance of taking over the whole system of terminals. How else can they get any results from government operation? The whole object of this Bill is to remedy conditions, or supposed conditions, about which we have heard a great deal of fault found—the conditions existing at the terminals. If you are not going to take the radical steps demanded by the men of the west, and the minister evidently considers them to be radical, then I would like to know what sense there is in taking the position at all, and what benefit there is in this whole legislation. I have listened to the member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), explaining the advantages of the amendment that he proposes in lieu of this section. I think I am somewhat of the opinion of the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), probably neither the section itself, nor the proposed amendment, will be efficacious in preventing the men who own the interior elevators throughout the west from also being interested in the operation of the terminal elevators. If the minister, with the aid of his legal advisers—and I am sure the member for Portage la Prairie is willing to give him all the assistance possible in this respect—is unable to draft a section that will prevent the condition complained of, that is of the men who own and operate lines of country elevators from also owning and operating the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, is unable to bring here a clause that will absolutely commend itself to this committee as meeting this situation, then it seems to me this section is absolutely of no value, and it is only fair and right that the minister should tell us he does not think this section will fill the bill. If the minister does not think he can draft a section to meet the requirements, and if he is going to try any experiment at all, he ought to try the experiment that the farmers of the west have asked for, and take over all the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I am rather surprised to hear the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), confess that there is a wrong, for which there is practically no remedy. The government is assuming that there is a wrong, and where there is a wrong, I think—although in this I am contradicting the hon. member for Portage la Prairie—there is a remedy, and this committee should find that remedy. It is all very well to use destructive arguments as the hon. gentleman has done. Destructive criticism is of very little use, we want constructive criticism. I was also surprised to hear him say that the matter referred to by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down was not in discussion—that is of finding a remedy for these wrongs. If it is not under discussion why waste time, we should not have anything to do with this matter at all. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says there is a wrong, and that he is trying to rectify it; and I think he has satisfied himself—I am sure he must have—that so far as rectifying the wrong complained of, the proposed section 123 is so much useless paper, it is not worth the paper it is written on.

The mere fact that he refuses to discuss that section now, and in connection with it the amendment of the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) convinces me of that fact. There is something in the suggestion of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie and I think he could easily rectify it by the insertion of a word or two in the 4th line, so that it would read:

> No person owning, managing, operating or otherwise interested in any public or terminal elevator shall buy or sell or be otherwise interested in the buying or selling of grain, etc.

Let us compare for a moment, the section as it stands, and the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Moosejaw. In the first place you will find that by section 2, subsection 1, it says that section shall not apply by reason only of the fact, etc. The hon. member for Moosejaw has shown the difficulty that will arise as the section is at present drafted. That is, a person may be interested in, or may be the owner of a terminal elevator, which shall be leased in accordance with the provisions of the following subsections. He may own half-a-dozen elevators, but so long as he has one elevator

in which he is interested, leased to some person else, he is exempt. The other subsection (b) should commend itself to the approval of the minister, where the person who is the owner of stock or shares of any railway company which owns or operates any elevator, shall also be exempt. I think the hon. member for Portage la Prairie is satisfied that this can be remedied, and that the minister must see that this clause is defective and can and should be improved.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think that both of the suggested amendments are perhaps worthy of more consideration than I was at first disposed to give them, and what has been said by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie has also impressed me, as all his utterances on these legal questions do. I would be sorry to have the clause pass without getting as near as possible to the intent of the Act. We might allow this to stand and think it over, and see if we can get any better construction of this clause. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) has also a suggestion to make I understand.

Mr. AIKINS. I would move to add as an amendment at the end of section 123:

But if the person who is mentioned in subsection 2 owns, manages, operates or is otherwise interested in any terminal elevator other than a terminal elevator mentioned in subsection 2, he shall not be exempted from the provisions of subsection 1.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). That only covers one of the difficulties.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). We will allow this to stand at present, and take it up again.

Mr. KNOWLES. The minister asked if I would read the question which I had asked the Prime Minister. It is at page 2911 of 'Hansard' February 12.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether any decision has been reached to place a sum in the supplementary estimates for the securing of elevators by lease, purchase, or expropriation.

Mr. BORDEN. That question has not yet been formally considered. An announcement will be made in connection with the supplementary estimates.

Mr. KNOWLES. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman if he sent the following telegram to Mr. F. W. G. Haultain:—

F. W. Haultain,

Regina

Telegram received. The statement you bring to my attention is utterly untrue. Bill now before the House includes power for purchase, lease or expropriation of terminal elevators; an appropriation to be placed in the supplementary estimates for this purpose.

(Sgd.) R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. BORDEN. Yes, I sent that, but it is quite true that the supplementary estimates have not yet been formally considered, and that an announcement to the House will be made when that takes place.

I understood that the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce would give some information as to how this information came to be given to Mr. Haultain several days ahead of the time when the Prime Minister told us the matter had not yet been formally considered in council.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not think I promised my hon. friend to give him any explanation at all.

Mr. KNOWLES. You raised a hope.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am sorry if I raised a hope that now I shall have to dash to the ground. I quite see what an important influence this has in the proper arrangement of section 123 so as to make it effective. It has been the only little divergence from the straight and narrow path that we have carefully followed, which was to discuss this Grain Bill on its merits. This little episode, however, shows how manfully we have stuck to the right principle. But as there is always an exception, my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has formed the exception. However, knowing him as we do, we will forgive him that breach of the general method which has been adopted in the discussion of this Bill. I do not think the Prime Minister was much out of the way. I think he explained himself, he gave an answer, and he gave an explanation. He said it had not been formally considered, and in following up the answer he said that the supplementary estimates had not been considered. This, if it comes in anywhere, as it will come in, will be in the supplementary estimates. I think the Prime Minister was quite consistent in what he said as to why he sent a telegram to Mr. Haultain, and the Prime Minister when he comes will give that explanation himself. I suppose it was to give certain information to Mr. Haultain.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think I had a perfect right to bring this to the attention of the minister. I contend that we should have been given every particle of information that the government possesses. The Prime Minister was possessed of certain information that he was in a position to impart to a political pet, Mr. Haultain, of Regina. The Prime Minister, I think, had a greater duty to perform to us than he had to perform to Mr. Haultain. Mr. Haultain was told in categorical terms that such money would be in the estimates. I asked: Had the decision been reached to put that in the estimates, and I am told the matter had not been formally consid-

ered. Was Mr. Haultain told that it had not been formally considered? No, he he was told in the most formal way that the vote would be in the supplementary estimates for such and such a purpose. I think we are entitled to just as much information as Mr. Haultain was, if not a little more. It is an important matter for us in the west. I have letters upon letters from people in the west, people whose hopes have been raised that they would secure terminal elevators by lease, expropriation or purchase by this new government. Perhaps those hopes are to be dashed to the ground. If the minister will be more particular to execute his promise of expropriating the elevators and less particular about establishing a Tariff Commission, he will confer greater benefit on the people in the west. We have been told that the one great reason for the haste of the government in instituting this Tariff Commission was that they made a promise, and the promise was weighing heavily upon their conscience until it was fulfilled. Surely if they are so much in a hurry to fulfil their promise in regard to the Tariff Commission, why should they not be equally in a hurry to keep their promise in regard to terminal elevators? Their rule seems to be that promises to the manufacturers must be kept, but promises to the farmers may be 'chucked.'

Mr. McKENZIE. I understand the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) to say that although an individual in his private capacity could be prevented from doing a thing that was subject to a penalty, if he were to join a corporation he could secure immunity for doing that very thing which he could not do otherwise. All I have to say is that corporations are subject to the penal laws. In redrafting this section I hope the minister will do it in such a way that it will apply to corporations as well as individuals. The criminal law deals with corporations just as well as with individuals. True, you cannot put a corporation in jail, but you can reach them by heavy fines. As this would be an indictable offence, I would suggest that whatever penalty applies to an individual should be made to apply to a corporation.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The point is that the corporation would not be violating the law, and therefore would not be subject to the penalty. The corporation would be quite within the provisions of the Act. Certainly a corporation under the Act as it stands, if it violates the law, is subject to the penalty the same as any one else, because the word 'person in the interpretation clause covers 'firm "or corporation'. I do not see at present what remedy there would be that would not make the evil worse, that is to say, that would not entail an even worse confusion. I do not think my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) would advise the government to frame this clause so that no person could be an owner of stock, however small, in one company doing a grain business, and also own stock in another company doing a storage business. If he did that what would happen the unfortunate individual who received by will stock in one business, when he himself owned money in another? He would be violating the law without any act of his own whatever.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 125—security by license,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I propose to amend this section by striking out all the words after 'sum' in line 24 to 'elevator' in line 26.

The words struck out will be 'of not less than ten thousand nor more than fifty thousand dollars, in the discretion of the board, for each terminal.' Then I propose to insert the words 'of seven thousand five hundred dollars for each terminal elevator of fifty thousand bushels capacity and under, and of a proportional sum for each terminal elevator of more than fifty thousand bushels capacity.' That puts it upon the basis of $7,500 for a bond for a 50,000 bushel elevator or under, and on the same proportional basis for an elevator of over 50,000 bushels. Seven thousand five hundred dollars is 15 cents per bushel and that is based on the principle of 15 cents for every bushel of capacity in the elevator. That is the same bond that is given in Minnesota; it is not considered too large, and it is cheerfully given there, I understand.

Mr. OLIVER. How would that rate compare with the rate actually required now?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is much larger. We cannot go above fifty thousand. If you have a seven million bushel elevator you get a much larger bond.

Mr. OLIVER. I draw the minister's attention to the fact that a little while ago his argument was that the bond was sufficient security and that there was not the necessity of action by the board to close an elevator. I must say that fifteen cents a bushel is not a very adequate security.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend will make the calculation he will find that it gives a very large security.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a large security, but it is not an adequate security.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think it is an adequate security, if you take into

consideration that the grain itself is within the elevator. It is not taken out. Of course, if it were something which was dissipated and if all you had was 15 cents a bushel, it would not be a very large proportion compared with the price of the grain, but this is a large bond for security.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not complaining of the bond, but I am complaining about the application of the minister's argument in a former case.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 57—sale by sample.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Section 57 at present reads as follows:

Nothing in this Act shall prevent any person from selling or buying grain by sample regardless of its grades.

I propose to add the following:

Subsection 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act that may conflict therewith, sample markets may be established in the cities of Winnipeg, Fort William and Calgary and the mixing of grain permitted in connection therewith under such rules and regulations as shall be recommended by the board and approved by the Governor in Council.

3. The provisions of section 208, with the exception of subsection 3 thereof, shall apply to sample markets when established.

Mr. OLIVER. On the face of it, this amendment would seem to contemplate the mixing of grain at terminal points, or at any rate it would contemplate the mixing of grain after inspection. I think that in the beginning of our consideration of the Bill it was generally conceded that that principle was objectionable to the spirit of the Bill; that is to say, that there should be no mixing after inspection. I think the committee would be glad if the minister would give a somewhat full explanation of this proposed amendment, because it seems to contradict the principle of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Of course, the object of this amendment is to introduce the sample market into the grain trade and the introduction of the sample market carries with it the mixing of grain under certain conditions and under certain supervision. I do not suppose that the members of the committee wish me to go into a long statement as regards the differences between a sample market connected with a grade market and a purely grade market.

Mr. OLIVER. I think we do. We want to have a very thorough understanding of this question which is a vital point of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Very well, if my hon. friend requires a fairly full explanation he has a perfect right to have it. Perhaps it would be as well to premise the statement in reference to this by a little glance at the history of the grain business in the United States of America. Instead of travelling all over the States and particularizing, it would be just as well for the purposes of this explanation that we should take the state of Minnesota and confine ourselves to that. The facts of the case in reference to the development of grain marketing in the state of Minnesota are briefly these: The time was when they had no sample market and allowed no mixing of grains. They had a grade market and a grade market only. Gradually, in the evolution of the grain trade and public sentiment developed and in the course of time, in the early eighties, I think it was, the grade system pure and simple was superseded by the sample market system. For a number of years the sample market system has been the one in vogue in that state. The modus operandi of the system is something like this:

Grain coming from the west to Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth, is at a certain point outside of Minneapolis sampled by the samplers of the Grain Exchange of Minneapolis and also by the samplers of the state who correspond to our government inspectors. These samples are sent in the one case to the members of the Exchange, and in the other to the proper state officials. The object of the sampling by the state official is to set the grades of the grain; the object of the sampling by the grain exchange is to get from these cars sale samples which are placed in the hands of the members of the exchange. These samples appear in the exchange when the exchange opens for business. There is a sample of the grain taken from each car, the number of the car, and the district from which the car comes, and these samples are viewed by the buyers, and according to the quality of the samples shown the purchase is made. The samples taken by the state officials, have by an early hour of the day been inspected by the state inspectors and the grades for the cars are fixed and the certificates are sent up to the grain exchange and the buyer then has the advantage of the sample itself which he can see and feel, and of the grade and standard which has been established by the state inspector. The purchases are then made and the cars have gradually made their way down to the city and they are to remain for a certain period. These carloads of grain are bought then by people upon the sample market. They are afterwards taken, if bought by the millers, to their mills, and if bought otherwise they are taken to the warehouses as they call them, or the public or terminal elevators, as we call them. They are inspected into these

elevators and are stored in them and are again inspected out, and are to be inspected out at the same grade and at the same weight as when inspected in.

Mr. OLIVER. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say there were two inspections?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is a sample inspection by the state and that becomes the inspection into the elevator. I did not mean to say there were two inspections into the elevator.

Mr. OLIVER. When the grain leaves that elevator is there a verifying inspection or a different inspection?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is a verifying inspection out, exactly the same as we have. That warehouse man is under bond and he has to keep the grade and he has to give out the same grade and the same weight as under our law. Then, there are special bins provided for in these terminal warehouses and the operator of the warehouse must give a bin to any person who wishes it, and that bin is to be at the disposal, of the person who has it and he can authorize the mixing, the cleaning, improvement and treatment of grain in that bin, by the warehouseman. That cannot be done except under the instructions of the owner of the grain. That is about the modus operandi so far as the terminal elevators are concerned. They have also a system of country elevators or as they call them local warehouses, which are operated much the same as our country elevators in the west. They have also what are called private terminal elevators where grain is taken in and where it is mixed, whether under license or not I cannot quite gather from the reading of the law. These mixing elevators are mixing almost entirely what belongs to themselves. They also come under bonds in some way but these are not essential to the system which I have been describing. They, therefore, have both the sample market and the grades as well. Now, there has been for some time in our country a disposition towards the establishment of sample markets for our western grain. I have here a report of an elevator commission appointed by the local government of Saskatchewan which held extensive investigations in 1910 and took evidence at a great many different places and embodied a great deal of valuable information in their report. I find in that report some statements which bear upon the matter in hand. They give a list of the charges against the present system which operates in the province of Saskatchewan. They give the grievances and charges against the system as brought together by those who appeared at their investigations and particularly as advanced by the Grain Growers' Association of the province of Saskatchewan. One of these complaints is against the grading system and is denominated in this way:

1. That the grades do not represent different values of the grain for milling purposes.

2. That good grain in any one grade gets the grade price only, and that selling by grade enables the millers and elevator companies to lower the quality of each grade, and so to fix the export and home prices upon the basis of the lowest level of each grade.

3. That the existing grading system is unfair to grain which though slightly bleached, smutted or frosted, is nevertheless of good quality for milling purposes.

4. That mistakes are made in sampling and grading.

These are the chief grievances or complaints that came before that commission with reference to the grading system. Another grievance against the large western milling companies is thus formulated:

That the defects of the grading system, and the absence of a sample market, enable them to buy grain which though slightly bleached, smutted or frosted. is of superior quality. and to buy it at a price far below its value.

On page 22 of that report they again formulate their grievances against the present system in this way:

The selling by grade alone is one main condition of their buying the grain below its value.

Again, on page 25, in formulating what is demanded in regard to the grading system, they say:

What is demanded in regard to the market? To have a sample market which will remedy the defects of the grading system, and give to the farmer the actual value of his grain, whether it is especially good, poor bleached, smutted or frosted, as distinguished from a general grade price.

Again, on page 28, in a resumé, under the head of 'Sample Market,' the commission says:

There is a general demand among the farmers for a sample market. It arises from the belief upon their part that the general grade price does not do justice to particular lots of grain, either lots specially good or lots that are low or off grade.

I make these quotations from the report of the commission as corroborative of my statement that there has been, and is now amongst the farmers of the northwest, a demand for a sample market. I find in the report of the proceedings of the Grain Conference, on page 100, a statement also bearing upon this point, given by Mr. Partridge, who, I think, represented the Grain Growers' Association at that conference. He said:

I could go into details with regard to the matter, but I want to point out that I

am fully convinced, as the result of the tests that I have spoken of concerning different types of wheat, that it becomes absolutely necessary, if we are to have an ideal market, that we must have a sample market to temper the inefficiencies and inadequacies of the grading system, and in order to have such a sample market, we cannot, rely on the western millers, who can place a carload in a special bin, but we must have the grain specially binned in the terminal elevators in order to enable the eastern miller and the old country miller to enter into this competition.

I find also, on page 103 of the proceedings of the same conference, a statement from Mr. Henders, who I think is at present the president of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, as follows:

We cannot compete under the present existing conditions, but if we could be put in such a position that we were able to go on a sample market in Winnipeg and select our types of wheat and compel the Ogilvie Milling Company and the Lake of the Woods Milling Company to go on the same market and select their types of wheat the same as we do and compete with us, we could go into the business. On the other hand we put ourselves in this position that we send to the old country the wheat which is not selected by the Ogilvie people or the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, a secondary article which goes into a general bin, and this fixes the price at which we have to sell our good stuff.

In the minutes of the proceedings of the Senate Committee, on page 200, I find in a formal statement put in by Mr. McKenzie, the secretary of the Grain Growers' Association, the following:

There is a consensus of opinion that a sample market established in Winnipeg would be in the interests of the grain producers. In my judgment, that, however, can only be made effective by permitting dealers special binning privileges in terminals so as to preserve the identity of their purchases on the sample market. I cannot conceive of a purchaser on a sample market storing his grain in a special bin in an elevator operated by his competitor. The risk would be too great; his competitor would soon put him out of business. The only effective special binning privilege that could be secured would be in government owned terminal elevators.

I read these as sample statements from those who in the west represent the organized grain producers in the associations known as the Grain Growers' Associations. I might quote from Mr. Fream, of the Alberta Farmers' Union, to the same end, that he is in favour of a sample market, but he wants to see government elevators at the terminals before he would be in favour of having a sample market introduced. Thus much for the opinions of those who represent the grain producers of the Northwest. When we come to other classes who are interested in the grain business, we find probably different views. Many of them are in favour of a sample market; some of them are not. On the whole, I should judge that the preponderating opinion of those most vitally interested in the grain business of this country is in favour of having a sample market in Canada. It is in deference to the course which history has taken in Minnesota and generally in the United States, and also in deference to this opinion, which I believe to be general, that the government has determined to introduce at this time into the Grain Bill a provision under which sample markets can be established at Winnipeg, at Fort William and at Calgary.

The arguments on general principles, without taking up too much of the committee's time, seemed to me in general to be these: The natural method of buying and selling is for the seller to show and the buyer to examine the article which it is proposed to exchange between them. A man wants to buy a horse, some one else wants to sell a horse. The buyer and the seller come together, and the buyer examines the points of the horse with what knowledge he may have and he fixes his price for that horse on his own examination. He does not sit in his house and buy a horse by grade or anything of that kind. That is probably an extreme illustration, but what I want to come to at first is, that the natural way of buying and selling is to buy and sell by an actual examination of the article of which an exchange is to be made between the two. Now it would seem to be plain that where you have three or four standard grades of grain, the standard being fixed as being of a certain weight, of certain texture or kernels of grain, certain colours and so on, that you will have as between the different grades established varying degrees of excellence in the grain. You will have a No. 1 which is flush and full. You will have a No. 1 which is between that and a bare No. 1 which the inspector looking at in sample, and knowing what the various standards are, will say: 'Yes, that can go into No. 1'; and so you have these spreads in value between the different grades as far as the grades go. From what study I have given to the matter the impression is strong with me that the farmer gains less and loses more by sales under grade, than he would if he made his sales by sample. If you have a sample market in Winnipeg, where the farmer's grain, sampled from his car, goes on inspection, and the buyers are present in the sample market the grain of the farmer is not simply bought by those who are upon the sample market because it grades No.

2, and the price just given simply on the grade of No. 2, but the price will be proportionate to the qualities within the grade itself. A man will see a plump good quality of No. 2. He will see a less generous quality in No. 2; he will see one that goes down very close to the border. In a competition of buyers it is plain to me that the better price will be given for the higher quality within the grade. By the other system it is sold out of sight and by grade. It seems to me that it is rather paid for to the farmer by the lowest of the grade than by either the average or the highest of the grade. The trouble which is complained of, and it is a grievance, is the spread in price between the different grades. Those who are in favour of a sample market believe that the purchase thereon by the competitors will bring out the value for all these qualities between the grades, and that those values will certainly be shared and gererously shared by the farmers. That is the argument for the sample market so far as that is concerned. The argument against the sample market is one that says: 'Hold by the grades' and avoid mining. Now it seems to me a necessity for a sample market that you should have mixing privileges as well, and mixing privileges, says the man who stands by the grade, and that alone, will deteriorate the grades themselves, and on the ultimate market you will therefore, get a less price than you would if you had no sample market, and no mixing of the grain as a concomitant of the sample market. The man who buys on the sample market with the privilege of mixing in a bin at the terminal elevator or anywhere else, buys the different qualities within the grades and he directs them to his bin. He will buy, for instance, a good grade of No. 1 and he will buy the best grade of No. 2. He will direct both of these—if he buys a carload or two or three carloads of each—to his bin in the terminal elevator. They will go into that bin, and the two of them mixing together will make a good grade of No. 1, and before they go into the market they pass the inspection and receive their grade out. That grade out given by the same inspectors is a uniform grade, and the grain goes upon the market with the impress of the grade, with the certificate that the government inspector gives it. I do not know if there are any other points that should be mentioned in giving this very cursory, and of course not very full or complete, description of the sample market as contrasted with the grade market, or the difference between the two. No doubt we shall have some conversation upon this, and other gentlemen will have their views upon it. We will discuss it and I shall have further opportunity for speaking upon it. Probably I have said sufficient in introducing the question to the committee for its consideration. and by and by for its conclusion.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Is the sample market in the United States under federal control, or state control?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is under state control.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure the committee is indebted to the minister for the statement he has made on the introduction of this very important amendment. But I am bound to say that the explanation he has so far given does not meet the questions that are in my mind. First let it be thoroughly impressed that for good reason or bad, whether wisely or unwisely, it has been the principle contended for, especially by the western farmers, but acceded to by everybody—that it was in the interests of the trade and in the interests of the grower of grain, that grain should go forward to its ultimate market according to the inspector's certificate.

That has been a cardinal principle of our grain trade which has been held more and more strongly every year, and the desire to maintain that principle is the foundation of the demand for government ownership of terminal elevators, or for the divorcing of the ownership of terminal elevators from the buying and selling of grain. The minister did not make it clear whether this is an amendment that applies in fact only to grain bought for local consumption and not in serious measure to grain for export. It seems to me that while ostensibly and according to the argument of the minister it is a provision which will be applied particularly to grain intended for local consumption, as a matter of fact the mixing privileges which this contemplates will apply to grain for export quite as much as to grain for home consumption.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend understood me to limit it to grain for home consumption he took from my words a meaning that I did not intend to convey. They apply generally.

Mr. OLIVER. If he had given it to be understood that it applied especially to grain for home consumption I could then have seen the force of the argument, but if it is to apply to all grain I fail to see the logic of his explanation. It is then in direct contradiction to the principle that has been established and carried on for so many years. I am not going to argue for the moment that that principle is right. it may be that in the quotations he has given my hon. friend finds good reason for reversing the principle, but before reversing it there should be the most sub-

stantial reasons and the most complete explanation.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). After the grain arrives at an elevator at Fort William it is allowed to be mixed, and a man buying on sample market is allowed to mix it, and the grain is graded out.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what is proposed under the amendment and I say that is contrary to the principle which now prevails. To-day the principle is that the grain is inspected as it comes from the country elevator, at Winnipeg; it goes forward under that inspection and it is held most strongly, especially by the farming community, that it should still go forward on that inspection, and should not be mixed at Fort William.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Did they not pass a resolution at Brandon last year asking for the establishment of a sample market?

Mr. OLIVER. In my humble judgment there is an effort under the name of establishing a sample market to secure unlimited rights for mixing grain for export and that is entirely contrary to our present principles of handling grain.

There can be no question of the advantage of selling grain on a sample market if there is a demand for that grain which demand can handle it without requiring it to be graded or to go through varying channels of transportation. Then, undoubtedly the farmer will get a truer value for his grain. But that only applies and can only apply so far as there is a consuming market within such range as will allow that grain to go forward without breaking bulk, so that the grain which has been bought on sample will be actually delivered to the place of consumption. Once bulk has to be broken before grain reaches its ultimate point of consumption then, in order that the grain trade may be carried on with facility, it must be carried on under grade and not under sample. You cannot preserve the identity of grain in practice between Fort William and Liverpool.

You must carry on the trade between Fort William and Liverpool on grade and not on sample. You can only carry on the trade by sample where you can reach the point of consumption without breaking bulk from the point of shipment. When conditions in Minneapolis are cited as conditions that might prevail at Winnipeg, you lose sight of the fact that at Minneapolis a large percentage of the wheat is for home consumption, and a small percentage is for export. But at Winnipeg the small percentage is for home consumption, and the large percentage is for export. That makes a radical difference in conditions. In the case of Minneapolis it matters little what happens the small proportion of wheat that is exported; the great bulk of it is milled for home consumption, and the great bulk of the mills are right at Minneapolis. But in our case, where only a small part of the whole product is locally milled, the large proportion is for export. Therefore, it makes a great difference to us how that grain that goes to the export market is handled; it makes less difference how the grain that goes for home consumption is handled. Therefore, when a proposition is made which, under the name of giving our farmers the advantage of a sample market, merely becomes a proposition to legalize the mixing of grades for export, it is a matter of a most objectionable character. I wish to place myself on record as being strongly opposed to the proposition of legalizing the mixing of grain in the terminal elevators, because that is what this proposition is.

Mr. STAPLES. It is a proposition for a sample market.

Mr. OLIVER. A sample market has nothing whatever to do with the mixing of grain for export, or has no necessary connection with the mixing of grain for export. So far as there is a milling demand which can be centred in Winnipeg for the purchase of the farmers' grain, that milling demand can be exercised without mixing the grades in the terminal elevators. The two things have no necessary connection. Provision can be made in the Bill, if necessary, for selling grain on sample in Winnipeg. The provision exists in the Bill to-day, but it has never been taken advantage of, because I presume, the time has not arrived when conditions were favourable to dealing with it in that way. At present, in the Bill of 1908, provision is made that the shipper of a car of grain can order it stopped at Winnipeg for the purpose of giving him an opportunity of selling it on sample, and afterwards within six months he can ship it farther east at the same through rate, a provision absolutely intended to facilitate the establishment of a sample market in Winnipeg. So far as I can see, that is all that is necessary to the establishment of such a market, except the local milling demand, which is the only thing after all, that will create a sample market. When my hon. friend gave notice of the amendment, I wired Mr. R. McKenzie, at Winnipeg, whose name has been mentioned here, asking him his opinion of the amendment. I will read his reply:

Suggested amendment positively no value to western farmers. Opposed utterly by our association. Ostensibly to establish sample market, effect will be to enable few private individuals to make immense profits out of second-class grain at expense of reputation of standard grades, with no advantage to farmers. Conditions essential to establish sample

market at Winnipeg, involve making Winnipeg an order point, and sending samples from points west of Winnipeg in advance of cars, as in Minneapolis, and equal opportunity to all dealers to have identity of grain purchased on sample preserved at terminals.

The suggestion of Mr. McKenzie has all been met in making Winnipeg an order point, that is, a point to which cars may be ordered and held for the purpose of the load being sold. In regard to the other suggestions that he makes, they can be dealt with very easily, and in no way do they involve the question of mixing at terminals. I have here a copy of the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' containing an article by the editor upon the sample market in Minneapolis. I think it was perhaps from this article that my hon. friend got the information that he gave to the House to-night. Mr. Chipman went to Minneapolis for the express purpose of studying the sample market, and his conclusion is this:

It was quite evident from the best advice to be received in Minneapolis that the sample market cannot be created by statute. The only thing that can be done in the matter by law is to make the conditions favourable, and the sample market will follow promptly. These conditions will include:

1. Sampling of cars at divisional points outside of Winnipeg.
2. Increased terminal elevator accommodation.
3. Permission to special bin and mix grain purchased on the sample market.
4. A prompt and efficient system of handling appeals against the grade given by the government inspector.

In regard to number 3, I take it that is mixing for the purpose of local use, that is to say, for home milling consumption, which of course must be done. When the grain goes to the ultimate consumer the miller must, of course, mix the grain to suit his particular trade. No doubt the British miller has to do the same. When the grain is bought on sample and can be delivered with the package unbroken, it is perfectly legitimate to mix that grain to make it suitable for the miller's market. But that is a different proposition altogether from mixing that grain for the purpose of sending it across the water. If the grain to be exported is to be scientifically mixed, it necessarily follows that it will always be only what will pass the grade; it will be of a lower standard than if it were not scientifically mixed, and the result of that is that our trade is affected to that extent in the British market, and our home prices are correspondingly affected.

That is necessarily the result of permitting or legalizing the mixing of grain in the terminal elevators for export. Let me draw the distinction absolutely between the question of establishing a sample market and the question of mixing grain for export. The one has no necessary connection with the other and while the establishment of a sample market in so far as it could be established would necessarily be to the benefit of the farmer, and particularly to the benefit of the farmer producing the highest quality of grain, the privilege of mixing for export would necessarily have the absolute contrary effect and would be a detriment to the good farmer inasmuch as he would not be getting the grade for the higher quality of grain that he produced.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Mr. Chairman, I regard the amendment moved to-night by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) as being perhaps the most vital feature of this Bill and I welcome with all the earnestness I can the principle launched in this amendment. I believe that it will open up a line of legislation and of grain operating in western Canada that will go far, in the course of time, to get over all the obstacles under which we suffer now. I cannot say that I am surprised that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has a telegram in his possession that the clause is absolutely worthless from Mr. Roderick Mackenzie of the Grain Growers' Association. I regret that the officers of that association cannot see their way at the present time to give their assistance to the establishment of sample markets. But while I cannot feel myself to be in touch with them so closely as are the hon. member for Edmonton and his associates I do feel that on this subject I am certainly as closely in touch as I can be with the farmers of my own constituency. I did not learn until I reached this House and knew that sample market provisions were in contemplation by the government that those at the head of the association had become antagonistic to the idea. During and before the last contest I was met by farmers at every point in my constituency and at points in other constituencies in Saskatchewan as well as in northern and southern Manitoba and the desire seemed to be universal that sample marketing privileges and machinery should be provided. I believe that desire is universal to-day and that the gentleman who sent that telegram will become aware of it in due course of time. Why is this proposition made and what is the object to be served? I do not know that I am capable of stating it as it appeals to my mind. I think it appeals to my mind fairly clearly, I will do the best I can to state it and I will be brief. Our grading system is at present in vogue and in order to carry out that system we have to have certain specified and defined grades. We must have a certain number of grades ranging in merit from the best to the worst. Each must

be defined in so far as words can define it and the grading is done according to the definition. Let us take the case of wheat in order to make it simple. If in buying all the wheat could be divided into certain sections in such a way that each would just reach the grade that is to say if it could be so divided that all in each section would just be No. 1 Hard and no more, all No. 1 Northern and no more, all No. 2 Northern and no more and so on down the list, the farmer would get the full benefit. Then there would be no means of extracting from him a certain amount of the value of his wheat. As the system is operated up to this point, by means of one device or another, the purchaser of the grain, chiefly by mixing, has been enabled—I am dealing now with the export trade because it will make the argument clear—to make the export grade the minimum in each case. By mixing perhaps two different samples of No. 3 Northern he is able to make them No. 2 Northern, the one making up what the other lacks. By mixing a high No. 2 and a low No. 3 he is able to make a No. 2 Northern. At all events he so arranges that, generally speaking, he is able to export different classes of grain, each of the minimum of its grade. He does not buy that grade. On account of the grading system in vogue he is able to buy on one basis and sell on the other and by this means he is enabled to snatch and appropriate to himself the excess of value that comes by reason of the fact that a certain sample of grain stands between the grades. It is to get over that disadvantage under which the farmer labours that this provision is introduced. The question before us is: Does this provision for a sample market get over it? I contend it does. What is the machinery? What does the Minister of Trade and Commerce present to the committee? It is that markets shall be arranged at certain points and it is provided that all that is necessary for that arrangement shall take place there. In addition, in so far as the grain that is bought by sample is concerned it may be specially binned at the terminal elevators or at the public elevator at Winnipeg and may be mixed; that is to say that grain that is bought by a purchaser may all be mixed together and he may do what he likes with it. In so doing he divides it into certain grades and he is able as well to so arrange it that it will be the minimum of its class. But in order that he may do that and get the grade he is bound to pay the farmer what that grain is actually worth because he buys it by sample and his competitor is right there to compete with him. He is therefore bound to give the farmer what he formerly has been able to extract himself. He is bound to pay the farmer every cent that that farmer's grain has in value over and above the minimum of its class. So that the establishment of a sample market and allowing mixing at the terminals, in so far as the grain is bought by sample, gets over the difficulty under which the farmer has laboured for a number of years as, by virtue of the fact that under these mixing privileges and on account of the practice of purchasing by sample there will be returned to the farmer that which has formerly gone to the purchaser and the operator. The hon. member for Edmonton seemed to argue that this was all right in so far as the home market went, that in so far as grain was bought for milling purpose the sampling provisions were good and would redound to the farmer's benefit, but they had no application to grain bought for export.

In the first place I do not think the practice has so settled. I have spoken with men in the grain business in Duluth. I refer now especially to one who is on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange at present—and my information is that grain is bought by sample for export just as generally as it is bought for local milling. It appears to me that the advantage to the farmer is just as clear in the one case as it is in the other. The mixing is done when it is bought for milling purposes at home and the sample provisions are provided in order that the farmer may get the benefit of that mixing. It applies just as well to what is bought for export. The provision must be made that only grain bought by sample can be so mixed, and that it cannot be mixed in such a way that other grain bought by grade under the old system, can be mixed with it. The point that did appeal to me, and I think both the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) raised it, is that mixing being allowed in the elevators at Fort William that contain the grain bought by sample, that mixing will result in enabling the purchaser to ship across the water to the ultimate purchaser the minimum grade of No. 1 hard, and the minimum grade of No. 2. That is to say, that the grain which goes across the water will always be at the minimum, instead of it being, if no mixing were allowed, much of it above what is the minimum of No. 1 Hard, and much of it above what is the minimum of No. 1 Northern, and so on all the way down. Of course, it is quite clear that if we could provide that our grain should go over there intact, and much of what goes over as No. 1 Hard, is really above No. 1 Hard, that would enhance the reputation of our wheat, and if the machinery were just up to that point the farmer would get the benefit. But I apprehend that by the sampling provision the farmer would have his option to sell one way or the other; the competing buyers are there, the man who is buying by sample and the man who

is buying by grade, and the farmer can sell either way. The man who is buying by sample could get the benefit of the mixing provision, and he will consequently pay a much higher price, and the man who is buying by grade has to pay it or he won't get the grain. It appears to me very much could be done through the machinery provided by this section to meet the difficulty that was in the mind of the hon. member for Edmonton. I do not pretend that I have always understood this question, or even that I fully understand it yet, but I know that a very strong feeling has prevailed that only by government operation can the difficulties be overcome. I am still an advocate of government operation. I earnestly hope that the government shall adopt not only this provision but the other also, and by means of the two together we will I feel certain be able to work out a satisfactory solution. The sample market is certainly popular in the constituency of Portage la Prairie. I have no doubt whatever of that. I would need evidence greater than could be read by the hon. member for Edmonton, to convince me that it is not. I have certainly failed to read the mind of the farmer in my constituency if I have not read it right when I say that he is heart and soul behind the proposed sample clause submitted to this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. NEELY. I would like to see the Bill in proper form carried very promptly through the House, and to see its provisions, so long as they meet the necessities of the case, become effective at once. But, we are called back to consider this clause for the purpose of considering an amendment, which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen), admitted in his opening remarks, was an absolute reversal of the whole policy of the past in dealing with our grain. The minister makes practically the same admission, and the question is too serious to pass over lightly. We discussed some days ago the value of a sample market, or the possibilities of a sample market under the present conditions. Is the minister going to ask us to insert a provision now which will permit the very thing that is complained of by the men who are asking for this legislation? There would not be any Grain Bill at all before this House if it were not that the farmers of the west have complained in the past that mixing of grades had been carried on in the terminal elevators, and that as the result of that mixing our grain standards had been depreciated especially in the Liverpool market. As we all know, we have a condition in the grain trade in western Canada that is not altogether analagous to the condition in the grain trade of the states across the line. We know that practically all the wheat grown in Minnesota and the Dakotahs is exported in the form of flour if it is exported at all, and that practically none of it goes to the outside world's markets in its natural condition. The hard wheat that is graded according to our grading system is almost entirely milled in the mills of Minneapolis. On the other hand, the bulk of the Western Canadian grain is sold in the markets of Great Britain and elsewhere. The present system, whether it is right or wrong, has been the only system in vogue in this country since we have had a grain trade from the east or from the west. The farmers of the west have made complaints—and that is the cause of this legislation—that until last year the elevator operators at Fort William and Port Arthur had been mixing in their elevators the different parcels of grain shipped into these elevators, some labelled No. 1, and some No. 2, or No. 3, as the case may be, and that they have been raising a great quantity of the producer's wheat to a grade higher than was given to it by the inspector's certificate it received when it passed through Winnipeg. Every year our inspectors select samples of the different official grades, and in every case those samples which are sent to the world's buyers are a better average than the minimum of the grade requires. The western grain producer claims that as a result of the mixing that has gone on in the terminals in years gone by, the Liverpool purchaser of his wheat has not been getting the kind of wheat he might expect to get from the sample furnished him by the government inspector at the beginning of the shipping season. That is why this grain legislation was introduced in the last parliament, and has been re-introduced this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN. This does not prevent that at all. The grain would still be inspected out, and the grain thus inspected, must be equal to the sample in the hands of the purchaser in England. This legislation has no effect whatever on that.

Mr. NEELY. The point I am making is, that if this legislation goes into effect, it will bring about a condition of affairs absolutely identical with that which the farmers have been complaining of in years gone by—that, instead of the Liverpool buyer getting the average of the grade which he might expect to get, judging from the sample which the inspector sends him, he has been getting, as a result of the mixing that has been going on at the terminals, the minimum of the grade, and this has depreciated the standard of our grain in the Liverpool market, and lowered the price. If these practices have not been going on, the farmers are mistaken, and there is no necessity for any legislation, other than what

we have on the statute-books at the present time. If, on the other hand, the farmers have been suffering, as they have been complained of doing, from this very condition at the terminals, what does the minister mean by undertaking to legalize the very condition that has been complained against, and that is the cause of any new grain legislation at all? I can quite conceive that a sample market under proper conditions, might be of very great benefit to the grain producer. There is no doubt that the farmer loses and is bound to lose, by having to sell all his grain on the straight grading system, because there is, and must always be, such a difference in the prices paid for the different grades that the man who has a very high average of a certain grade is necessarily losing to some extent; but if the buyer in the world's market could be assured every shipping season, that he was getting something more than the minimum, that he was getting the average of the grade he had been led to expect to get, from the samples he receives from the government inspector at the beginning of every shipping season, the farmer would not be losing as much as he does at the present time. I can quite see, that beyond all that, there are conditions under which a sample market might be an advantage; but I do not think the sample market would be of any advantage whatever if we are going to insert a clause; such as this amendment is, that will permit of promiscuous mixing at the terminals, and of re-grading the grain out of these terminals for export purposes. If, for instance, a miller from Ontario wishes to go to the sample market at Winnipeg or at Fort William, and purchase a certain brand of No. 3, and a certain quality of No. 2, and intends to take that grain down to his mill in Ontario, certainly if a sample market is going to be of any advantage in that case, you must give him the privilege of leasing a special bin in the terminal at Fort William; but if he does so, and the different parcels of grain which he purchases on the sample market are, inspected or not, I say that if you give him the privilege for his own convenience of putting a certain parcel of No. 3 and a certain parcel of No. 2 or of No. 1 into a special bin at Fort William or Port Arthur, you have no right to allow your government inspector to re-grade that grain out of the elevator. Then, if the Liverpool buyer wants to purchase grain and comes over to our sample market—we will say that he is a miller, or is buying for a mill or a number of mills—if he wishes to come over and buy certain qualities of grain on the sample market and ship them in one parcel to the mills for which he purchases, there is no reason why he should not have special bin privileges at Fort William and Port Arthur. There is no reason why you should not have a sample market and the mixing privilege if you restrict them in the ways I have suggested; but there is no evidence of any restriction. If you are going to allow a Liverpool buyer to come to the sample market and take a certain sample of No. 3 and a certain sample of No. 2, and send them to a special bin at the terminal, mix them and have them regraded out, you are going to have continued in the grain trade, exactly the condition which the farmers are complaining of at the present moment. The grain dealer is not a philanthropist, and he will deliver to the purchaser, to whom he sells, either in eastern Canada or in Liverpool, a grain not a bit better than what the absolute requirements of the case demand.

And what are you going to have with this anomalous mixing privilege as suggested by this amendment? You are going to have continued in existence, only on a much larger scale than at present, the mixing of grain to the disadvantage of our grading system and to the advantage of the man who comes between and sells the farmers' grain to the world's buyers. This, Mr. Chairman, strikes me as being such an important amendment that I do not know but that the Minister of Trade and Commerce might very well give us a little further time for its consideration. I am not blaming the minister for the fact that on his own side, as well as on this, there is not as full a House at the present moment as there might be. But whether this amendment is carried out or not, I want to say, so far as the position taken by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) is concerned, I think when he says the farmer of the west would like to have a sample market he is perfectly correct, but my hon. friend knows under what conditions the farmer thinks that a sample market could be safely and properly established.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. member not think that the conditions set out by Mr. Chipman are not satisfactory?

Mr. NEELY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Chipman guards his position very thoroughly.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Those conditions are all provided for here.

Mr. NEELY. Does my hon. friend mean to say they are all provided for in this amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I think so.

Mr. NEELY. Then the hon. gentleman's vision is much clearer than mine.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Read it and see.

Mr. NEELY. I have read it thoroughly again and again, and I can see no safe-

guard in any shape or form for the evils that would be brought into being in my judgment. If the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) takes a different view, his vision is much clearer than mine.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What I stated was that in my judgment the Bill provides the conditions set out by Mr. Chipman, and I think my hon. friend would hardly dare—I am sure he would not dare—to stand up in this House and say there was anything wrong in the 'Grain Growers' Guide.'

Mr. NEELY. I will frankly say that I am not the proprietor or publisher of the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' and I am not a shareholder or stockholder in it or any similar publication. I am not a member of the Grain Growers' organization, or any business concern connected with it. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), should take such a position——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. NEELY. —because anything that emanates from the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' or the officials or head men of the Grain Growers' Association in his own province, seems to contain in itself the germ of disapproval so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Oh, no, not necessarily.

Mr. NEELY. Apparently so. It appears that when the minister is making use of a quotation which bears out his argument from some member of the Grain Growers' Executive, or from the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' it is very acceptable, but when anything to the contrary is suggested by way of authority from these very same sources, that is enough to condemn it in the eyes of the hon. gentlemen opposite, including the member for Portage la Prairie. Now, I think hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be reasonable in this matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN. My hon. friend knows the rule, which is a very good principle in law or anything else, that a man's admission can always be used against him, but it can never be used in his favour.

Mr. NEELY. I am not going to split legal hairs with the hon. gentleman, because I am not a lawyer, and I do not propose to enter into any fine legal discussion, but I am lawyer enough, I think, to see the effect and the tendency of this amendment, and I fail to see yet—and I have read the article of Mr. Chipman, editor of the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' who let me say takes no active part in politics whatever—that the article makes any such admission as claimed by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie and the minister in dealing with this proposition to allow mixing privileges at the terminals and then grade the grain out again for export purposes.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I am really anxious to have a little light on this question. I listened extremely carefully, with all the care I was capable of, to the minister and my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), but I cannot say that I understood the question much better after they were done than when they began. It may have been my obtuseness, it very likely was; but a man rarely gives up some belief in his own judgment, and I have some suspicion that they do not understand the question themselves as well as they might do. Now, with regard to the minister's statement of the general desirability of buying upon sample there can be no two opinions. In the internal markets of the old countries of Europe no other kind of selling of grain is known. The farmer takes his sample to the market, and he sells upon that sample, and he sells the bulk at the price he has arranged for. But why do we have a system of elevators and grades in this country? I think the answer is very simple and on the surface. It is because we have an enormous export trade. We cannot sell our grain to the consumers as they sell their grain to the consumers in the old countries of Europe. These grades and elevators, and all this complex and large machinery that is unknown in Europe, are necessary here because of our enormous export trade. Now that would seem in itself to cast some doubt upon the general argument in favour of this amendment that has been presented to this committee by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) does not agree with the leaders of the grain growers nowadays. This nonagreement is of somewhat recent origin surely. There was a time, if my memory serves me right—very likely as my hon. friend's memory is younger he may be able to correct me, but I am almost sure I am right this time—when there was mention made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House of government ownership and operation of elevators. I am surely right in that recollection, and at that time the hon. member for Portage la Prairie and Mr. Roderick Mackenzie were absolutely at one. The vote of my hon. friend was in accordance with the opinion of Mr. Roderick Mackenzie.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Not on reciprocity.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). What in the world has that to do with the matter under discussion? When the hon. member becomes a little older and wiser, he may come into accord with Mr. Roderick Mackenzie on reciprocity. If this blockade continues, it will be necessary to find an outlet for

our grain somewhere. There was a time when he was in accord with Mr. Mackenzie to this extent that he voted for a resolution in favour of government ownership and operation of elevators.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Hear, hear, that is correct.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Then his education has gone on very rapidly in the last few months. I am only sorry that he cannot carry on that education in such a way as to convince me of what he has learned. He dealt with a matter that is elementary to us who are trying to get to the bottom of this very complex question. For an amateur he gave a fairly good description of what has been the evil with which we are contending, that is the mixing of grain. It is just the description I have heard Mr. Roderick Mackenzie give of that very evil so that on this head also he is in agreement with that gentleman. His peculiarity is that he has voted for an amendment which will allow this mixing to go on. The mixing is the evil we want to get rid of.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The mixing of itself is not the evil we want to get rid of, the evil we want to get rid of is that the grain buyer is getting the benefit of the mixing instead of the farmer.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). My hon. friend overlooks one half his case. Canadians have been proud of our grain product and we wanted to preserve that grain product according to its grade on the Liverpool market. If the mixing lowers the character of the grade it lowers the value of the grain at Liverpool and to that extent lowers the price which would be obtained by the farmers at Portage la Prairie as at other places. I contend that the mixing is the evil and that being the case the Grain Growers came here two sessions ago and said that the only way to cure that evil is by government ownership and operation of elevators.

We have now come to this situation that our friends opposite are doubtful about the establishment of government ownership and operation being the cure for this mixing; they tell us that the sample market will deal only with a very small part of the grain that is grown and exported. They will agree only to a sample market in conjunction with the carrying out of the promises which our friends opposite gave and the Grain Growers are looking to hon. gentlemen opposite as they have a right to look for the fulfilment of the promises by which they won the last election. I would be the last man to say that government ownership is an absolute panacea for all the evils the farmers suffer from, I was brought up in too individualistic a school for that. But the Grain Growers will be less interested in my opinion than in the vote of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question.

This buying on a sample market in the first part of the amendment cannot be objected to but where we are left in the dark is in the second part of the amendment. I do not see how we can possibly meet the views of the Grain Growers or deal with the admitted evil of mixing by embodying an amendment which allows the very mixing we have been trying to stop.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). The minister quotes the Saskatchewan Elevator Commission as authority for the proposed amendment. I have met within the last few days two members of that commission, Mr. Green and Mr. Langley, and if these gentlemen ever approved of the mixing of grain under present circumstances, they have since changed their minds, and are now strongly opposed thereto. I don't think they ever approved of allowing mixing under existing circumstances. If these gentlemen could see that we would be allowed to dispose of our grain on the American market, then possibly they would not consider the mixing of grain so great an evil, at least the sample market would be of much more use to us. I do not know that these gentlemen would be so strongly opposed to a sample market, even with mixing, provided that we had government ownership of all terminal elevators; without that they are as strongly opposed to it as they can be. Mr. Fream is of the same mind. There is no use casting slurs at these gentlemen. They are careful, conscientious men who have gone over this thing, and know more about it than most of us do. I have listened with attention to the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). I do not know how long he has been engaged in farming. I have been at it for over a quarter of a century, and I am beginning to doubt my knowledge of some of these things. My hon. friend, I fancy, thinks he knows all about this question. Perhaps after he has been dealing with wheat as long as I have he will find out that he does not know so much about it. We have a good deal to learn about it yet, even those of us who live in the west. I would ask the minister not to press this amendment.

Mr. NEELY. Will the minister tell the committee on whose recommendation, by whose advice, he has come to the conclusion that it is advisable to legalize the mixing of grain as he proposes to do by this amendment? The member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) tells us that many of the farmers in his constituency are in favour of a sample market. Are they in

favour of mixing as is proposed under this amendment? How many communications can the member for Portage la Prairie give us from farmers in his constituency to that effect? Did the Minister of Trade and Commerce get his advice from the farmers, from the men who came down here and discussed this legislation with him? I would like to know that. The member for Portage la Prairie tells us that it is in the interest of the farmers. Now the farmers should know something about what is in their interest, and will the minister say whether it is the farmers who advised him along this line? Did they suggest this legislation legalizing the mixing, the very thing they have complained of for years, the very thing that this legislation was originally intended to stop? If they did not advise him to do so, then at whose request is he doing it? I cannot forget that a few days ago the member for Rainy River (Mr. Carrick) made a very strong speech in favour of this very provision in the amendment. But what sort of a constituency does that hon. gentleman represent? It is not a constituency of farmers by any means.

The chief interests in his constituency are industrial interests, are terminal elevator men, mill-owners and proprietors, men interested in the buying and selling of grain. That hon. gentleman was strongly in favour of the enactment of just such legislation as the minister proposes by this amendment, and his whole argument, and the argument of the member for Portage la Prairie, are along the same line. The argument of the member for Rainy River was all to the effect that this would be in the interest of the grain producer and not of the men who operate the terminal elevators. Beautiful philanthropy! The hon. gentleman who represents the elevator interests and the milling interests in this House, those interests being the chief industrial concerns in his constituency, advocates this very thing, and his reason is that it is in the interest of the western grain producers. And the member for Portage la Prairie, who represents a rural and farming constituency, strange to say, can support that for the very same reason. It is a remarkable state of affairs. No doubt the minister is also legislating in the interest of the grain producers, because they are the men who handle the grain and who take their profit out of it. I say these gentlemen should have some knowledge and some information to show us why the minister is making this proposition, and why he proposes to change the whole current of legislation in this country by this simple looking amendment to clause 57. As I said, certain gentlemen representing the western grain producers were here, I believe, when this Bill was first brought into committee; they no doubt made certain representations to the minister. I took an opportunity to discuss this very question of the sample market with some of these gentlemen, Mr. Fream, Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Henders, and they said they did not want a sample market under present conditions.

Mr. STAPLES. Under what conditions would they accept it?

Mr. NEELY. Under government operation of terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. STAPLES. Suppose you got them?

Mr. NEELY. That is the point. We are legislating so as to legalize mixing, but we are not legislating for government ownership or operation. We are making it permissible for the government to do it, but that is all. We had the definite statement from the Minister that he would not lead the committee into any false conclusions by saying the government propose to go into this matter on a wholesale scale.

Mr. STAPLES. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of providing sufficient money to buy all the terminal elevators at Fort William?

Mr. NEELY. The question of government operation does not involve the question of buying.

Mr. STAPLES. Well leasing then?

Mr. NEELY. I do not know that leasing would be any particular cost at all because the elevators under their present operators are supposed to pay dividends.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Are you in favour of leasing then?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the government, but I am willing to say that if the government should stay by the present system, or if they propose, as they pledged themselves to do, to go into the business of operating the terminals, they ought to do it in a straight, upright manly way by taking over the whole proposition. They cannot show the farmers of the west what they can do by taking over one or two elevators for a season. That particular season the rest of the elevator operators may find it a very useful thing to be on their best behaviour in order to show that the government-operated elevator had not turned out any better results than they had. But, we have had the results of the operation of these terminals year after year. The government cannot carry on a successful experiment unless they take over all the terminals and the handling of the whole year's output. This is not the way by which they can demonstrate the success otherwise of government ownership as compared with private opera-

tion. But, that is not the question under discussion. I do not want to say that my hon. friend was asking me any question to divert my remarks from the line on which I had started out, but I do say again, Mr. Chairman, that it is a strange situation that presents itself. We have one hon. gentleman from Port Arthur and Rainy River telling us that he wants this kind of legislation because it is in the interests of the producer, although he represents an industrial constituency, and the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) telling us the same thing because he represents a rural constituency. The conditions might be worse than they are at the present time, but if the farmers of the west are not to be consulted with reference to this legislation, if their views and wishes are absolutely to be lost sight of, and if the present conditions of marketing the grain of the west are to be reversed in a way in which the western grain producer does not want them to be, I think it is only fair that the minister should give us the reasons why he desires to make this change, and at whose instigation the change is to be made.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay the passage of the Bill. I would like to dispose of this amendment to-night, in fact I would be glad if we could carry the Bill out of committee to-night, but it will not be possible to take the Bill out of committee to-night because section 123 stands for consideration, and while I would not suggest that possibly very much more could be said in regard to this amendment which is now before the committee, it will be admitted by everybody that it is the most important feature of the whole Bill as a matter of policy, and as a matter of legislation. The membership of the committee at the present time is very small, and I would suggest to the minister that it would not be creditable to pass such an important amendment in such a small committee, and that as the Bill is not going out of committee anyway, and must be considered at another time the amendment be allowed to stand until the consideration of the Bill at a future date.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want to press unduly for the passage of this amendment, or of the Bill, and I do not think that my hon. friends on the other side can say that I have been pressing unduly, but we do want to get the Bill through. I do not know, if we were to let it go until to-morrow, what could be said further than what has been said. The hon. gentlemen who are opposed to this certainly are the pick of their side, and they are the men who have grown up on grain. They come right out of the atmosphere, they have it in their boots, and in their hats, it is through them all the way. They are the competent ones, they are the ones who have stayed by this Bill manfully as we have been carrying on the discussion for the last fortnight, and I am sure that nothing can be said, but what has been said so eloquently, and so well by the members who have had their full say to-night. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), is not satisfied. I would invite my hon. friend to make himself over a little if it is not too late. What is the reason a man who is not a farmer cannot express his views and give his quota to legislation in the interest of farmers, and of the grain producers of the country? Is it absolutely impossible? The whole argument of my hon. friend was based upon a remarkable conjunction of feelings and of sentiment. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Carrick), was in favour of this very thing and he favoured it because it was beneficial to the producer of grain. Why, should the argument prejudice the case? Could not my hon. friend (Mr. Carrick), hold that sentiment, and advance it in this House, and be thoroughly honest in it? Does it depreciate his argument because it is not made by a man who raises grain? Surely that is not what my hon. friend (Mr. Neely), would say. But the strangeness of the thing went still further. There was a complete agreement between the argument of my hon. friend from Rainy River and the argument of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). They were on the same line. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie says that his farmers are in favour of it. He advocates it because it is in favour of the grain producer, not of the grain handler. Did my hon. friend mean to throw discredit on that argument because my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie was not a farmer? Here are two arguments, one from a gentleman who is a business man, who is not a farmer, and one from a lawyer who is not a farmer, but who represents a farming constituency. But the whole point of my hon. friend's argument. if he means to throw discredit on the thesis that was being advocated, because it was advocated by men who were not farmers, falls to the ground when he sees that the arguments, sentiments and reasons of these two gentlemen were exactly in accord with what I have read here to-night as the printed statements of the Grain Growers' Association's officers who are farmers. There is an argument that compels me, if I were not perfectly clear in my own mind before, to come to the conclusion that this plan must be right. These are the sentiments of the men who grow the grain in the west. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie from his acquaintance with and knowledge of the

farmers whom he represents is entitled to give the reason which he has given for supporting this proposal. He believes that it will be a benefit to the farmer.

The man of general business knowledge looks over the whole scene with just as good a business head as my hon. friend has, and he says he advocates it for the benefit of the farmer. There is a concurrence of testimony that must carry weight in this House. The hon. gentleman is anxious to know why I introduced the amendment, and what did it arise from. I will tell my hon. friend. I have given what study I could to it. I am a novice in the business but I have some power of reasoning and of getting a grasp of facts, and this proposal is here because after a thorough study I believe that the sample market is in the interest of the grain producer. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) admitted it himself to-night; he said: The farmer loses and is bound to lose under the grade system. So did the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) admit it.

Mr. OLIVER. Both myself and Mr. Chipman say you cannot create a sample market by statute.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I deny that Mr. Chipman's whole article and the conclusions from it are anything else but an argument in favour of a sample market. I have read it carefully and it seems to me that the whole description is sympathetic to a sample market. I believe that the main thing to keep our minds on is what is in the best interests of the producer of the grain. The exporter and the buyer will take care of himself. The eternal battle point between buyer and seller is where the farmer comes in and at the present time he comes in at a disadvantage. The sample market to my mind will give him the advantage he has heretofore been deprived of and that is sufficient reason for me to favour the passage of this amendment. I have a good deal of respect for theory. There are just as good men who can be found who out of a life-long experience in the grain business will stand up and say that as far as this whole matter is concerned the buyer on the European market buys by grade under our present system and his price is predicated upon that grade. He buys on grade and he fixes his price according to the grade and whatever is over the grade upon which he buys it, is so much advantage to him and so much taken from the farmer. It is the farmer who has been missing the fatness of the grade and it is the handler and the miller here and the miller in the old country who gets the advantage of the fatness of the grade. To hear some of my hon. friends opposite you would think there was a generic difference between the miller who bought for milling purposes in Ontario and the same miller who is the ultimate buyer in the English market.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Will the minister explain how you can sell on sample from here to Liverpool?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I believe that with the establishment of a sample market within five years you will find the biggest grain market in the world in the city of Winnipeg, and I believe when a sample market is established in Winnipeg the European buyer and the Ontario buyer will be there in person or by agents and will be buying by sample on that market. I believe that the possibilities of the market in Winnipeg are illimitable. You say that Minneapolis has the advantage in the sample market because Minneapolis has the advantage of the millers close by, but Winnipeg has the advantage of the millers on the sample market itself in the person of commission agents who will buy for them. You say that we are perpetuating mixing which we have been trying to minimize by previous legislation. Will my hon. friend talk with Mr. Mackenzie from whom he received that telegram and put to Mr. Mackenzie this question: do you believe in a sample market and Mr. MacKenzie will say: I do. Then ask him: Mr. Mackenzie, do you believe a sample market is possible without mixing, and he will say I do not. Then ask him are you in favour of a sample market now, Mr. Mackenzie, and Mr. Mackenzie will answer: I am, provided we have the proper mixing—no, I will not put it in that way: provided we have our mixing in the place where no other mixers will be allowed to meddle with us and provided we do it ourselves. That is what Mr. Henders will tell you, and that is what Mr. Fream will tell you. They are all in favour of a sample market and they will tell you that a sample market is impossible without mixing, but they do not trust their mixing to go on in the other fellow's shop; they want a government shop in which they can do their mixing in their own bin. We will give them a government shop in which they can do the mixing in their own bin. Before next season's grain is ready to be shipped there will be elevators placed under government operation where these gentlemen can have their bins and where they can do their mixing under conditions which they themselves declare will be honest conditions. In the face of this why is it that my hon. friend must seek for reasons for my bringing this proposal in? These are the reasons. I may be in error but my position is that if we have a sample market, then with the other conditions which

will go with it, we will be helping the farmer directly and we will be helping him greatly. You say that the grain out of these bins where grain has been mixed will be degraded on the European markets and so lower the price. Let me take two branches of that argument. Suppose it does slightly degrade, and suppose the English buyer there puts his price down a little the reflection of that fact on the farmer in the west will be something, but a sample market in Winnipeg where his grain is bought on sample will take away the spread that now exists and he will thus get two or three times on the balance of price.

I believe more. Here is the gentleman who inspects the grain out in bodily form. He inspects out the grain which comes from the farmer; on that inspection it is put into store on grade, and is inspected out by himself on grade. It comes out as he sees it. It comes out good and easily goes as No. 1. Another lot comes out. He says, I am afraid of that a little; it is very close down to No. 1, the very lowest point of No. 1; it is a little shaky; that will go down into No. 2; and so all through. He will not pass a grade to go to the old country market or to the ultimate buyer unless he knows that it is without suspicion of that grade. That is the system on which the grading has been done, and to-day I have talked to one of the best and oldest graders in this country, Mr. Horn, who tells me that the complete testimony from the English market is that the grades of Canadian grain have been remarkably even and satisfactory, and that therefore, there is scarcely any grievance or complaint on the other side. The man who grades out those grades, and sees that they are not skin grades, but are generous grades, is the very same man who will grade out the grain that is mixed in the bin for the sample market buyers, and will see that it goes out on exactly the same level as the others. Therefore, I do not look for that degradation of grades that is feared by some.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). If everything is so satisfactory, why pass an Act at all?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I pass the Act because I think it will be for the benefit of the men who ought to have the greatest benefit, that is, the farmers who produce the grain.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). They are getting it now, according to your own statement.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). They are not. It is the ultimate buyer and the handler who are getting all the fatness, and the farmer gets paid only for the very lowest grade, and even for a grade below what is the real grade. This dread would be to my mind diminished by the sample market, and the ultimate good resulting from it would be infinitely greater than any possible harm, if we admit a possible harm, from the degradation of the grades if that should take place.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. Has the minister anything to tell us in regard to the questions with regard to the Manitoba extensions which were on the order paper to-day in my name, and which were passed over?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). To-morrow I will move that the resolution be taken up on the next day. I do not think the Prime Minister will be with us to-morrow, but I will communicate with him at once and if possible will have those questions put down for to-morrow. I do not know anything about them myself.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a rumour in the Montreal papers that the Manitoba boundaries question will go over to the next session.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If I were my hon. friend I would not put my faith in rumours.

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

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If I can get that clause fixed up, I will try to get the Grain Bill out of the way, if possible. Then there will be one stage for the Manitoba Boundaries Bill, but that, I imagine, will not cause any discussion. The Tariff Bill will probably be taken up, and the Highways Bill, if the Minister of Railways is back, as I hope he will be, and after that we shall probably go into Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 27, 1912.

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

FIRST READING.

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

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT CUSTOMS OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Rt. hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolutions:—

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act and the Acts in amendment thereof, and to provide as follows:—

1. (As section 39, subsection 2), that a person who has served seven years as a chief clerk in the outside service of the Customs may be appointed to the rank of senior chief clerk, subject to such examination on the duties of office and other qualifications as is prescribed by the deputy head in a report to be concurred in by the head of the department. The salary of such senior chief clerk shall be from $2,200 to $2,800 per annum.

2. (As section 39, subsection 3), that a person who has served over three years as a clerk in the outside service of the Customs may be appointed to the rank of senior clerk, subject to such examination on the duties of office and other qualifications as is prescribed by the deputy head in a report to be concurred in by the head of the department. The salary of such senior clerk shall be from $1,200 to $1,600 per annum.

3. That the part of schedule 'B' of the Civil Service Act which relates to Customs be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

SCHEDULE 'B' CUSTOMS.

Higher Classes.				
Collectors, salary per annum	from	$ 300	to	$4,500
Chief inspector, salary per annum	"	3,200	"	4,000
Inspector of ports, salary per annum	"	2,000	"	3,000
Assistant inspectors, salary per annum	"	1,600	"	2,000
Chief clerks salary per annum	"	1,200	"	2,200
Senior chief clerks, salary per annum	"	2,200	"	2,800
Surveyors, salary per annum	"	1,200	"	2,800
Assistant surveyors (comprising tide surveyors, chief waiters and chief lockers), salary per annum	"	1,200	"	1,600
Technical Officers.				
Dominion Appraisers, salary per annum	from	$2,200	to	$2,600
Appraisers, salary per annum	"	1,200	"	2,200
Assistant appraisers, salary per annum	"	900	"	1,600
Gaugers, salary per annum	"	900	"	1,600
Other Classes.				
Senior clerks, salary per annum	from	$1,200	to	$1,600
Clerks and landing waiters, salary per annum	"	400	"	1,200
Examining officers (including preventive officers whose duties are not chiefly clerical, and lockers), salary per annum	"	100	"	1,000
Packers and messengers, salary per annum	"	400	"	800

He said: His Royal Highness the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, has been pleased to give his assent thereto.

FISHERY REGULATIONS.

Rt. hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) if the question at issue between Canada and the United States with reference to the Fishery regulations on the treaty shore under the award of the Hague Tribunal and the recommendations of that tribunal has been settled.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN. I scarcely know how far I should go in reply to the inquiry of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at the present time. Perhaps my right hon. friend will allow the question to stand and I shall reply to him to-morrow, and in the meantime I shall see my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I simply want to know if it has been settled; if not, I shall not press my question.

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island) moved the adjournment of the House in order to call the attention of the government and of the Minister of Railways to the inadequacy of the train service for the transportation of passengers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

He said: Mr. Speaker, for some years past it has been the practice of the Prince Edward Island railway to have a special train to meet the winter boats at Georgetown to take passengers who come by those boats from Pictou to Charlottetown without delay. This year that train has been taken off and the consequence is it is exceedingly inconvenient to the travelling public. There is only one train a day between Georgetown and Charlottetown and passengers wishing to go to the mainland from Charlottetown have to leave for Georgetown by the early afternoon train, remain there for a considerable portion of the afternoon and cross to Pictou the following morning. It takes about twenty hours to go from Charlottetown to Pictou, a distance of about ninety miles. Going the other way the conditions are still worse. The boat cannot possibly arrive at Georgetown until after the regular train leaves in the morning. She arrives at Georgetown about two hours after the train leaves and, there being no other train, passengers have to remain there until the following morning, twenty-two hours after they arrive, before they

can go to Charlottetown where business is generally done, or proceed by the regular train to their destination. In former years we had the privilege of a special train leaving Charlottetown in the evening about eight o'clock meeting the boat at Georgetown and passengers could go on board and proceed to Pictou the following morning. In the morning the train would take the passengers on the return trip on the arrival of the boat. The train would take the passengers to Charlottetown where they could do business and proceed by the regular train to their destination the same day. This train has been taken off I suppose by the Railway Board or perhaps by the management at Charlottetown for purposes of economy. I do not think there is any economy in it for this reason that under such conditions as I have pointed out, travel would practically cease. The railway management at Charlottetown will give a special train to Georgetown and return at any time for $40 and, therefore, I presume that $40 will pay the expense and leave something over, probably $30 would be the expense of a special train. As the fare between these two points would be about $1.25 or $1.50. I am sure I shall be well within the mark when I say that an extra fifteen or twenty people would travel by that road per day if that accommodation was given and that this would pay the whole cost of the special train. I am convinced that no money is saved by this policy. But for some reason or other the Railway Board appointed a few years ago seem to do strange things, they do not seem to take into consideration to any great extent the convenience of the public, but in order to save a dollar they give these peculiar orders or perhaps the management at Charlottetown is to blame. But there is more than that to it. When Prince Edward Island joined the confederation we came in under a bargain and that was that we were to have efficient and continuous steam communication for passengers the year round with the mainland.

I do not suppose that the present hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), is familiar with that. I do not know that the board of railway management are familiar with it, but they ought to be familiar with it, because it is important. In order that the present minister may have his attention called to it I shall read the clause in the agreement made at confederation which says that we are entitled to have a better train service than we are getting. Then, among other things, the Dominion government undertook this:

> Efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers, to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial railway and the railway system of the Dominion.

I am sure that no man will say that the service that I have pointed out is either efficient or continuous, for passengers landing at Georgetown have to remain at least 22 hours before being able to proceed to any other point on the island. I would ask that the Prime Minister or the Minister of Railways and Canals take this matter into consideration, and give an order by wire to the management at Moncton, and the management at Charlottetown to put a special train on at once such as we had in former years. This matter has been going on for six weeks. Possibly it has been brought to the attention of the minister because I see by letters and papers, some of which letters I have myself received, that the inconvenience is so pronounced that the people are very much put out by it, and I would ask the minister to send a telegram either to the management at Moncton or at Charlottetown instructing them to remove these grievances immediately. I would ask him also to see that these vexatious and cheese-paring regulations are not continued by the board in the future.

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals). As the hon. member from Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes), says, I am not familiar with the train service down there, but I will take it up with the board at once, and see what can be done. It is only one other evidence that the hon. gentleman and his party have not done their duty during the last fifteen years, because, if they had, they would have had a ferry in operation such as we are proceeding at once to construct, and which we hope to have in operation in a few months.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). I have the privilege of replying.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, go on.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). I am pointing out to this House and to the minister, that we have not as good a service as we had in former years under the late administration, and that we would be satisfied if we had such a service.

Mr. COCHRANE. If you had had a car-ferry you would have had a good service.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). I hope we will have a car-ferry

within the time that the minister has promised.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well then, be satisfied.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). If we have that, and if it removes all the difficulties, that we have laboured under for many years it will be a very good thing, but the fact that under this government, the privileges that we have had have been taken away from us is not the best proof.

Mr. COCHRANE. I said to the hon. gentleman that I would look into the matter at once.

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Yes, but somehow or other the service has been taken from us in the meantime. I am sure that I presented the case reasonably fairly to the minister and I do not hink that the minister should in his reply have made the statement that he was doing much better or intended to do a great deal better than the late government had done.

Motion (Mr. Hughes, Kings, Prince Edward Island) negatived.

NEWS SERVICE FOR MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

On orders of the day being called.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, I am told that a Marconi service has been established by the government in order to supply the news every week to the Magdalen Islanders. Would my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) inform me by whom that new service is provided and what is the nature of it? I see that the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) announced in the press the other day that the service had been established.

Mr. HAZEN. I will be delighted to look into the matter and get the information for my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) at the earliest possible date.

BOUNDARY WATERS TREATY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the House (Mr. Borden) if the papers connected with the negotiation of the boundary waters treaty have been laid on the table.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I am not aware that they have been laid on the table of the House. On a former occasion I mentioned to the hon. gentleman the reason. I am not aware that the matter has been arranged. It is necessary to obtain consent. However, I shall make inquiry about it and ask why there should have been such delay. I think the delay is greater than should be necessary.

DISMISSAL AND APPOINTMENT OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) to the fact that on January 24, 1912, an order of the House issued on my motion:

> For a return showing all the employees of the different departments at Ottawa, and also in the nine provinces and territories of Canada, and other places outside of Canada, in the inside and outside service, who have left their employment since the 1st October, 1911, up to the 10th January, 1912, inclusively, with their names, Christian names, age, nationality, employment and salaries respectively; the date of their appointment; the date of their leaving; their salaries at the time of their appointment and at leaving; the reasons of their leaving; and if replaced or not; the names, Christian name, age, nationality, employment and salary of those who have replaced them; and in the case of dismissals, a list of the persons who asked for their dismissals; in the case of those replacing them, a list of the persons who recommended their successors.

I want to draw the right hon. Prime Minister's attention to the fact that this return has not yet been brought down. It seems to me that it would be very easy to procure the list. The heads of the different departments have pay lists.

Mr. BUREAU. Too long.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). I do not think it is too long. I would like to have the answer of the Prime Minister as to that.

Mr. BORDEN. I shall direct that attention be given to the motion, which, as far as I can gather its terms, seems to be pretty comprehensive.

MANITOBA BOUNDARY EXTENSION.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to renew the inquiry I made yesterday as to the answer to a question relating to the resolution in regard to the boundaries of Manitoba. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) said yesterday that he would draw the attention of his colleagues to it and have the information produced as soon as posible.

Mr. BORDEN. I am afraid I did not have my attention directed to it. However, I am supposed to move the resolution as soon as the government orders are called and possibly I may be able then to give my hon. friend the information desired.

Mr. OLIVER. The notice appeared in the Votes and Proceedings on Friday last and it is rather important that the answer should be in such shape as to enable the basing of an argument upon it before the resolution is moved.

PAYMENT OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) if the amounts due the census enumerators have yet been paid. The Minister of Agriculture smiles—let me say to him that to hundreds of people all over Canada the matter is quite serious. Only to-day I had a letter from a settler in the province of Saskatchewan who tells me that he has as yet been unable to market his grain and he is in a position almost of poverty and yet there is quite an amount due him by the Department of Agriculture. I have letters also from quite a number of others. I do hope that the matter has been settled, or that it will be in the course of a few days. What is the position now?

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture). I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) that this matter is being expedited as fast as possible by the officers of the department. I am unaware that hundreds are unpaid, but I do know they are being paid as fast as it possibly can be done, and my impression is that there are not a great many left to be settled with at present. Those who are not paid, will be paid as fast as we can do it, probably within a week or two.

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA—EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

Resolved, that it is expedient, (a) to extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba northward to the sixtieth parallel of latitude and northeastward to the shores of Hudson bay, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the legislative assembly of Manitoba and by parliament;

(b) to authorize the Governor in Council, inasmuch as the province was not in debt at the time of its establishment, to pay to the said province an annual sum of $381,584.19, being the equivalent of interest at five per cent on $7,631,683.85, the difference between a principal sum of $8,107,500 and $475,816.15 heretofore advanced by the government to the province for provincial purposes; such annual sum to be paid as and from the first day of July, 1908, but subject, however, as to payments due upon the coming into force of any Act founded upon these resolutions, to the deduction of certain sums received by the said province by way of interest on capital allowance in lieu of debt;

(c) to authorize the Governor in Council to pay to the said province, in lieu of ownership of public lands, an annual sum based upon the population of the said province as ascertained by each quinquennial census thereof, such annual sum to commence with $562,500 (less certain deductions in respect of what are known as swamp lands and university lands) and not to exceed the annual sum of $1,125,000 (less equivalent deductions); the same to be paid as from the first day of July, 1908, but subject, however, as to payments due at the time of the passing of any Act founded upon these resolutions, to a deduction of the aggregate of certain sums received by the province on and after July 1, 1908, on account of indemnity in lieu of public lands;

(d) to authorize the Governor in Council to pay the said province one-half on July 1, 1912, and one-half on July 1, 1913, the sum of $201,723.57 towards the construction of public buildings.—Mr. Borden.

Mr. BORDEN. It will be remembered that on the 13th day of July, 1908, the right hon. the then Prime Minister moved certain resolutions in this House with regard to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec. The resolution so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned, was in the following words:—

Whereas, petitions have been presented to the government and to this House from the legislative assembly of Manitoba, praying for an extension of the boundaries of the said province northward and eastward, and for an additional subsidy to the said province in lieu of the ownership of public lands in the territory to be so added.

Be it resolved.

That it is expedient that the prayer of the said petition should be acceded to, and that upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislative assembly and by parliament the boundaries of Manitoba be extended as follows:

The Northern boundary to be the sixtieth parallel of latitude; the western boundary to be the present eastern boundary line of the province of Saskatchewan to the said sixtieth parallel, the eastern boundary to be the present eastern boundary as far north as the northeast corner of the province, thence on a straight line to the most eastern point of Island lake and thence on a straight line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longitude intersects the Shore Line of Hudson bay.

And, be it further resolved:

That whereas, notwithstanding the extension of territory above described, the ungranted lands of the Crown in the territory so to be added to the said province will still continue to be administered by the government of Canada, for the purposes of the Dominion; and the said province will not have the public land as a source of revenue.

It is just and equitable to recognize the increased cost of civil government which such extension of territory will occasion to the province, and in view of the premises, to make to the said province an increased allowance by money payment, the amount of which should be the subject of negotiation between the government of Canada and the government of Manitoba.

For some time afterwards, the question of the financial terms was the subject of negotiations between the government of Canada on the one hand, and the government of the province of Manitoba on the other, but without any definite result. So, the matter stood when the present admin-

istration took office on the 10th of October last. Shortly after we had taken office, the Prime Minister of Manitoba and one of his colleagues, visited Ottawa, and after some negotiations a basis of arrangement was arrived at, which is set forth in a letter which I wrote to the Hon. R. P. Roblin, Premier of Manitoba, on the 20th day of November last. The letter is in these words:—

Ottawa Ont., November 20, 1911.

Dear Mr. Roblin,—Referring to our interview, I beg to say that the conclusions arrived at are as follows:

The extension of the boundaries of Manitoba has been under consideration at those interviews and a basis of settlement has been reached respecting the financial terms which hitherto have been in dispute.

The basis adopts the principle of equality of terms as between Manitoba and the other prairie provinces. The application of this principle to the details remains to be worked out.

I may add that we shall introduce the necessary legislation at this session.

Believe me,

Yours faithfully,

R. L. BORDEN.

Hon, R. P. Roblin,
Premier of Manitoba,
Ottawa, Ont.

This principle has been worked out with results which are briefly set forth in the resolution which is now submitted to the committee. Perhaps it would be advisable to place these results before the committee a little more in detail, and I shall begin by stating the amount of subsidy to which Manitoba, apart from this resolution, would be entitled for the year beginning July 1, 1911.

The following statement shows the amount of subsidies to which Manitoba is entitled for the year beginning July 1, 1911:

Allowance for government and local purposes, B.N.A. Act, 1907, sec. 1 (1) (a)	$190,000 00
Eighty cents per head per annum on 455,614 population, as ascertained by the census of June, 1911	364,491 20
Indemnity for want of public lands (cap. 50, Acts of 1885)	100,000 00
Interest at 5 per cent on capital allowance in lieu of debt (various statutes)	178,947 66
Total	$833,438 26

The following statement shows the approximate amount of subsidy Manitoba will receive under the resolution now under the consideration of the committee for the year beginning July 1, 1912:

Allowance for government and local purposes, B.N.A. Act, 1907, sec. 1 (1) (a)		$190,000 00
Eighty cents per head on 455,614 population, as per census of June, 1911, B.N.A. Act, 1907, sec. (1) (b)		364,491 20
Indemnity for want of public lands	$562,500 00	
Swamp lands deduction, about	$134,230 00	
University lands deduction	15,000 00	
	149,230 00	
		413,270 00
Interest at 5 per cent on $8,107,500	$405,375 00	
Less interest at 5 per cent on $475,816.15	23,780 81	
		381,584 19
Total		$1,349,345 39

This might be compared with the amount of the subsidies which the two neighbouring provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan will receive during the year beginning July 1, 1912, under the statutes which were passed by this parliament in 1905, creating a portion of the Northwest Territories into those two provinces. The following shows the amount of subsidies that the province of Alberta will receive for the year beginning July 1, 1912:

Allowance for government and local purposes, B.N.A. Act, 1907, sec. 1 (1) (a)	$180,000 00
Eighty cents a head on 374,663 population, as per census of June, 1911, B.N.A. Act, 1907, sec. 1 (1) (b)	299,730 40
Allowance in lieu of debt, 5 per cent on $8,107,500 (chap. 3, sec. 19, Acts of 1905)	405,375 00
Allowance in lieu of public lands cap. 3, sec. 20, Acts of 1905)	375,000 00
Total	$1,260,105 40

The following shows the amount of subsidies that the province of Saskatchewan will receive for the year beginning July 1, 1912:

Allowance for government and local purposes, B.N.A. Act, 1907, sec. 1 (1) (a)	$190,000 00
Eighty cents a head on 492,432 population, as per census of June, 1911, B.N.A. Act, 1907, sec. 1 (1) (b)	393,945 60
Allowance in lieu of debt, 5 per cent on $8,107,500 (cap. 42, sec. 19, Acts of 1905)	405,375 00
Allowance in lieu of public lands (cap. 42, sec. 20, Acts of 1905)	562,500 00
Total	$1,551,820 60

The resolution embraces some other considerations to which it will be desirable to call attention. As far as some of these allowances are concerned, it is proposed that they shall date from the 1st day of July, 1908, and, therefore, as to these there will be arrearages. The province of Manitoba took the ground that the

extension of its territory should have taken place at the same time that the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were constituted, and that it should have received from the federal treasury the same consideration which was at that time extended to the two new provinces then created. This contention was pressed with a great deal of earnestness and persistence. We found ourselves unable to assent to it; but, inasmuch as this parliament did on the 13th day of July, 1908, by the resolution which I have already quoted, determine that the boundaries of the province of Manitoba should be extended in accordance with the terms set forth in that resolution, it seemed to us a fair proposal that the treatment now proposed for the province of Manitoba should begin as and from the 1st day of July, 1908, and with a good deal of reluctance, the province has eventually come to the conclusion to accept those terms. It will be desirable, therefore, to submit to the committee a statement of what those arrearages will amount to.

I have an approximate statement of them here. It will be necessary probably to work them out more definitely and more fully, but in the meantime the committee is entitled to such information in regard to this matter as is in the possession of the government at the present time. The following is a statement showing approximately what arrearages will be paid to Manitoba, should the proposed Bill become law forthwith:

(a) Annual allowance in lieu of debt under Bill..		$381,584 19
Annual allowance already received..		178,947 06
Arrearage each year..		202,637 13
Arrearages for four years, July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1912.. ..		810,648 52
(b) Annual allowance in lieu of lands under Bill..		562,500 00
Swamp lands deduction, average say..	$105,500	
University lands deduction..	15.000	
Already received..	100,000	
		220,500 00

Deducting that sum of $220,500 from the proposed annual allowance in lieu of lands under this resolution, namely, $562,500, the difference is found to be $342,000. The estimated arrearage each year will, therefore, be $342,000, or for four years the sum of $1,368,000. Adding that to the sum of $810,648.52, above mentioned, we have the estimated total arrearages of $2,178,648.52.

Then it is desirable that the committee should have before it such information as is in our possession respecting swamp lands. Members of the House are aware that under a statute passed some years ago there was conveyed to the province of Manitoba a very considerable area of lands known as swamp lands. I believe that the total acreage up to the end of 1909 so conveyed was approximately 2,009,368 acres. The way in which that works out, according to the information at present in our possession, would be somewhat in this wise:

	Acres.
Swamp lands conveyed to Manitoba up to the end of 1909, approximately..	2,009,368
Sold by the province as per statement furnished by the province. January, 1912..	838,484·16
Balance to be reconveyed to the Dominion under Bill..	1,170,883·84
Estimate of swamp lands in the existing province of Manitoba still available—	
(a) Balance as above..	1,170,883·84
(b) Classed as swamp lands by Dominion government but not transferred..	431,948
(c) Estimated acreage of swamp in surveyed part of the province, exclusive of (b).. ..	1,760,000
(d) Estimate of swamp lands in unsurveyed part of the province..	4,870.000
Total estimated swamp lands..	8,232,831·84

Then I have a note which reads as follows:

The specifications (b), (c) and (d) were made by the late R. E. Young, chief geographer and superintendent of railway lands, in February, 1911. With reference to item (d) Mr. Young said:—The unsurveyed area in the province is estimated at 12,900,000 acres. This is largely unexplored. It is thought thirty per cent (4,870,000 acres) may be swamp. This land will be of considerably less value than the swamp lands already referred to.

It does not occur to me at the present moment that there is any further information which I could profitably give to the committee at this stage, but I should be very glad to give any further information in my possession to any hon. gentleman desirous of having it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Chairman: Whatever there may be in this resolution of a controversial nature, I do not, for my part, intend to advert to upon the present occasion. I think the time of the committee will be better employed in endeavouring to get information, which has been partly presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) in order that we may appreciate the reasons of the policy which has been adopted by the government with respect to this matter, and the basis of the financial terms which they have given to the province. The resolution in that respect is simply meagre, and I am sure

there is further information which could be got, by inquiring for it. I have to observe first of all, that in regard to the territory added to Manitoba the resolution as introduced by the Prime Minister will have to be amended by him, so as to conform to what I understand is now the settled policy of the government, with regard to those boundaries. My hon. friend has based his resolution in that regard, upon the resolution which was adopted by this House in the month of July, 1908, in which the boundaries intended to be assigned to Manitoba were thus defined:—

The northern boundary to be the sixtieth parallel of latitude; the western boundary to be the present eastern boundary line of the province of Saskatchewan to the said sixtieth parallel; the eastern boundary to be the present eastern boundary as far north as the northeast corner of the province, thence on a straight line to the most eastern point of Island lake and thence on a straight line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longitude intersects the shore line of Hudson bay.

The resolutions now proposed, although based upon that of 1908, do not seek to define the boundaries intended to be conveyed to Manitoba. My hon. friend in his resolution simply says:—

Resolved, that it is expedient, (a) to extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba northward to the sixtieth parallel of latitude and northeastward to the shores of Hudson bay, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the legislative assembly of Manitoba and by parliament.

There never has been any difficulty at all on this question of boundary between Manitoba and the Dominion government, in so far as the western boundary is concerned, because though the province of Saskatchewan made application to have its boundary extended eastward to the shores of Hudson bay, north of the territory which now constitutes the province of Manitoba, the Dominion government of that day could not see the propriety or the justice of this wish on the part of Saskatchewan, but thought, on the contrary, that territory geographically belonged to Manitoba, and ought to be given to her. There never was any difficulty either as to the northern boundary of the province, it was always understood that it should be the 60th parallel of latitude. The difficulty arose with regard to the eastern boundary. and that difficulty was that the province of Ontario made a large claim to have its territory extended north of what is now the present boundary of Manitoba—in fact at the conference which took place between the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario, in 1906 the government of Ontario asked to have its boundaries extended up to the Churchill river.

On the other hand, the House remembers that the province of Manitoba asked to have its boundaries extended eastward over the territory which was claimed by the province of Ontario, north of the Albany river up to about the longitude of Fort William. The government of that day could not see its way clear to grant either the prayer of the province of Manitoba or the prayer of the province of Ontario in its entirety, but thought that justice would be done both if the boundary between the provinces were made as described here, that is to say an extension of the present boundary of Manitoba from the northeast corner of that province by Island lake to about the 89th degree of west longitude. I am aware that the province of Manitoba at first demurred strongly to accepting the boundary which we had assigned to them. Several conferences were held between the government of the Dominion and Manitoba. I had the pleasure on more than one occasion of having conference with my hon. friend the present Minister of Interior (Mr. Rogers) when he was a member of the government of Manitoba, not only as stated by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), as to the financial terms, but also as to the actual location of the boundary. And I may say that it was only last winter, after the conference we had between the Dominion government and the provincial government, that the boundary which we had offered the province of Manitoba was accepted. The record of that conference is before the House. In the memorial which was sent to my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) after he had accepted office, and which also he has laid before the House, the government of Manitoba officially and formally accepted the boundary which had been offered. It is also of record—or, if not of record, it is of public knowledge—that the government of Ontario was not satisfied with that boundary and pressed to have its claims accepted, that is to have its boundary extended northward to the Churchill river, as it had claimed originally. I assume that, as the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has brought in the resolution in its present form, 'extending the boundaries of Manitoba north-eastward to the shores of Hudson bay' without stating precisely the point at which the boundary is to touch the bay, the government have not yet decided whether they should or should not accept the pretensions set forth by the province of Ontario.

Mr. BORDEN. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is mistaken in that regard. The boundaries are the same as those defined in the resolution of 1908, except that they have been set forth in more explicit terms by the Dominion geographer. This more definite and explicit des-

cription was placed in the hands of the proper officer of this House to prepare such resolution as might be necessary, and he has prepared the resolution in the way in which it is set forth, and which seems to be all that is necessary, inasmuch as the lands are not being handed over as they are being handed over to Ontario and Quebec.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Whatever may have been the cause which inspired the present resolution, as to the effect of it I am obliged to differ with my right hon. friend. If the resolution were to be adopted as it is, 'to extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba northward to the 60th parallel of latitude and eastward to the shores of Hudson bay,' there would be no actual definition of the boundary. I presumed, in the innocence of my heart, that it was because the boundary had not been decided. For it is reported that Sir James Whitney said no later than last week that he expected that Ontario would have a harbour on Hudson bay. Therefore, I assumed, that the question had not been settled. But, if there is any doubt on this point, a new resolution has been given notice of by my right hon. friend in which it is stated that the eastern boundary of Manitoba shall be that set forth in the resolution of 1908, the production of a line from the north eastern corner of Manitoba to Highland lake and from that to the 89th degree of latitude. I apprehend that the matter has been settled finally and that the province of Ontario has agreed to have its boundary such as was set down in that resolution of 1908, that is to say it will have no harbour at Churchill or Nelson, but is to go no farther northward on the shores of Hudson bay than the 89th degree of latitude. But I persist in saying that if the resolution were to remain as we now have it under consideration, and the Bill were to be put in this form, it would be impossible to say where the boundary of Manitoba was. My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will not pretend seriously that there is any definition of a boundary in the resolution we now have before us. I presume that if he is to introduce legislation that will be effective he must amend his resolution and state that the boundary of the province of Ontario is to be the 89th degree of latitude. If it is the intention of my right hon. friend in this way to settle the boundary of Ontario, it would be preferable to make the matter perfectly clear.

Mr BORDEN. I have no objection to that. But, perhaps the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not understand me. For what reason is a resolution necessary at all? The proposed Bill will not alienate any part of the public domain of the Dominion, and in that way it will not constitute a charge upon the treasury. It would not occur to me—with all deference to the right hon. gentleman—that any resolution was necessary so far as the question of boundaries is concerned. The resolution is necessary so far as the increased subsidies are concerned, these being a charge upon the public treasury. If my right hon. friend who has had great experience, thinks it would be better to state the boundaries in the resolution exactly as they are to be defined in the Bill, I should have no objection. But it occurred in the way I have stated. The specific boundary, more definite and more specific than as expressed in the resolution of 1908 but covering exactly the same territory, was placed in the hands of the officer of the House for the purpose of preparing the proper resolution. He has framed it in the way in which it appears before us. But, as I say, if an hon. gentleman of the experience of my right hon. friend thinks it would be better to express it more fully, I have no objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it ought to be expressed. But, even from the point of view of my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden), I think it essential because the money terms to be granted to the province must depend largely upon what territory is given to the province.

My hon. friend has copied the resolution adopted in 1905, with regard to Saskatchewan. Under the resolutions now before us; the territory of Manitoba will be about the same as the territory of each of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and, therefore, I do not see how it is possible to offer to the province of Manitoba any compensation in lieu of the lands which are to be retained by the Dominion unless we know exactly the area of the province, and you cannot know what is to be the area of the province unless the boundaries are settled. That is an additional reason why the boundaries ought to be settled here and now. I am glad that my hon. friend agreed to the suggestion I made which, if there was any doubt, will remove that doubt. So it is settled that the boundaries of the province of Manitoba are to be the boundaries which we offered in 1908.

I said to-day that I did not want to enter into any matter of controversy on the present occasion, I am seeking for information, but I would observe to my right hon. friend that there is no justification that I can see why these four years' arrears set forth in the resolution should be given to the province of Manitoba. What reason can there be? The province of Manitoba has contended that its boundaries should have been extended at the time that the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan

were created. I cannot see that there is any connection between the two ideas. If Manitoba were entitled to an increase of its territory—and for my part I have always been of this opinion—this question had no relevancy whatever to the creation of the new provinces. Everybody knows that in 1908, when we created the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the province of Manitoba made a strong effort to have its boundaries extended. But parliament has not forgotten that the reason we did not extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba at that time was that we thought it would not be advisable to extend those boundaries unless the two neighbouring provinces of Ontario and Saskatchewan had an opportunity of presenting their claims to us. It was well known to us that the province of Manitoba was making a claim for the extension of its boundaries eastward, and it seemed to us that, although we had not then received any request for the extension of the boundaries of Ontario, it would not be in the public interest, and we would be inviting trouble if we were to attempt to settle the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, where they come in contact with the boundaries of Ontario, unless we had also the opinion of the province of Ontario.

Therefore, we held a conference in 1906, with the three provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario. I stated a moment ago that the government of the province of Saskatchewan, asked to have its boundary extended eastward along the present northern boundary of Manitoba to the shore of the Hudson's bay. I must say that after having heard what the province of Saskatchewan had to say upon this point I could not see my way to recommend this to my colleagues or to parliament. It seemed to me that that territory belonged to Manitoba and should be given to Manitoba. When it came to the discussion of the eastern boundaries of Manitoba where they touched Ontario we found, as I said, quite a cleavage of opinion between the two provinces, and neither would give way. Ontario insisted on having its territory extended westward as far as the Churchill river, and Manitoba claimed an extension eastward to Fort William. We could not see the propriety of these respective pretentions of either province, and we struck what I then thought was a legitimate boundary of the two provinces, and I am very happy to see that it has been at last accepted.

The province of Manitoba has sought to have these terms date back to the year 1905. This pretension of the province of Manitoba has not been accepted by the government. My hon. friend tells us that after a conference they have determined to extend the terms back to the time that we made this offer, in July, 1908, and no further back. What reason can there be why Manitoba should be given any terms dating back to 1st July, 1908? The reason which is given us is that at that time the province of Manitoba was offered these boundaries. There was a controversy between the late government and the government of Manitoba as to the financial terms which would be extended to Manitoba as a consequence of the extension of its boundaries. If that had been the only controversy between us and the government of Manitoba, the government of Manitoba might perhaps say: We were ready to accept those boundaries in 1908, and if we did not accept them it was because the financial terms which we asked were not granted, and if those financial terms for which we then made a claim and which have now been granted, had been granted then, we would have had those financial terms since the 1st of July, 1908. If the government of Manitoba were in a position to make that statement there might be some basis for giving the province those terms as from the 1st of July, 1908, but I have to call the attention of the House to this fact, that the boundaries which we offered to Manitoba in 1908 were not accepted by Manitoba in 1908, or in 1909, or in 1910, or until about the month of March, 1911, and then were not officially recorded until the month of October, 1911. Under such circumstances I fail to see upon what basis it can be claimed that the trems which are now extended to Manitoba should date back not from the time the statute is passed, but to July, 1908. For my part I repeat that this seems to be a claim for which there is not a shadow of foundation. But I shall not press the point to-day, I said I would not enter into any controversial matter, but would put forth my objection as I conceived it to be, and as I think it must impress the mind of any one who thinks that Manitoba ought to be treated fairly, even generously, but at least reasonably.

I have nothing more to say except that I shall ask the Finance Minister to give us the reasons why he has agreed to these terms which are proposed in these resolutions. These terms were pressed upon us more than once by the government of the province of Manitoba. We have always treated any new province coming into confederation on the terms which are given in the Confederation Act, that is to say that the province must be given a portion of the revenue of the Dominion to carry on its affairs.

This was done by the Act of Confederation of 1867, the terms of which were revised in 1907 and put upon a new basis.

It seems to be reasonable that if a new territory is to be added to Manitoba where they will have to carry on the civil government, they should be given a reasonable allowance to meet the increased expenditure which this increase of territory will entail upon them. That, I say, seems to be reasonable. But, what is proposed to-day is not to give to Manitoba a sum of money to carry on the civil government in the new territory which is to be allotted to the province, but the whole financial terms which are now granted to Manitoba are to be revised and Manitoba is to be given compensation in money above anything that it is receiving at the present time. That is my first objection. My second objection is that Manitoba is given a sum of money in compensation for land not only within the extent of the territory which is to be added to its present domain, but over the whole of the province. In other words, Manitoba, which has been for forty years in Confederation, is to be treated exactly as if it were a new province entering to-day the family of provinces. It has been for forty years a member of confederation; it has received the same terms as those which have been given to the other provinces. It has been given special terms from time to time on account of it being a new province and being therefore entitled to special treatment, but to-day it comes in and is treated exactly as if it had been the same as the territory which we are adding to the province. I do not think there is any justification for that. But that point I shall not press any more to-day. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) what reason there can be for the proposal as contained in clause (b) of the resolution:

(b) to authorize the Governor in Council, inasmuch as the province was not in debt at the time of its establishment, to pay to the said province an annual sum of $381,584.19, being the equivalent of interest at five per cent, on $7,631,683.85, the difference between a principle sum of $8,107,500 and $475,816.15 heretofore advanced by the government to the province for provincial purposes; such annual sum to be paid as and from the first day of July, 1908, but subject, however, as to payments due upon the coming into force of any Act founded upon these resolutions, to the deduction of certain sums received by the said province by way of interest on capital allowance in lieu of debt;

To find the origin of this disposition we have to go back to the Act of Confederation itself. When the four provinces formed the confederation each had a debt. Old Canada, afterwards Ontario and Quebec, had a debt of $67,000,000, New Brunswick, $7,000,000 and Nova Scotia about $8,000,000; $62,000,000 of the debt of Canada $8,000,000 of the debt of Nova Scotia and $7,000,000 of the debt of New Brunswick were assumed by the new Dominion. Compensation was made because the debt of one province exceeds the ratio per head of that of other provinces and since then whenever we have brought a new province into the Dominion we have always given it an allowance calculated on this amount of the debt of the province entering into the confederation, the sum being $32 per head of the population. That is what was done with Manitoba. By the last Act upon this point, the Act of 1885, Manitoba was given an allowance for debt calculated upon its population at the time. What reason can be urged why, when Manitoba has been in confederation for forty years, these terms should be departed from and it should be given the same treatment as was given to Alberta and Saskatchewan? I have only to answer my hon. friend saying that Alberta was given an allowance for debt because it had no debt at the time, the same as the other provinces of $32 per head upon a population numbering 250,000. My hon. friend has departed from these terms and he has applied others to the case of Manitoba. Upon reviewing the whole situation I cannot see that there is any basis for that departure. But, he has a right to his opinion and I would be glad to hear what he has to say upon this point.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the Bill which will be founded upon these resolutions is to establish equality between the province of Manitoba and the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan; in other words to do simple, plain every-day justice to the province of Manitoba, which, I am sorry to say, was withheld from that great province by my right hon. friend when he was Prime Minister of this country. I am sorry to say that the statesman in my right hon. friend is being lost in the lawyer. What he has said is substantially correct with regard to the principle upon which the allowances were made in lieu of debt, but the situation in regard to the provinces forming the confederation to-day cannot be described as otherwise than anomalous in regard to the amounts which have been given them from time to time. I do not believe it possible to say that the allowances which are now made to the several provinces in lieu of debt are on any logical basis. From time to time changes have been made and if my right hon. friend will bear in mind that what we desire to do in the case of the Bill which will be founded upon these resolutions is to put Manitoba upon a precise equality with Saskatchewan and Alberta he will have no difficulty whatever in understanding the terms of this resolution. Take the

statements submitted to the House by my right hon. friend. The position with regard to the subsidies to-day is that the amount of subsidy to which Manitoba is now entitled for the year beginning July 1, 1911, is $833,438. The approximate amount of subsidy which Manitoba will receive under the proposed Act now under consideration for the year beginning July 1, 1912, will be $1,349,345.39. Under the proposed Act Manitoba will receive an additional amount of subsidy of about $516,000. Let us consider these figures. The allowance for government and local purposes to which Manitoba is now entitled $190,000, will remain precisely the same under the new Act. Manitoba's position in regard to that is precisely the same as the position of the other provinces. By the British North America Act, 1907, it is provided:

> That the following grants shall be made yearly by Canada to every province which, at the commencement of this Act, is a province of the Dominion, for its local purposes and the support of its government and legislature.

And then, a fixed grant is given, according to population. The grant that Manitoba is entitled to under the provisions of that Act, subsection 1 (a) is $190,000; the province of Alberta is receiving under that same section, and will receive, $180,000; and the province of Saskatchewan $190,000. Therefore, so far as these three items are concerned, Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta are in precisely the same position, under the Britith North America Act of 1907, which applies to the several provinces.

Take the next item, eighty cents per head per annum on 455,614 population as ascertained by the census, June, 1911, $364,491.20. That is precisely the same amount as Manitoba will receive under the new Bill, and that compares with $299,730 that Alberta will receive, and $393,945.60 that Saskatchewan will receive. In other words, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta take only what they derive under the British North America Act of 1907, as to these two items which I have mentioned. In connection with the item to which my hon. friend has directed my attention most particularly—under the resolutions, Manitoba will receive an indemnity for want of public lands,—because Manitoba has no lands, as the House knows, as Ontario had, and as the eastern provinces of the Confederation had. The indemnity for want of public lands, fixed under the Act and subject to increase is $262,500. If Manitoba had received no swamp lands and no university lands, Manitoba would receive under the terms of the Act, $252,500. But Manitoba received about two million acres of swamp lands, of which some 838,000 acres—speaking from memory— have been sold. The position is that Manitoba has sold 838,000 acres of land, received the money, or will receive the money, if the sales have been made on the installment plan, and has a balance of some twelve hundred thousand acres of swamp lands still vested in her. It would not be fair to give Manitoba the full $562,000, and the result is, that there must be a deduction, representing five per cent. interest upon the selling price of the swamp lands, which Manitoba has already sold. The estimate of that is about $134,230, and I may say that the Bill will make provision for a careful audit of the accounts of Manitoba in that respect, in order that the proper amount may be accurately ascertained. The deductions which would take place from the selling price of the swamp lands are these: certain amounts were charged by the Dominion to the province, in connection with the expense of surveys, and Manitoba should also be made an allowance for the expense connected with the sale of these lands. Those amounts will be deducted and as nearly as we can ascertain. Taking the figures of Manitoba, the amount which would be deducted on the basis of five per cent which is the basis as between the provinces and the Dominion, is about $134,230.

Then, in the year 1885, under chapter 50 of the Dominion Statutes of that year, in the settlement with Manitoba as of that date, 150,000 acres of land were given by the Dominion to the University of Manitoba. The lands, as of that date, were placed on the basis of two dollars per acre making $300,000, and five per cent upon that equals $15,000. Add $15,000 to the amount of $134,230, which I have mentioned before, and you have a total of $149,230, which must be deducted from the total amount of $562,500, stated to be indemnity for want of public lands, leaving the balance $413,270, which Manitoba would be entitled to receive under that heading.

That is putting Manitoba precisely on the same basis as Saskatchewan and Alberta, but making the necessary deductions Manitoba will receive less by reason of having obtained the moneys representing the selling price of these swamp lands.

I come to the next item, viz., the allowance in lieu of debt. The province of Saskatchewan gets an allowance in lieu of debt, five per cent on $8,107,500—that is under the Autonomy Act of 1905, chapter 42, section 19—and Alberta is put on precisely the same basis getting also an allowance in lieu of debt, five per cent on $8,107,500, or $405,375 for each province. Now, the position, so far as Manitoba is concerned, is one of perfect equality. Manitoba is given 5 per cent allowance on the same sum of $8,107,500 or $405,375, precisely the same amount as is given to the prov-

ince of Alberta and the province of Saskatchewan, but less interest at five per cent upon $475,816.15. Now, what is that $475,816.15. Let me explain: some of the provinces have borrowed from the Dominion certain amounts, and have to that extent diminished their capital allowance upon which they have received the five per cent in lieu of debt. The province of Manitoba has diminished her capital sum on which she has been receiving interest in lieu of debt, to the amount of $475,816.15, and taking five per cent interest upon that we have the sum of $23,780.81, and subtracting that from the sum of $405,375——

Mr. MACDONALD. What has been the total debt allowance to Manitoba, previous to this proposition, say on March 31, last?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). $178,947. At five per cent on capital allowance in lieu of debt, Manitoba is now receiving $178,000 and if you multiply that by twenty you will get the total of about $3,570,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. I thought my hon. friend would have the figures at hand. Can he tell me whether or not Manitoba has withdrawn on her credit at Ottawa?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That is precisely what I am dealing with.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend know what the total debt of Manitoba is?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I do not know offhand.

Mr. MACDONALD. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, in discussing the subsidy resolution of 1907, laid it down that it was absolutely essential in considering this question that the fact should be ascertained as to the total debt of the province. I thought my hon. friend would know what that is.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I do not think it is essential myself, but it can be easily found out.

Mr. MACDONALD. The Minister of Trade and Commerce thought it was essential three years ago.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). That may be, but I cannot undertake to get figures for hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with everything my colleagues may think. However, the interest at five per cent on this sum of $475,000 is $23,781.81, and the result is that Manitoba receives in lieu of debt the sum of $381,584.19.

These figures show that we are placing the province of Manitoba upon a precise equality with the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and that is what we are trying to do. We are trying to do simple, plain justice to Manitoba—to put it in the position in which it should have been put in the year 1905, when the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were constituted. Manitoba contends that these increased subsidies should date back to that year, and there is very much to be said in favour of that contention; but, as the resolution of this House, concurred in I think unanimously, was passed on July 13, 1908, Manitoba with some reluctance has consented to accept the increased subsidies from July 1, 1908. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition has I think in his mind that the increased allowance should only be in lieu of such sum as might reasonably be required for the increased expenditures of Manitoba in connection with the added territory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). In that case, Manitoba would receive a comparatively small sum. I think this matter goes very much deeper than that. The province of Manitoba has been dissatisfied for years, and where you have such a province as Manitoba dissatisfied, and expressing that dissactisfaction, irritably, as my right hon. friend once said, something is wrong in the political situation; and what we are trying to do is to remedy that. In 1881 Manitoba's boundaries were greatly extended by the Campbell Act; but the boundary award deprived Manitoba of that territory. I have said that we are seeking to put Manitoba on the same basis, as far as financial terms are concerned, as the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. I have figures submitted by Mr. R. E. Young, the chief geographer of the Dominion, on February 6, 1911, in which the total area of Alberta was placed at 253,000 square miles, Saskatchewan at 250,000 square miles and Manitoba at 73,000 square miles, or less than one-third of the area of Saskatchewan or Alberta. Now, we propose, by enlarging the boundaries of Manitoba, to increase its area to 251,832 square miles, which will bring about practical equality of area in the three provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are we to have a map laid on the table of the House showing the boundaries of the enlarged province?

Mr. BORDEN. I will have that before the second reading.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My right hon. friend has instituted a comparison between the treatment accorded to Manitoba and that accorded to the other provinces. Manitoba is of course giving back her swamp lands, a statement with regard to which was given by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. With regard to those swamp lands, I am unable to estimate their value, but Mr. Young, who is responsible for the figures which have been sub-

mitted to the House by my right hon. friend says:

The unsurveyed area in the province is estimated at 12,900,000 acres. This is largely unexplored. It is thought that 30 per cent (4,870,000 acres)) may be swamp. This land will be of considerably less value than the swamp lands already referred to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If Manitoba has disposed of these swamp lands to the extent of 800,000 acres, is there any information as to the price realized for them?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). In the figures submitted by the province of Manitoba, which, as I have said, must be checked on behalf of the Dominion before a final adjustment can be made, the total acreage sold is stated to have been 838,484·16 acres; the amount received for them is $3,137,399.30. Dominion deductions from provincial subsidy with respect to surveys of swamp lands, &c., amount to $211,942.95; provincial expenditure on account of swamp lands, proportionate estimate, $240,854.60. These two make a total of $452,797.55; leaving the net amount received or to be received by the province from swamp lands at $2,684,601.75. Five per cent of this amount is $134,230.08, which I deduct, as I have previously explained. That would give an average of about $3 an acre for the swamp lands already sold by Manitoba. As to the swamp lands, the right to which Manitoba will now surrender, estimated at over 8,000,000 acres, what the value of these is I am unable to say; but Mr. Young expresses the opinion that these lands are of considerably less value than the swamp lands already referred to. Of course, they are not yet surveyed, and it may be a considerable time before they are available for sale.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Were the sales of the swamp lands cash sales or on credit?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). On credit, most of them, paid for in instalments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is more money expected to be paid on account of these sales?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The figures given represent the principal sum. They will have to be made the subject of an audit. But so far as this Bill is concerned, that makes no difference, for this reason. We charge Manitoba with the total amount for which she sold these lands. Manitoba will continue to hold that amount, and we charge her 5 per cent upon it, and deduct the interest from the amount she would receive if she were placed in the same position as Alberta and Saskatchewan, and did not own swamp lands.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the charge of 5 per cent on the proceeds of the sales of swamp lands date from the 1st of July, 1908, or from the time the sales were made?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We consider the state of the account as from the 1st of July, 1908.

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the time the sales were made.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Up to that time Manitoba had been deriving certain subsidies under statute. Well, we start afresh as on the 1st of July, 1908. We take the total capital amount for which on that date Manitoba had sold the lands—because the province will continue to administer these lands and receive the payments—we take 5 per cent upon that, and deduct from the 5 per cent upon the total capital allowance of $8,000,000, and the result is the balance which Manitoba will receive under the proposed new Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Manitoba, for instance, 10, 15 or 20 years ago received cash from the swamp lands. Why, then, should she not give credit to the Dominion for the interest which she has received upon them in the meantime?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). As a matter of fact, whatever Manitoba derived was derived by virtue of the statutes at that time. What we are doing, as I have already said to this committee, is to place Manitoba on a footing of equality with the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and we are commencing to make a fresh start as on July 1, 1908. So far as the suggestion of my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is concerned, that Manitoba might very well reply—although I do not think it necessary for her to reply—that she would be justified in asking for these increased amounts from July 1, 1905——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think I have answered the questions propounded to me by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), although I do not know whether it is entirely to his satisfaction or not. With reference to the boundaries, I think the leader of the government has mentioned all that is necessary to be stated, namely, that the boundaries are precisely the same as those fixed by the resolution adopted by this House on July 13, 1908. As to a point made by the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the effect, as I understood him, that Manitoba had not accepted the boundaries, my understanding is a little different from his. I believe Manitoba would have been willing to accept the boundaries de-

fined in the resolution of 1908 if the financial terms had been satisfactory. That is my own belief in regard to the matter. The whole question of dispute between the government of Manitoba and the Dominion government related, as I understand, to financial terms; the boundaries proposed would have been entirely satisfactory. In that connection, I will read a letter from the then premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Mr. Roblin, which reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Roblin,—I have the honour to enclose the draft of a Bill for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. This Bill is on the line of the resolutions adopted by the House of Commons at its last session. The amount of allowance to be paid to the province in lieu of lands has been left in blank. According to the aforesaid resolution of the House of Commons this amount should be fixed by negotiation between the Dominion government and the government of the province.

We will be happy to confer with you at any time that may be convenient to yourself and to your government.

Yours respectfully,
WILFRID LAURIER.

I will now read a letter in answer to that from Mr. Roblin. It is to the following effect:

Winnipeg, March 1, 1909.

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 26th ult with enclosure as stated. I have read the Bill and, as I presume you would expect, I am disappointed. The preamble in the Bill only recites one of our requests, viz., subsidy in lieu of lands, where our petition also asks for a readjustment of subsidy or capital account; but which I presume, can be dealt with in the conference.

Our legislature has unanimously passed a resolution authorizing the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada to be memoralized along these lines. I presume the material will reach you in a day or two, if not already in your hands. In the meantime I enclose you a copy of the resolution on which the memorial is founded.

I accept the invitation you have extended by your letter to the members of my governmen to a conference regarding the terms upon which the said extension of boundaries is to be made.

As your parliament is in session I can understand that your time is considerably taken up. I therefore will ask you to be good enough to name the day or days that you can give for such conference and in that way avoid the unnecessary and tedious delay of the representatives of Manitoba at Ottawa

You will therefore be good enough to name the day or the days and advise me.

Yours very respectfully,
(Sgd.) R. P. ROBLIN.

It will be seen that the premier of Manitoba raised no question, so far as the correspondence goes at that particular time, with regard to the boundaries. I have understood subject to correction—because I was not in any way privy to the negotiations and my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) may have a different view, and may recall that some objection was raised with regard to the boundaries—that Manitoba would have been willing to have accepted the enlarged boundaries which we now propose, provided the financial terms had been satisfactory. The point as to which the province of Manitoba and the Dominion government were unable to agree was principally with regard to this matter of financial terms, to which I understand the leader of the opposition now objects. I think that is all that I have to say upon this occasion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand the important difference between the Dominion government and the government of Manitoba until quite recently was this: that the former was quite willing to make an allowance to Manitoba in respect to the added territory—that is to make a reasonable allowance to cover the administration of the government so far as the added territory was concerned. It was also willing to make a reasonable allowance by reason of Manitoba not getting any of the public lands in the added territory. The government of Manitoba, however, said: 'We are not satisfied with that. We want, as a condition of our accepting the larger boundaries, the whole basis of Confederation, so far as Manitoba is concerned, to be readjusted.' The Dominion government said: 'That is a matter which will stand upon its own merits, which must be settled at a conference of the family of provinces, and all we can do is to give you such reasonable and fair treatment as may be necessitated by reason of adding this additional territory.' But is not the important point this, that the question never was settled? It is only a few months ago that the question was settled as between the two governments, and upon what reasoning can the argument be founded that the Dominion should go back some four years, and make to Manitoba an allowance just as if the settlement had then taken place, and as if the terms had been readjusted four years ago? I quite agree with my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that Manitoba having been dealt with not only fairly in the past under conditions existing where previous allowances were made but generously, there is no argument or justice that can be urged in favour of carrying the terms of settlement back four years and giving the province in a lump sum, as is proposed, something like $2,000,000. Now, the Minister of Finance has dealt with this question just as if it were a question between Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. He has forgotten that there are other provinces, besides the three

provinces named, in Canada, and when we come to consider as to what should be a readjustment of the terms with respect to one province, we have to look to the question as to what is just and fair to all the other provinces of Canada, which as I have said, constitute the family of provinces composing Confederation. Now, take first the question of the debt allowance. What was the theory upon which the fathers of Confederation agreed to admit a province into confederation at a certain date? original provinces had gone into debt for

It was based upon this—that the four the purpose of constructing public works of a useful character, some more useful than others, some of a revenue producing character, but some not revenue producing. In the case of Ontario and Quebec, as my right hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says, these two provinces of old Canada had actually gone into debt for public works to the exent of $62,500,000, or thereabouts. These public works were handed over to the Dominion, and so the Dominion had something to represent the expenditure, and the provinces were allowed 5 per cent. interest on debt account from the Dominion on entering confederation. Then, take the case of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, a case which, I think, is of the most striking character, for their treatment then as compared with the treatment now being accorded to the province of Manitoba, I am satisfied, will impress the people of those provinces as being most unjust. Take first, the case of New Brunswick. That province was allowed to come into confederation with a debt of $7,000,000. She had actually, at the time of confederation, expended $6,500,000 or $6,600,000 on public works, which were handed over to the Dominion. Nova Scotia had expended even more. The public works which these provinces had constructed were, like the canals and other public works of Ontario and Quebec, handed over to the Dominion. In the case of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, a part of the property handed over consisted of the railway between Halifax and St. John. That road had been almost completed at the time of confederation, and the additional amount required to complete it was charged up to these provinces upon debt account. That piece of railway, now a portion of the Intercolonial railway, was actually earning a dividend at that time, was actually a revenue-producer, as you will see, by looking through the Debates at the time of confederation. It was handed over by these provinces to the Dominion as an asset, and to-day I venture to say, pays as well as any piece of railway property in the Dominion of Canada. It helps to equalize the expenditure and receipts of the Intercolonial railway. And by itself, it would be a splendid piece of property, a revenue-producer for the two provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. But for that property, New Brunswick gets no allowance; she gets no 5 per cent upon what it represents in the way of expenditure. She incurred a debt in the construction of that railway, handed the railway over to the Dominion, and it has become a valuable and paying asset of the Dominion. But what is proposed to be done in the case of Manitoba to-day? After Manitoba has been forty years in the confederation, it is proposed to raise her debt allowance from $3,500,000 to upwards of $8,000,000. And upon what ground? Upon the ground that Manitoba had no debt at the time of confederation. What does that mean? It means that she had not incurred expenditure in the construction of public works and had no public works to hand over to the Dominion to become assets of the Dominion as the public works handed over by the other provinces became assets of the Dominion.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? What explanation has he of the fact that Alberta and Saskatchewan were each allowed 5 per cent on $8,107,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Those were territories of the Dominion of Canada. They had no public works. New provinces were being created. The whole territory had to be developed, and so it was reasonable to give them a certain allowance to construct parliament buildings, to build roads and other public works, and to make the other expenditures necessary to the work of a provincial government. But Manitoba, as I have said, has been forty years a province of Canada. Her people agreed to enter into confederation on the terms arranged at the time she entered. If the hon. gentleman will look at previous legislation he will find that, almost without exception, when it has been deemed advisable to increase the debt allowance of any province, there has been a readjustment in the case of all the provinces. He will find that some years ago the debt allowance of Ontario and Quebec was increased from $62,500,000 to $73,000,000, and that New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were treated on a similar basis. You are adding to the debt allowance of Manitoba, one of the old provinces of Canada, to the extent of about $5,000,000, and basing that allowance upon its population. But if you were to do the same with Ontario and Quebec, what would you have? Ontario and Quebec now have a population of about 4,500,000. Give them the same debt allowance per head, as you propose to do in the case of Manitoba,

over and above the cost to them of the assets which they handed over to Canada, and they would be entitled to a debt allowance of about $130,000,000, as against $73,000,000 which they have been allowed. This would at once give to these two provinces an additional revenue of about $3,000,000 over that which they are now enjoying. Take the case of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. If you deduct from their debt allowance this revenue producing property, the railway between Halifax and St. John, which was built by the two provinces and handed over to the Dominion, and treat these two provinces in the same way as you propose to treat Manitoba to-day, you would add a good many hundreds of thousands of dollars to the revenue of these provinces on debt account. And I presume the same would apply to the province of British Columbia.

What I ask is not that the government should decline to take into consideration the necessities of the province of Manitoba, if it is thought necessary to increase her debt allowance. I would not complain if all these provinces were being treated alike. But what I do complain of is that the government should come down with exceptional legislation proposing to deal with one of the old provinces of Canada, one member of the family of provinces, upon an exceptional basis, while altogether ignoring the claims of the other provinces. Because Manitoba is close to the other prairie provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and because she has an alleged grievance which has been assiduously cultivated by gentlemen in accord politically with the present government, we are to deal in an exceptional way with Manitoba in order, as it is said, to put her on an equality with Alberta and Saskatchewan. But Alberta and Saskatchewan, as I have said, were created as new provinces. It had always been recognized that in the case of new provinces there should be a debt allowance. There was a debt allowance given to Manitoba, an allowance which was then thought to be fair, and with which the people of Manitoba were perfectly satisfied. In the case of Alberta and Saskatchewan it was thought reasonable to make these debt allowances. When these new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were created from the territories of the Dominion there was every prospect of their increasing rapidly in population. And to-day, Saskatchewan, after having been in confederation only about six years, has a population larger than that of Manitoba. There would be reasonable justification to look forward and make a debt allowance somewhat in accordance with what it was supposed would be the population of the province within a comparatively few years.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Cannot my hon. friend see that when you attempt to treat an old province which has been in the Dominion for forty years on a basis which will put it on an equality with two other provinces of the Dominion, utterly ignoring the claims and the position relatively of the other provinces of Canada, you are doing an injustice, and more than that you are creating a source of dissatisfaction which is going to lead to infinite trouble in the future? The idea of the fathers of confederation was that these subsidies should be upon a fixed basis, and if the hon. gentlemen will look back to the legislation which was enacted not many years ago when the debt allowance was last increased, they will find that that was accepted by the province of Manitoba as a full and complete settlement of all claims up to that time. Surely it is better that when there is any proposition for an increase of subsidy to any of the provinces, the negotiating should be done as it was a few years ago by a conference of representatives of the different provinces, so that they might agree upon what would be satisfactory to all, and so that no injustice might be done. It is not in accordance with the scheme of confederation, it is not in the best interests of the country to pick out any one province and attempt to alter the terms of confederation in relation to that province.

But this government is moving along these lines in other directions. The province of British Columbia has made claims which were also submitted to the conference, and the conference unanimously decided that it would be against the interests of the people of Canada to determine the claims of any province by arbitration. Yet my right hon. friend, as reported in the Toronto 'World,' has sent a telegram to the Premier of British Columbia agreeing to refer the claims of British Columbia, which were dealt with at the provincial conference, recognition of those claims being then refused, to a commission, one of whose members is to be chosen by this government, another by the government of British Columbia, and the third by these two, or, in case they fail to agree, by the Colonial Secretary—to all intents and purposes an arbitration, the arbitrators being allowed to determine as to the claims of a province for consideration in a financial way beyond what is provided for by the British North America Act. As well might Saskatchewan make a similar claim now or in the not far distant future, as well might New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario or Quebec. To say that it is unwise, is simply to say what all public men from confederation down to the present time have said should not be done, that whenever there was a proposition to increase the allowance to any one prov-

ince, the subject of the allowances of all the provinces should be dealt with. Surely the province of New Brunswick, for instance, would have as much right to have her subsidy readjusted, to have her debt allowance readjusted, and surely Ontario and Quebec would be entitled in the same way to have taken into account the valuable properties which were handed over by those provinces, and which became a part of the assets of the Dominion of Canada. If this Bill goes through, I do not see upon what ground a separate application from any one province could be refused recognition by parliament, if you get away from the well settled principle adopted at the time of the British North America Act which has been recognized ever since.

Let it be well understood that what it is proposed to do by this resolution is to increase the debt allowance of Manitoba, which had no debt at the time of its establishment, after it has been forty years in the Dominion from $3,500,000 to upwards of $8,000,000, and the government base their argument entirely on the fact that they want to place Manitoba on an equality with Saskatchewan and Alberta, altogether ignoring what would be justice to the other provinces of Canada. The Minister of Finance says that we want to do justice to Manitoba in another way, we want to give her territory as large as that of Alberta or Saskatchewan. We often hear of Manitoba being a postage stamp upon the map but Manitoba to-day contains 20,000 square miles more than the three maritime provinces. The three maritime provinces have but 52,000 square miles, while Manitoba has something like 73,000 square miles, and it is proposed at once, without consulting the other provinces, without seeing what New Brunswick or Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island may think, to add something like 200,000 square miles to the territory of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Was it not proposed in July 1908 by resolution of this House to do that precise thing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it was, my hon. friend is entirely right.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Did you object to that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I intended to urge certain terms which I thought would do justice to the maritime provinces, and I propose to urge those terms in a little while upon the attention of this government and this committee.

We come now to clause (c) which authorized the Governor in Council:

To pay to the said province, in lieu of ownership of public lands, an annual sum based upon the population of the said province as ascertained by each quinquennial census thereof, such annual sum to commence with $562,500 (less certain deductions in respect of what are known as swamp lands and university lands) and not to exceed the annual sum of $1,125,000 (less equivalent deductions); the same to be paid as from the first day of July, 1908.

What is the position Manitoba is put in? When she received those swamp lands she was not entitled to any more debt allowance than she then received, that is absolutely clear because she started with a population of 15,000 when she entered confederation. She had a reasonable debt allowance, I think considerably beyond what she would have been entitled to simply on the basis of population. The Minister of Finance says she has sold the best of her swamp lands at low prices. She does not propose to account for the interest on the moneys she has been receiving during the last twenty-five or thirty-five years, but she proposes simply to begin to hand back what is left, the worst of them, and then to begin paying interest as of the first of July, 1908, of $130,000 a year when she is to get from the Dominion something like $700,000 or $800,000 a year or perhaps even more than that. The paragraph contains these words:

The Governor in Council to pay to the said provinces in lieu of ownership of public lands,

That is not the language which was used by the late government away back some thirty or forty years ago; when an allowance was made to Manitoba it was put in as for want of public lands. This resolution would seem to imply that in some way or other Manitoba is entitled to the public lands within its boundaries and that as it is not intended to give these lands to the province, this large sum of money, $562,500, should be given to her in lieu of public lands. I notice that when the resolution was first placed on the order paper the words were:

—in lieu of ownership of public lands in the added territory.

When my right hon. friend the Prime Minister had the resolution drawn no doubt he saw that the only thing which he could logically ask parliament to do was to make an allowance in lieu of public lands in the added territory.

But that would not suit the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), because he was wanting a bigger haul out of the Dominion treasury than would be represented by anything commensurate for the loss of the lands in this added territory, and so I take it for granted that he succeeded in getting the resolution altered and that a day or two afterwards, when it appeared again upon the order paper, it

was to authorize the Governor General to pay this amount in lieu of ownership of public lands.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I can assure my hon. friend that that is not a correct statement of the case. The change was due to the mistake made by the law clerk in regard to the matter. The Bill as it now stands is precisely as it was in the beginning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad to accept the statement of my hon. friend, but certainly the law clerk has a good deal of ability, and his legal instinct would show him that the right thing to do was to put it in because he would hardly assume it to be possible that my hon. friend would be making an addition of this territory away to the north which will not have very much settlement for a hundred years to come the ground for such a large allowance. Some parts of it will be settled, like the Pas and around the mouths of the Saskatchewan, Nelson and Churchill rivers, but, speaking generally, it will not be of enormous value to the Dominion or to the province for many years to come. The law clerk would see that it was proposed to do something by reason of adding this territory, and that the words 'in lieu of ownership of public lands' should be in. But, there is no doubt that the scheme of the government is to make the addition of this new territory an excuse for altering the whole terms of confederation in so far as Manitoba is concerned, for picking out Manitoba as a favourite child in this family of provinces, and for giving it exceptional treatment, and giving it in such a way that I am sure, if we were dealing with Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island, my hon. friend would be terribly shocked if such a proposal were made. I desire to take the position that these lands do not belong to Manitoba. Those of us who come from the smaller provinces to which no territory can be added, in order to do justice to the people we represent, have to take the ground in the strongest manner possible that neither Manitoba, Ontario, nor Quebec, is entitled to one acre of these lands which are outside the bounds of these respective provinces. These lands formed a part of the Hudson bay territory, they were bought by the original four provinces of Canada, and they paid their hard money for them. While it may be natural and right that they should be added to these provinces, yet if they are to be so added the addition ought to take place upon terms upon which the other provinces have been consulted, and with which they are satisfied. The Act of 1871, I think, provides that the boundaries of a province may be extended. But it expressly provides that in case the rights of any other provinces in the confederation are in any way affected by that extension these provinces shall be consulted, and the government or the legislature—I forget which—of the provinces concerned shall be assenting parties.

It is proposed to enlarge the territory of Manitoba. It is proposed to give her $560,000 a year in lieu of public land. On the order paper also we find a proposition to enlarge the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and to give to them vast tracts of territory which, I say, belong to the whole people of Canada, the people of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, as well as to the people of other sections of Canada. In regard to the question of representation, I would like to invite the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, to the point as to how this addition to the territory of the province of Manitoba—and of course the same question would come up—when we come to deal with Ontario and Quebec, and more especially in reference to Quebec—will affect the representation of the other provinces. When we come to Quebec the contention, I think, can very properly be raised—and I submit it with all seriousness to my right hon. friend—that the added territory shall form no part of the province of Quebec, so far as the unit of representation is concerned. Quebec, under the British North America Act, is entitled to 65 representatives. I think it is impossible to successfully meet the contention that that means Quebec as it existed at the time of confederation. I observe in the resolution upon the order paper that there is no saving clause in regard to that. If I remember rightly, in the resolution which was passed in 1908, there was a saving clause. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, then Prime Minister, suggested, or consented to, an amendment by which it was provided that the added territory should not count in the estimate of 65 representatives for the province of Quebec, but that the additional territory should have representation, just the same as if it were another province.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That condition was accepted by the province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that condition was accepted by the province.

Mr. FOWLER. Does my hon. friend give it as his opinion, that it is within the power of this House to pass legislation limiting the representation of Quebec, as far as added territory is concerned, or would it not require an Act of the Imperial parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would think not, because I think Quebec means Quebec as it existed at the time of confederation. But, at all events, my own view is, that if the

terms of confederation are to be re-adjusted with respect to Manitoba, there ought to be Imperial legislation and the boundaries should be fixed. But, that is a matter for the legal advisers of the government. What I submit is, that as Quebec is to be the pivot upon which the representation of the different provinces turns, it should be Quebec as it existed at the time that confederation was formed. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, when he was leader of the government, recognized that principle and introduced a saving clause into the resolution. I would like to direct the attention of my right hon. friend the leader of the government to the fact that the boundaries of Quebec have already been enlarged. They were enlarged in 1898. I know the argument has been raised that the statute simply fixed the boundaries. I do not think so. I think that by that statute, there was something like 200,000 square miles added to the territory of Quebec. At the time of confederation, everybody recognized that Quebec extended to the height of land. We know that in the olden days, when the province of Quebec was owned by the French and Prince Rupert Land was owned by the English, Prince Rupert Land was understood to cover all the territory which was drained by the rivers that flowed towards Hudson bay, and in the old geographies, the height of land was shown as the northern boundary of Quebec. This is very important, because all that section of country through which the Transcontinental railway runs from a point,—I do not know what distance from Quebec, but extending north of Lake Abitibi, is included in the territory which was formerly Prince Rupert Land, because, as hon. gentlemen know, the river Abitibi as well as all the other rivers in that territory drain through to Hudson bay.

I would suggest to my right hon. friend that when he comes to consider the question it cannot do much harm to extend the proposition of the right hon. the leader of the opposition a little bit further and as regards the basis for representation leave Quebec as it was at the time of confederation. So far as Manitoba is concerned, and also so far as Ontario is concerned, the subject of representation is also important. As my right hon. friend knows, there is in the British North America Act, section 51, what is known as the saving clause, so far as the other provinces apart from Quebec are concerned. That provides that although relatively to Quebec a province might lose its representation as a result of the census, yet such province shall not lose unless it has fallen a certain percentage behind all of the provinces of Canada. In the case of New Brunswick, after the last distribution, if the computation were confined to the original provinces of Canada, New Brunswick would not have lost in her representation, but it was because of the new provinces being considered that the effect of this saving clause was done away with and our province lost in representation. In the representation case which came before the Supreme Court of Canada and afterwards went to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and in which I had the honour of being concerned, I took the ground—as the court held that the population of the new provinces should come in against us in considering the effect of that saving clause—that the population of the territories should not count. The point was left undecided. There is no principle upon which the population of the territories should count; it could not be brought in under the terms of section 51 of the British North America Act in any way. You will have this result, that in all these additions to Quebec and Ontario and Manitoba you are bringing in a portion of the territories; you are making them a part of the province, and their population, which, if they had remained territories would not have counted against the older provinces in respect to representation, will count from the day you make them part of a province. Therefore, I do submit that the provinces ought to be consulted. I do submit that before you strike a blow at the provision of the British North America Act which was intended to save these smaller provinces from the loss of representation, you ought to expressly provide that the population of these added territories shall not at all interfere with the operation of that saving clause or affect the rights of the other provinces so far as representation is concerned. I have felt it my duty to mention these matters, which hon. gentlemen may think more especially pertain to the province I have the honour to represent, and I do so because I believe it is important. I remember very well when the matter was discussed in the New Brunswick Legislature some years ago, when I was Attorney General of that province, that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries expressed himself as very strongly of the opinion that in any redistribution these questions ought all to be taken into consideration. I am relying with the utmost confidence upon his being a strong advocate of the course which I contend ought to be adopted now. I have not dealt very much with the subject of the public lands in the territories because that question will come up more appropriately when we come to deal with the resolution as affecting the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. But, these questions are germane to the subject because it is proposed to give Manitoba this very large allowance in lieu of public

lands to which the province of Manitoba is not entitled. I am fortified in that view by the statement of Sir James Whitney, Premier of Ontario, made in the legislature a few days ago, when he said that neither Manitoba nor Ontario was entitled to these lands and that they are lands which belong to the Dominion. That is the view I take and that is a view that cannot be too strongly urged. No province ought to be allowed to receive a subsidy upon the theory that it is any more entitled to the public lands of the Dominion than any other province. Whatever else it is deemed desirable to give to Manitoba in order to enable her to carry on government by reason of the added territories and discharge her duties in respect to the people who are there now, or may be there in the future, well and good; and I would not only be just but generous to the province in that respect. But, I do not want to express my approval of taking up the case of any one province and making it a separate case and attempting to take it out of the well settled principles which govern the status of all the provinces under the British North America Act.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I wish to say a word with reference to the last paragraph of the resolution, which reads:

(d) To authorize the Governor in Council to pay to said province, one-half on July 1, 1912, and one-half on July 1, 1913, the sum of $201,723.57 towards the construction of public buildings.

The explanation of that is that the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan respectively received under the Alberta and Saskatchewan Act, to provide for the construction of public buildings, the sum of $468,750, the payment of which was spread over five years. The province of Manitoba has heretofore received from the Dominion on account of the construction of the legislative buildings and government house at Winnipeg $267,026 and the sum of $201,723.57 referred to in the resolution is the difference between the two amounts I have mentioned. I have listened with very much interest to my hon. friend and to his expression of opinion that the other provinces will be dissatisfied with what he calls the exceptional treatment of Manitoba. In my judgment, if there has been any exceptional treatment of Manitoba, it has been by the late government and not by this government, and in that connection I would call the attention of the House to the differences between the status of the several provinces of the confederation with regard especially to the ownership of their natural resources. All the provinces of Canada, with the exception of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, were made sovereign provinces and the lands belonging to the Crown were vested in these provinces. The result is that they have had the advantage of their lands, their minerals, and the royalties consequent thereon. That is not the case with the three prairie provinces. They have no land, they are not sovereign states in that sense as the other provinces are, and the result is that prima facie they should be entitled to the same treatment. Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba not being sovereign provinces, not being entitled to their lands, minerals and royalties, should prima facie, other things being equal, and having regard to their status in the west, be entitled to precisely the same treatment. That is what we are trying to accord to them. My hon. friend said that no province is entitled to an acre of land without the consent of all the other provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. To an acre of Dominion land.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). And he was speaking of the extension of the boundaries at the time and I am not sure whether he meant the transfer of lands to the provinces or the extension of their boundaries. I understood him to mean that the extension of boundaries could not take place without—

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said was that the Dominion lands belonged to the whole Dominion.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Which Dominion lands?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Wherever they are in the territory. The lands north of British Columbia belong to the Dominion, the lands north of Ontario belong to the Dominion, and the lands north of Quebec belong to the Dominion and the lands in the prairie west all belong to the Dominion.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Do I understand my hon. friend to object to the transfer to Quebec of the added territory which is proposed, or was he referring to Manitoba?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and Ontario too without treating the other provinces fairly and justly.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). We are now dealing with the resolutions regarding the province of Manitoba. As far as the other provinces are concerned, I have no doubt that when they understand the situation they will be satisfied that it is only fair and just to Manitoba that this Bill should be enacted, in order that it may be placed on an equality with these other provinces, because Manitoba, like them, was deprived of its lands, minerals and royalties. Let me point out also that Manitoba under ex-

isting legislation, is entitled to receive about 8,000,000 acres more of swamp lands from time to time as they would be selected. It is getting an increase of about $500,000 a year by way of subsidies, and a total cash payment in respect of arrearages of about $2,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the standpoint of the Dominion, would it not be better for Manitoba to keep her swamp lands and sell them, because the Dominion gives away its lands free?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Manitoba has applied for an extension of her boundaries and for better financial terms. Presumably Manitoba knows her own business. A portion of these swamp lands will not come in for many years. But looking at the question at large and from the Dominion standpoint, having regard to the future as well as the present, the swamp lands represent in value a very large sum of money, which will be a set-off as far as the other provinces are concerned to the increased amount of money that Manitoba is now getting.

Mr. TURRIFF. Is it the intention of the government of which the hon. Minister of Finance is a member to hand over the lands to the provinces, as was promised by the right hon. leader of the government in the last campaign? If it is, it seems to me that this would be a good time to start doing that instead of giving an increased subsidy.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). The right hon. leader of the government, I have no doubt will be able to answer my hon. friend; but that question does not arise in connection with the present situation. This matter has been a long-standing sore to Manitoba. She has asked for an extension of her boundaries and a revision of her financial terms, and when we are proposing to meet her in these respects, hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to confuse the issue by asking such questions as that of my hon. friend. From my knowledge of the right hon. leader of the government I have no doubt he will be prepared in time to carry out explicitly whatever he promised. This question with regard to Manitoba should not be regarded from a narrow point of view. As the hon. member for St. John has said, Manitoba has been virtually a postage stamp on the map. A man has only to look at the map to see that great injustice has been done to Manitoba for years. Manitoba's claim has been soundly based, and everybody now, as in 1908, is in favour of enlarging her boundaries. The west is not entitled to exceptional treatment, but it is entitled to just and generous treatment. I am the first to rejoice that Saskatchewan and Alberta were dealt with so liberally as they were. I like to see those new children in the confederation treated properly. I have no exception whatever to take to the subsidies that were granted to Alberta and Saskatchewan. But we must go farther and put the pioneer province of the west in the same position as those favoured children in the confederation. And public opinion in eastern Canada will sustain that position, because it is the application of simple justice to Manitoba. The commercial hope of Canada to-day lies in the great west. There is room there for millions and tens of millions of people, and Manitoba is the pathfinder, the province that blazed the trail and suffered the privations of the pioneer in the early days of the west. We should not approach this question in the spirit of lawyers looking for technical points in statutes, but we should approach it in a broad statesmanlike way, with a desire to redress the injustice which Manitoba has suffered, and to put her in the same position as Saskatchewan and Alberta. It would be unfair in the extreme to put the province which has borne the burden and heat of the day in a subordinate position as to her territory or financial subsidies. Not only will the other provinces not be dissatisfied, but they will abundantly approve of the course which this government is taking in redressing the injustice under which Manitoba has laboured, and in putting the pathfinder of the west in as good a position as the two sister provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. BORDEN. In compliance with the suggestion of the right hon. leader of the opposition, I have asked the clerk of the House to amend the first paragraph of this resolution so as to set forth specifically the boundaries as they are proposed in the Bill. I have already informed the right hon. gentleman that those boundaries are the same as those defined by the resolution of 1908. The description is more elaborate. It has been prepared by the Dominion geographer, and with great care. I would therefore move that the first clause of the resolution be amended by substituting therefor the following:

That it is expedient to extend the limits of the province of Manitoba so that the boundaries of the province shall be as follows:

Then follows the description.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to follow the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on the point that he made that there should be equality of treatment between the different provinces in regard to subsidies and territory.

I want to point out to him and to the committee that equality of treatment does not involve merely an intimate know-

ledge of the multiplication table, or the other rules of arithmetic, but that equality of treatment necessarily involves due consideration of the physical and other conditions surrounding and connected with, the provinces with which it is proposed to deal. For instance, because the province of Ontario has a certain area and receives a certain consideration from the Dominion treasury, it does not by any means follow that part of the territory of Canada, lying beneath the Arctic circle and of the same area would be entitled to receive the same consideration, if erected into a province. That is an extreme illustration, but I want to make a statement of the position, as between Manitoba and Saskatchewan, to which no person can take exception. A provincial government is charged with certain duties of administration in behalf of the people under its jurisdiction, and the cost of that administration depends somewhat upon the area over which the people are spread, and as well upon their occupations and the means of communication. Now as between the province of Saskatchewan and the proposed province of Manitoba, each province will have an approximate area of 250,000 square miles. Of that area in the province of Saskatchewan it is fair to assume that not less than 200,000 square miles will be occupied by agricultural settlement. I think it is fair to assume that of the 250,000 square miles of the proposed province of Manitoba, that part which will be effectively occupied by agricultural settlement, will not be more than 50,000 square miles. That is to say, the area over which the respective provincial governments will be required to administer justice and deal generally with the subjects which comes within the range of a provincial government, will in the case of Saskatchewan, be over an area of 200,000 square miles, and in the case of Manitoba, over an area of 50,000 square miles. So that if there is to be equality of treatment in regard to the conditions as they exist, on the face of it, the province of Saskatchewan is unquestionably entitled—if the justice for which my hon. friend (Mr. White, Leeds) clamoured so loudly, is to be done—to receive a larger grant from the Federal treasury than the province of Manitoba. I do not want to be understood as objecting in any degree to liberality being extended by the government to the province of Manitoba. If it were possible to be generous to Manitoba without being unjust to the rest of the Dominion, then there would be no objection whatever to any amount that might be given to Manitoba. I am not even suggesting that the generosity shown in this case is an injustice to the other provinces, but I am bound to place before the committee the fact that what is an adequate and proper payment from the Dominion treasury to the province of Manitoba for the services of provincial government in that province, is by all right and reason, not an adequate payment to the adjoining province of Saskatchewan for the same purpose. And the same argument holds good in regard to the province of Alberta, but to an even greater degree, because that province is recognized as being of agricultural capability from north to south and from east to west. So that there is in that case, an area of presumably 250,000 square miles over which agricultural settlement may be spread, and which will require the administration of the provincial government which will have to incur corresponding expenses because of that. Therefore, if this question is to be decided as a matter of strict justice, and only as a matter of justice, I submit to the committee that that is not the basis upon which it is being decided now.

There are two features of provincial subsidies which are being dealt with in this arrangement: One is the feature in regard to the debt, and the other is the feature in regard to lands. The feature in regard to debt is dealt with by simply doubling the present debt allowance of Manitoba, or placing it on an equality with the province of Saskatchewan. I take a somewhat different ground, possibly, from my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and I offer no criticism against that increased debt account. I offer no criticism of the increase of debt account, because of equality of population between Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Be it remembered that the debt account is adjusted by population and not by territory, and that the addition of the new territory to the province of Manitoba has nothing whatever to do, either nearly or remotely, with the question of debt account. If Manitoba is entitled to an increased allowance of debt account it is entitled to that because of its population, and not because of its territory. But if I say that I am not exactly in accord with the remarks of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), I want to follow it with a statement that will be absolutely in accord with what he says. It cannot be held to be reasonable that there should be a readjustment of debt account in regard to any province without the consent of the other provinces. So when this government undertakes to readjust the debt account of the province of Manitoba, admitting that it is in itself a fair adjustment, it is taking upon itself the responsibility of disturbing the fundamental elements of confederation, and giving good and sufficient reason for some, at any rate, of the other provinces to come forward and demand a similar readjustment of debt account; and if the plea as to justice is to obtain, as my

hon. friend the Minister of Finance insists that it is, then the other provinces have just as good a right to claim justice as Manitoba has. That is a matter that I think the committee should consider very gravely; that it is not for any government to gratuitously disturb the basis of confederation and introduce an element of discord when that condition could be avoided.

This should certainly never be done under the conditions that exist at the present time, where a government deliberately comes forward and, under a plea of doing justice to one province takes it upon itself to readjust the debt account of that province—at once holding out to the other provinces the promise, or at least making the suggestion, that if they will only bring sufficient pressure to bear, their debt accounts may be readjusted as well; placing a premium—absolutely placing a premium—upon agitation against the fundamental basis of confederation. I think that a government which takes that attitude has something to answer for to the people of this country, altogether of more importance than the doing of what may be called justice in this particular to one province. The government has a duty to perform and a responsibility to bear, to the whole Dominion of Canada which weighs as heavily upon it as its duty and responsibility to the province of Manitoba. There is a proper way to secure a readjustment of the debt account of the province of Manitoba, but I submit that this government has not taken that proper way.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

On the order being called for the House to go into committee on Private Bills,

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point or order. I claim that these two Bills (No. 68) and (No. 69) are exclusively educational Bills, with which this parliament has no right to deal. The Ontario government were represented before the Private Bills Committee, and opposed the Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is out of order in attempting to discuss that question now. The motion is to go into committee, and it would be improper to discuss the question of the constitutionality or the principle of a Bill. That could be done in committee.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I can only raise the point of order when you are in the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no point of order in it, because it is a legal and constitutional question which the Speaker never decides.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have raised the point of order; you can do as you like with it.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE AT KINGSTON.

House in committee on Bill (No. 68), respecting the Queen's College at Kingston, and to change its name to Queen's University at Kingston.—Mr. Nickle.

On section 1—existing rights and liabilities continued,

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would again raise the point of order that this is a purely educational Bill, and has no right to be brought before this parliament, that the Ontario legislature would have just as much right to issue a bank charter as this parliament has to issue an educational charter. Consequently I object to the Bill being passed. The proper course would be to refer it to the Justice Department for their opinion. There is no question in the minds of many of the best lawyers in Canada that this is a matter over which this parliament has no jurisdiction, and is exclusively a matter for the Ontario legislature. Therefore, I move that this Bill, and Bill (No. 69) be referred to the Justice Department for their opinion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid that this motion is out of order.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. NICKLE. I hardly think I would be discharging my duty to my constituents, and to those who have placed this Bill in my charge if I allowed the hon. member's motion to go without challenging the correctness of his statement. In order that the House may adequately understand the relation of this institution to the national life, it is necessary that I should go into its history, take the House into my confidence and explain to them what legislation has been passed in this House affecting the university that now presents this Bill for consideration. In 1849 Queen's University was incorporated, not by an Act of the parliament of Upper Canada, but by virtue of Her Majesty's prerogative. From 1841 until 1874, the original charter granted by Her Majesty continued unchanged and under it the university was governed. In

1874, after the union of the Free Church of Scotland and the old Kirk in Canada, it was necessary to make application for fresh powers and at that time the legislature of the province of Ontario passed an Act in regard to the matter, which was then thought to be constitutional. However, a case commonly called the Temporalities Fund Case, was taken to the Privy Council, and that body laid down the principle that in the case of any corporation or institution enjoying privileges that affected the citizens of the two provinces, it would be ultra vires of either province to legislate away the rights of citizens of the other province. Believing that decision to be good law, the trustees of the university in 1882, made application to this parliament for a confirming statute and this parliament passed such an Act. Again in 1889, when fresh powers were required, application was made to this parliament and a most vigorous debate took place in this House, participated in by men like Sir John Thompson, Hon. David Mills, Sir John A. Macdonald, Mr. Weldon, of St. John and other eminent constitutional lawyers, after which by a vote of 104 to 35 this House decided that it had authority to deal with this question, because the rights of citizens of Ontario and Quebec were at issue. Again in 1906 the trustees came to this House for legislation when this House took the responsibility of passing legislation affecting Queen's University.

We come to the present. The hon. gentleman says that he understands the representative of Ontario contends that this House has not jurisdiction. It is well that the entire facts should be in the possession of the House. It is quite true that the province of Ontario did stand represented before the Private Bills Committee and the matter was thoroughly canvassed from every point of view. The stand taken by the province of Ontario was, that if clause 2, which reads:

> The university is hereby declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.

—were eliminated the province of Ontario had nothing more to say and was satisfied that this Bill should be passed. The hon. member for St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) has opposed this Bill from its inception to the present. From the time his voice was first heard in opposition to it, until to-day, he has left nothing undone that could secure the overthrow of this Bill. Imagine if you will, the scene in the Private Bills Committee a few days ago. The hon. member for St. Lawrence, contended that clause 2 infringed on the rights of Ontario, but when those who had charge of the measure withdrew the objectionable clause, he immediately changed his position, and said that with that clause out, we had no jurisdiction. The legislative authority rests somewhere in regard to this university, and those who have this Bill in charge contend that as the Dominion parliament has three times passed legislation affecting the university, as the Privy Council has given a decision that would seem clearly to indicate that jurisdiction lies here, this House should take the responsibility of legislating. The hon. member for St. Lawrence says that we should ask the opinion of the Justice Department. The hon. gentleman at the first meeting of the Private Bills Committee caused such a motion to be put, and the question was referred to the Department of Justice. But the hon. gentleman for St. Lawrence was not there at the second meeting when Mr. Gisbourne, the representative of the Department of Justice, came and gave an opinion.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to state that the question has been referred to the Justice Department?

Mr. NICKLE. I said that at the first meeting of the Private Bills Committee it was moved that the question be referred to the Justice Department. It was then referred to the Justice Department, and at the second meeting of the committee the representative of the Justice Department was present and he said that the question of jurisdiction was so shrouded in doubt that the Justice Department would not take the responsibility of saying that jurisdiction did not lie within this parliament, that the courts were open to any man who felt himself aggrieved and if it were not constitutional the fact that this House had arrogated to itself a right which it did not possess would in no way affect the rights of those interested in this Bill.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Was that opinion given in writing?

Mr. NICKLE. I am not aware that it was.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). It would be very useful to the committee if it was in writing for the benefit of everybody.

Mr. NICKLE. Does the hon. gentleman doubt my word?

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Oh, no.

Mr. NICKLE. That Bill was held up at the first meeting of the committee and I do not think that the hon. member will question my statement that it was referred to the Justice Department and the passing of the preamble was held up until such time as the Justice Department could give an opinion. At the second meeting of the committee the Bill was taken up clause by clause, and at the last, when every clause had been considered, the preamble was considered, it secured the concurrence of

the committee and the Bill was reported to the House. The Bill has since with amendments, been before the law clerk of the House and no objection has been raised by him. I can do no more than explain to the House the position that I and the promoters have taken. I am giving to the House my recollection of the opinion of the Justice Department, and if any hon. gentleman for one moment doubts what I say, I would be only too glad that that opinion should be asked in writing, but I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that they are inflicting a great hardship on this university by retarding the passing of this legislation which means a great deal to the university which I have the honour to represent here to-night.

Mr. BURNHAM. I can enlighten the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) who has just spoken a little on this subject because I took the liberty of referring the matter to the Department of Justice myself. We had a great deal of confusion in the committee, and we became entangled in a variety of religious questions which some of us, including the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) did not understand. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) objected on the ground of jurisdiction and the Bill under that reservation was considered very minutely and in every particular and detail and eventually was reported. The only question was that with regard to jurisdiction. In regard to my reference to the Justice Department, I do not suppose I am violating any confidence of the Justice Department when I say that one of the most important officials of the department took the trouble to come over to the committee room. He took me to one side and said: You will not consider it offensive on our part if I say that we do not care to put down in writing any opinion on a subject of this description for it is outside of the function of the Justice Department to advise in such matters. The hon. member for Kingston has stated accurately what has occurred and I am very glad indeed to be able to say that that is why there is no opinion in writing.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). The hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) deserves credit for having taken the trouble to procure the opinion of the Department of Justice on this question. We also owe some gratitude to the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) for having communicated to the committee the opinion which he has had from the Justice Department and the opinion of the representatives of that department in the committee. But I think it would have been better for the members of this committee to have had the opinion given in the House by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) himself. The opinion given by an official of the department to the committee is very useful, no doubt, but the committee, being informed of that opinion, should have reported to that effect and I am not aware that the report which the Chairman has laid on the table of the House relates that fact. It seems to me that the motion of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) is only reasonable. We will have the opinion of the Justice Department by to-morrow, and the department is ready to give its opinion according to the statement of the hon. member for Kingston. I have no doubt that the department is ready, and I would, therefore, second the motion of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Lawrence, that the proceedings should be suspended until this favourable opinion to my hon. friend's contention shall be brought before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Bickerdike moves that the committee rise.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). This parliament has already assumed jurisdiction in this matter. Now, I think myself that it is too late to raise the question of jurisdiction. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has shown clearly that the matter has been before parliament on a previous occasion and that it has been considered by such eminent authorities as Sir John Thompson, Hon. David Mills and others, and it seems to me pretty clear that the question of jurisdiction should not be raised. It will stultify this parliament as to its previous action. If there is any doubt in regard to the matter it is open, as my hon. friend from Kingston has said, to any one interested to test the matter in the courts. Then possibly the jurisdiction of the Dominion can be determined. But it does seem to me that, this matter having been before parliament, not only once but more than once——

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Not this Bill, Sir.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). But this question in substance has been before this parliament.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Not in the present shape.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Well, not in the present shape, but still in such shape as to be dealt with under the jurisdiction of this parliament. The same question I have no doubt arose then that is raised by my hon. friend now—the same question of jurisdiction, the same question of whether we really had legislative authority to deal with it. It does seem to me

that we are not going to be freed from that doubt. The proper way is to assume that parliament has the powers which it has already assumed to have and which, according to the opinion of the eminent jurists referred to, it had. The proper procedure is to take up the clauses of this Bill, make such progress as we can with them and subsequently allow any question to be raised. We stultify parliament by attempting to determine whether it has jurisdiction which it has in fact already assumed in the past.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). The minister contends that it is too late to raise the question of jurisdiction.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Not too late.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). The question of jurisdiction was raised the first time the Bill appeared before committee. It was raised to-night when Mr. Speaker was in the chair. It is raised now when the Chairman is presiding over the proceedings of this committee. It is all very well to say that because Sir John Thompson, or some other eminent jurist, gave a certain opinion we should assume the legislative jurisdiction of this parliament. It is all very well for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) to be the commissionaire of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) to bring his opinion before the committee, but it seems to me if the Minister of Justice himself would give his opinion to the committee it would be better, or if the Minister of Finance undertakes to say that this is the opinion of the Minister of Justice, supported by a full Cabinet, that is another proposition entirely. I do not think we deserve any reproach.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I am not reproaching you.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Perhaps the word 'reproach' is not the right word, but I do not think we have been negligent at all. We have been awake from the first time the Bill appeared before the committee. I have no other motive than the welfare of Queen's University, but above all, the rights of the citizens of this country without any consideration or regard for their nationality. The word 'national' is mentioned in the Bill connected with the word 'undenominational.' If the minister will look a little further on in the Bill he will find, in clause 20, that notwithstanding all the privileges they want to get from this House, and which it is proposed to grant to them, the university is still to continue distinctly Christian, putting away all British subjects in this country who are not Christian.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). My hon. friend (Mr. Wilson, Laval) must have misunderstood me, because I certainly did not mean it was any reproach to hon. gentlemen opposite that they had raised this question of jurisdiction. We were discussing the question of jurisdiction which had been raised, and properly raised by another hon. gentleman. The position I have taken is that we have already created our own precedent. Parliament has already dealt with this matter, and I understand from the hon. member for Kingston, that when the matter was being dealt with before the committee, a member of the Department of Justice attended and stated that while there might be some doubt about the matter, it had already been dealt with by parliament. I think it inadvisable to confuse the terms of the Bill with the question of jurisdiction. If my hon. friend desires to discuss the terms of the Bill—the clauses of the Bill, why, of course, that may properly be done in the committee. But, that should not be confused with the question of jurisdiction. The question of jurisdiction is one thing, the question of the propriety of the main clauses of the Bill is another thing. They may be discussed separately. But the point I am endeavouring to make, is that as the subject of Queen's University has been heretofore dealt with by this parliament of Canada, I do not say it is too late, but I say it is inexpedient to raise the question now, to raise any doubt as to the proceedings of parliament in the past, especially if the Minister of Justice, or the Department of Justice, have any doubt about the matter which they are unable to resolve. There are a number of matters which come up before this parliament in regard to which the question of jurisdiction arises. It may be that it is very difficult to determine these questions, but the fact remains that this subject has been dealt with from time to time by the Dominion parliament.

There would therefore be no harm in taking up this Bill and considering its several clauses. As I understand it, a representative of the province of Ontario attended the Private Bills Committee; the University being situated in Ontario, and that province being the authority to raise objection on the question of jurisdiction. but as I understand from my hon. friend (Mr. Nickle) the representative of Ontario withdrew opposition as to clause 2 which declares the University to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I do not think the hon. member for Kingston would say that.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Of course I was not present and I cannot speak on the subject from personal knowledge, but my understanding is that the representative of Ontario did not object to the jurisdiction of the Dominion having regard to clause 2

declaring the University to be for the advantage of Canada.

Mr. NICKLE The province of Ontario objected to that clause being inserted in the Bill, but Mr. Code, who represented the province, said that if that clause were deleted the province had no further objection.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think my hon. friend from Kingston is in error.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). Well, I was not present, and I had better not deal with that feature of the case. It is an essential point that parliament has already dealt with the matter.

Mr. NESBITT. When?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). On three occasions as I am told by my hon. friend (Mr. Nickle).

Mr. NESBITT. There is nothing before us to show us that such is the case.

Mr. NICKLE. The question was dealt with in 1882, 1889 and 1906 by the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. NESBITT. In what way?

Mr. NICKLE. It was rather complicated and it may take some time to explain the details.

Mr. NESBITT. Can you do so briefly?

Mr. NICKLE. I can and I cannot. I have done it once and I will try again. In 1882 the legislation that was then found necessary was promoted to confirm an Act of the Ontario legislature owing to the decision of the Privy Council in Dobie and the Temporalities Fund. Hon. gentlemen who are of the Presbyterian persuasion may remember that after the union of the Free Church of Scotland and the Old Kirk, questions arose in regard to the administration of certain church funds, and the litigation went to the Privy Council when it was decided that where a citizen of two provinces, that is of Upper and Lower Canada, had rights, that the legislature of neither provinces could destroy or annul these rights. It was to conform with that decision that in 1882 the university came to this parliament to get confirming legislation for the Act of 1874 passed in the Ontario legislature. Then, in 1889, the trustees again came to this House for legislation, at that time the question involved was the giving to graduates the right of representation on the trustee Board. Again in 1906 a further extension of the franchise, so to speak, to the graduates, was desired, and again this House was appealed to, and again this parliament decided it had jurisdiction. I may read for the information of the House what Sir John Thompson said in 1889:

I am afraid that in the short time remaining for the disposal of private Bills, it may be almost impossible if the objections are insisted on, to close the discussion. If hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken intend to insist on those objections, it is not worth while, I confess, to proceed; but, perhaps, they have merely spoken for the purpose of asserting their view of the jurisdiction of this parliament and they will permit the Bill to pass. If the Bill is to be opposed I shall offer a few observations in regard to it. There has been much argument offered on both sides, in which I cannot concur, but the strong point in favour of the passing of this Bill, if it is a Bill which commends itself to the House on its merits, is this: that this parliament in 1882 asserted its jurisdiction and passed an Act by which it arranged the organization of this college. I must assume that in passing that Act it made provisions and regulations which were unwise or inconvenient in their operation, and the promoters who submitted to that Act in 1882, come now to the same body and ask for the removal of those unwise or inconvenient restraints. I think the House, under such circumstances, ought not to decline jurisdiction, especially in regard to a private Bill.

And, Sir John Thompson was thought to be a pretty good constitutional lawyer.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The Minister of Finance is hardly fair in preventing this committee from knowing what the Minister of Justice or the Justice Department has replied to the question that was asked. I am not a member of the Private Bills Committee, and, therefore, I do not know what the opinion of the Justice Department is. So far as I can learn there was no such report presented to the Private Bills Committee, and if there was such a report, then the Committee of the Whole is entitled to see it. Why not let this Bill stand until the Minister of Justice is present to state his position on the matter? It is my opinion that the Ontario legislature would have as much right to issue a bank charter, as for this parliament to issue an educational charter, and the fact that parliament has in previous days dealt with this legislation, is no reason why, if parliament was wrong then, we should perpetuate the wrong now. I will take every means I can to get the opinion of the Justice Department before this committee.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). It is my duty to strongly object to the manner in which the Minister of Finance has expressed his satisfaction with the report made to him by the hon. gentleman from Kingston (Mr. Nickle). Suppose, for example, that that famous officer of the Law Department expressed his opinion to the hon. member for Kingston and to myself, each of us might draw a different conclusion from that opinion, and, therefore, we would be no better off than we were before in com-

ing to a determination, unless we were able to present that opinion to the members of the House to enable them to form their own judgment on it. It is the duty of the hon. member for Kingston to place the opinion of the Justice Department before us. If the other practice is going to be followed in this House, it will undoubtedly lead us into error.

If the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice were contained in the report of the committee, the situation would be different. When I asked my hon. friend if he would take the responsibility of saying that the opinion given by the Minister of Justice was as stated by the hon. member for Kingston, he would not take that responsibility. If Laval had given the same opinion instead of the hon. member for Kingston, I am inclined to think that the hon. Minister of Finance would have taken it cum grano salis.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I came into the House while this matter was under discussion. I understand that objection is taken to the Bill by my hon. friend from St. Lawrence division, Montreal, (Mr. Bickerdike) on the ground that this question concerning Queen's University is a provincial question. I must add my testimony to the statement made by my hon. friend from Kingston by saying that to my personal knowledge this parliament has already dealt with Queen's University. I remember the occasion to which my hon. friend has referred. I do not remember what the question was, but I know that it arose from a division which took place in the Presbyterian church in 1882. I have not forgotten the other incident referred to, when the opinion of Sir John Thompson was given that this parliament had jurisdiction. The matter presents itself in this way. The university was in need of legislation, and it had to decide whether it would go for it to Toronto or to Ottawa, and I presume that, following the precedents of 1882 and 1889, it decided to come to Ottawa. In my judgment this parliament has certainly jurisdiction, because we have these two precedents. Under such circumstances I would be loth for my part to vote to kill the Bill for want of jurisdiction. I understand that the motion made by my hon. friend from the St. Lawrence division is that the committee rise. If this motion were carried, the Bill would be killed. I would be averse, for my part, to take such a course, and I think the House should be chary about doing so. I think my hon. friend from the St. Lawrence division will agree that it would be hardly fair to the university to kill the Bill. My hon. friend may be entitled to information, and I am sure that the hon. member for Kingston would not object to giving it. For these reasons I could not vote for the motion that the committee rise; but in the meantime parliament will not be prorogued for some time yet, and it should be possible to furnish the information asked for by my hon. friend from the St. Lawrence division.

Mr. WILSON (Laval).

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). What has been pointed out by my right hon. friend had already been pointed out by the hon. member for Kingston. It seems perfectly clear that parliament has dealt with Queen's University on two previous occasions, and no less eminent a jurist than Sir John Thompson expressed the opinion that this parliament had jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Bill. The hon. member has pointed out that this legislation is of supreme importance to this university and to its adherents and supporters, who are a large and influential body of people, and it seems to me that we should proceed with the Bill and the question raised as to section 20 or any other section may be discussed afterwards in the committee or in the House. There is no question involved in this Bill that cannot be discussed apart from the question of jurisdiction. This parliament would stultify itself if it decided that it had not jurisdiction in this matter. I entirely concur in the view of the right hon. the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I do not wish to kill the Bill, but I have endeavoured on three occasions to get the opinion of the Justice Department on this question. My hon. friend from Kingston states that the Private Bills Committee has had that opinion. I am not a member of that committee, and I think we are entitled to have that opinion laid on the table of this House. There are some clauses in the Bill that we have pleaded with the promoters to leave out, because they are insulting to a large number of people. As long as clause 20 remains in the Bill, I will take every chance to defeat it. I stated to the promotor of the Bill that if that clause were struck out, I would not raise the question of jurisdiction.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. member for the St. Lawrence division evidently feels strongly on this matter, and I understand he is speaking from information given to him by people who are supposed to have some authority. Personally, I do not think there is anything in the objection as to the jurisdiction of this parliament, and that opinion is fortified by the fact that on two previous occasions parliament has exercised jurisdiction by dealing with Queen's College. But the law officer of the Crown is the Minister of Justice, and I must say that he does not honour us with his presence in parliament or in parliamentary committees as frequently as he ought. When hon. members raise a

serious question, I think the committee is entitled to know what the Minister of Justice thinks of it, just as a few years ago when a question was raised on a similar Bill, Sir John Thompson as Minister of Justice gave his opinion and settled the question. While not agreeing with my hon. friend from St. Lawrence in the objection he has raised, I think the promoters of the Bill would be well advised if they allowed it to remain in committee until the Minister of Justice stated to the House the opinion which he is said to have given.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hon. members know that it is near nine o'clock. I say that the Minister of Justice should be in his seat to give his opinion on a serious question raised in this committee, and that question will not be settled by the hon. gentlemen saying 'lost.' Hon. members who do not belong to the Private Bills Committee, and who had not an opportunity to hear the discussion there, cannot form an intelligent opinion on the legal question from the short discussion we have had to-night.

All I wish, with the desire of assisting the Bill—not believing in the point raised by my hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike), because there is no political question involved in this matter, not the slightest in any degree—is this: that my friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) having raised a question upon which the opinion of the Minister of Justice ought to be given; that he is not unreasonable, and that he is not stating a position which is untenable, when he suggests to the committee that we should have an opinion from the Minister of Justice before a conclusion is reached upon the matter. Can any reason be seriously urged in opposition to that course? Hon. gentlemen want to rush the Bill through without giving those who apparently have some ideas upon the subject, time or opportunity to present those views, without giving them an opportunity of having the legal question determined which they are instructed and advised is a very serious and important one. That is the whole issue and that is the question. Therefore, I would ask my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) to recognize that it is impossible for the Bill to go through at this sitting of the House and to accede to the request of my hon. friend, Mr. Bickerdike.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). I want to make my position very clear on the question, and I desire to state that I do not want to kill the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Hon. gentlemen may protest; they seem to be in a great hurry. If the ministers had been in their seats at eight o'clock, instead of 8.15, we would have been able to proceed very well with the business before the House. I remember in the old days when we on this side occupied the seats to the right of the Speaker, and those gentlemen who now sit there were sitting on this side, that a certain hon. gentleman who was a plain member of parliament and not a minister, took very good care when the member for Laval was absent from his seat, to express deep sorrow that that hon. gentleman was not in the House when a public question of interest to his riding was being considered. I shall not mention the hon. gentleman's name.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He is not in his seat now.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). No, he is not in his seat now. I do not know whether that hon. gentleman wishes to refrain from giving his opinion on this Bill. At any rate the position I am taking now is the position that every member of the House, in my opinion, should take. I want to know whether the hon. member for Kingston is sure of his ground, or whether he is afraid to knock again at the door of the Minister of Justice in order to have his opinion confirmed and submitted to the House? I think, Mr. Chairman, my demand is a reasonable and just one and should have been accepted by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle).

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for Private Bills having expired, the House will go into Committee of the Whole on the resolution in regard to the Manitoba boundaries.

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA.—EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES.

House again in committee on resolution respecting the boundaries of Manitoba.

Mr. OLIVER. When the House rose at six o'clock I was discussing that part of the resolution which deals with the question of debt account. I want to point out to the committee, that the question of the readjustment of the subsidies to the provinces was dealt with in the conference that was held, I believe in 1906, and the conclusion of which conference was afterwards embodied in an amendment to the British North America Act. At that conference a change was made in the basis of two features of the subsidy allowance, namely, in regard to civil government, and in regard to payment per head of the population. It was arranged at that conference, and afterwards sanctioned by the Imperial authorities, that hereafter the allowance for civil government, and the allowance on account of population would increase

from time to time with the increase of population. There was no such readjustment in regard to debt account. But in my humble judgment, Mr. Chairman—and I am speaking now on behalf of the western provinces—such a readjustment would have been right and proper at that time, and not having take place at that time would be right and proper and would be in order to be taken into account at some future conference. The idea of the subsidy is for the purpose of enabling the provincial governments to discharge the responsibilities which confederation lays upon them, and it is an evident fact that these responsibilities, speaking generally, have increased with increase of population, so that, however the original basis of subsidy was arrived at, or for whatever reason a certain sum was fixed upon, if the population has increased largely then that fixed sum becomes inadequate and should, outside of the question of law, as a matter of equity, be subject to readjustment. What has occurred in the case of Manitoba is liable to recur in the case of that province, and still more liable to occur in the case of the three provinces farther west: That is, that their debt accounts being adjusted on the basis of present population, the population of those provinces is liable to increase so very rapidly that the provision towards their total subsides on debt account is certain to be inadequate. It is I presume, that reasoning which leads the government to make provision for an increase of Manitoba's subsidy on debt account by doubling the calculation, that is to say increasing the population basis from 125,000 to 250,000, the basis of population adopted in the case of Alberta and Saskatchewan. But the arbitrary adoption of the same basis of population as was adopted in the case of Alberta and Saskatchewan does not by any means settle the question, does not by any means bring it to finality. Once the government undertakes to depart from the original fixed basis without consultation with the other provinces there is no finality. And in my judgment there should not be a finality so long as the population is increasing, but there should not be action by the government dealing with the case of a single province, unless there is an arrangment and understanding with all the other provinces, so that every province shall feel that when a certain province has received an increase of subsidy the other provinces have been fairly dealt with at the same time. With our vast area of agricultural land in Alberta and Sasketchewan, with the increases of population that have taken place since these provinces were organized, it is clear to-day that the subsidy allowance on debt account is not adequate, and is not fair to those provinces of Canada.

Mr. OLIVER.

Now, to repeat. The population of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba is a larger precentage greater than the basis of the debt account, than is the population of any of the eastern provinces. Therefore, if I were making an argument on the grounds of pure justice, I would claim at once that the debt allowance of these provinces should be increased in order to put them on an equal footing with the eastern provinces so far as population is concerned. But I have taken the ground that the government should not interfere with the basis of calculation of subsidy on its own initiative and should only interfere with it with the consent of all the provinces.

To emphasize the point, let me illustrate: Take the case of the province of British Columbia. That province to-day receives a smaller allowance on debt account in proportion to its present population than any other province in the Dominion. If there were any ground for increasing the payments on debt account to the province of Manitoba, that reason is just as strong or stronger in the case of the province of British Columbia; and by making the increase that has been made in the case of the province of Manitoba, I take it, the government is thereby compelled to make a similar increase to the province of British Columbia,—or, if they do not, the province of British Columbia will rest under a sense of injustice at the hands of this government.

I have gone into this in detail for the purpose of demonstrating that this portion of the subsidy grant in regard to debt allowance should not have been interfered with by this government except as part of a general scheme in which the rights of the provinces should have been considered and, as far as possible the consent of the provinces obtained. Again I say that I deal with this question at such length because I am quite aware that the late government will be subjected to adverse criticism because of the cash payments proposed to be made by that government in connection with the proposed extension of the boundaries of Manitoba as compared with the cash payments proposed to be made by this government; and I point out that in my judgment the late gevernment had good and sufficient reason, and was well advised, in not undertaking of its own motion to increase the subsidy of the province of Manitoba on debt account as this government has seen fit to do. I do not speak of the matter with any idea of preventing the province of Manitoba from getting a larger payment on debt account, but in order that there may be a square deal amongst all the provinces; so that there may not be raised a sense of irritation on the part of any of the provinces which, as I have pointed out, is bound to occur

in the case of British Columbia at any rate and which would not have occured had not the government taken the course it has taken in this connection.

Now, as to the item in the resolution in regard to subsidy in lieu of land: The resolution before the House sets out that there is to be paid each year $562,500 on account of land, less certain deductions; and I am informed in reply to a question that the actual cash payment less the deductions to be made is $413,270 a year. This is $313,270 more than the province is now receiving on land account and $113,270 more than the province would have received under the arrangement offered by the late government which involved practically a payment of $200,000 on land account. The deductions that have been made from the nominal sum placed in the resolution, we have been informed by the Finance Minister, are deductions on account of swamp and university lands handed over to the province by the Dominion and disposed of, either in whole or in part, by the province and charged up to the province. On that point, I think my hon. friend is hardly dealing fairly with the Dominion in the calculation that has been made so far as the university lands are concerned. It is true I have not had very much time to consider the figures, but if this land transaction is to be a purely business transaction, and if the province is to account to the Dominion for that which it has received and the amount thus accounted for is to be deducted from the cash to be paid, then it is fair and reasonable that we should consider whether the calculation has been rightly made or not. The province is charged with $15,000 a year, presumably interest on the value of the university lands, none of which are to be returned to the Dominion. The quantity of university lands is 150,000 acres. These were selected lands, selected as being farming lands. Being within the province of Manitoba and being selected, they must have a very fair market value; and as they are acquired by the province for the purpose simply and solely of securing a revenue from them for university purposes, of course the province is entitled to dispose of them so as to get out of them the last cent of value that is in them. Now, I think it would not be an unreasonable valuation to put on these lands to say that they were worth $10 an acre. In fact, it is in my mind—having had some occasion to go into this matter in the past—that an actual accounting giving all the sales of these lands would indicate that the price at which they had actually been sold was in the neighbourhood of $10 an acre.

One hundred and fifty thousand acres of land at $10 an acre would mean $1,500,000, and if interest is computed on that at 5 per cent, it would make an interest value of $75,000 a year which has accrued to the province of Manitoba in respect of the university lands on the calculation which I think it is fair to make, while the Dominion is only credited and the province is only charged with $15,000 a year. Of course, the expense of handling, selling and selecting these lands is properly chargeable to the amount received from them, but I do not think that even under the able administration of my successor in office, who may be supposed to have had something to do with the management of these lands, it can be presumed that the expenses of sale would make the difference between the $15,000 and the $75,000 per year. It is only fair that the minister should at a later date give us the grounds upon which he arrived at the calculations by which he charges the province and credits the Dominion with $15,000 in respect of 150,000 acres of selected lands in the province of Manitoba, the interest upon which is, according to his own figures, computed at 5 per cent.

In regard to the swamp lands, 836,430 acres realized $3,137,389. It will be observed that the swamp lands have not brought the returns per acre that I have placed as a valuation upon the university lands, but the swamp lands are not selected lands; they are taken because they are swamp lands, and they must be sold as swamp lands, but I submit that if the swamp lands are sold as they have been to the extent of over three quarters of a million acres at $3 an acre, they not being selected lands, surely the university lands, which were selected, were worth a great deal more. I am not objecting to the calculation in regard to the swamp lands, as far as I can see it appears to be a fair calculation of value.

I observe, however, that the Dominion is charged with the cost of sale amounting to something like a quarter of a million dollars. I have not the figures absolutely correctly, but it is over $200,000 a year and something less than $250,000, so that undoubtedly the Dominion is being charged up with every expense that can reasonably be charged against it. Thus, as far as the swamp land is concerned, it must be presumed that it is a business transaction as set down here and that the Dominion has got no advantage in it.

On land account, as I have said, the province is to get, over and above what it now receives, $313,000, and over and above what it would have received under the offer of the late government $113,000. The figures I have been dealing with have been the figures which were used by the

government in its calculation as showing that as a proper deduction from those values, and in the case of university lands I am suggesting that the calculation has not been altogether fair to the Dominion. But there is a serious difference beyond what I have mentioned between the offer made by the late government in regard to the extension of the boundaries and the offer contained in this resolution. By the offer of the late government the province would receive $200,000 a year in cash with a certain increase in case of increase of population, and the province would retain its swamp and university lands. There was no returning of the property rights of the province in regard to these lands. So that, if we are to make a comparison, and I may be permitted to take a little time in making the comparison because we all know that these terms are going to be used as a political argument by our friends against the late government, it is fair and reasonable that a comparison should be made as between the offer of the late government and the resolution before this House in regard to that part of the subsidy relating to land. This offer is better in cash by $113,000 a year than the offer of the late government, but it is worse in land by the amount of some 7,000,000 acres of swamp lands. This swamp land is not all of saleable value at the present time, that of course must be admitted; but on the other hand there is no doubt that a very large proportion of it is of saleable value at the present time and I have no doubt that if the government of Manitoba had advertised that they had 7,000,000 acres of swamp lands for sale they could have found buyers who would have given them a cash price for that land of not less than $3 an acre. The province of Manitoba could have sold out their right to that 7,000,000 acres of swamp lands any time within the last two years at the prices they actually received for the three-quarters of a million acres or nearly a million acres they have already sold. I have said that there is no doubt that all possible deductions have been made from the value of the lands sold. The Dominion has evidently not been given any advantage in the calculation. Therefore the figures that are here are the figures of actual value of the swamp lands and the province, so far as swamp lands are concerned, stands in the position of getting under this arrangement $113,000 in cash as against the ownership of 7,000,000 acres of land worth $3 an acre or $21,000,000 at 5 per cent, a yearly value of $1,050,000 under the arrangement proposed by the late government. I am quite aware that those lands, although they represent value, are not cash but no person I think will argue that the cash value I have mentioned is not in those lands and, therefore, the position is as I have said that so far as the land is concerned the province is getting better terms than the Liberal government offered by $113,000 in cash and getting worse terms than the Liberal government offered by 7,000,000 acres of swamp lands, worth on a fair calculation $21,000,000 in capital sum or $1,000,000 a year in annual revenue.

Dealing with the question of swamp lands themselves and the principle on which they were first allotted to the province, I wish to again call to the attention of the Minister of Finance the fact that the multiplication table is not the only rule that governs values in this connection.

It must be assumed that when that arrangement was made with Manitoba, I think, in 1886, whereby all lands declared to be swamp lands by the Dominion government, should become the property of the province, the arrangement was arrived at for some good and sufficient reason, some reason that had to do with the well-being of the province and with the successful administration of its government. Every man who has lived in Manitoba, and I lived there, knows the reason why the swamp lands of Manitoba were handed over to the province by the Dominion. The provincial government is necessarily charged with the construction of public works, and necessarily drainage falls into the line of responsibility of the provincial government. Naturally, if there are settlers upon low lands within the province, these settlers will, from time to time, demand from the provincial government the drainage of these lands, or some action that will help the drainage of these lands. Inasmuch as we cannot drain private lands without draining the adjoining public lands, it will be a reasonable proposition that, as the province would have to incur large expenditures from time to time in order to drain lands that would be occupied by settlers, the lands which were swamp lands not occupied by settlers, but which would be benefited by these expenditures, should become the property of the province, so that the province might be able to recoup itself for the expenditures made on drainage. That was the principle upon which the action was taken. It was a sound principle, it was for the good of the province, both for the settlers of the province, and for the government of the province in carrying out its work of administration.

My hon. friends, in dealing with this question, as they are, in the resolution, ignore that condition altogether. They simply consider these swamp lands as something to be dealt with merely for the purpose of revenue. They have lost sight of the necessity of draining swamp lands in order to give them value. They have lost sight of the fact that if the provincial government is to do its duty, it must make

drains in order to relieve the settlers who are now on low lands and, with these swamp lands handed back to the Dominion, they will be spending provincial money for the purpose of giving value to Dominion lands, which is not a sound business proposition from the standpoint of the province, nor a sound business proposition from the standpoint of the Dominion, because it is reasonable to conclude that, if the province is not to get the value that is going to be given to these lands, by reason of the drainage, then the province is not going to incur the expenditure that it otherwise would incur and the lands are going to remain swamp a great deal longer than they otherwise would.

Mr. STAPLES. Why did not the hon. gentleman work along this line at the creation of Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) is worrying about. Conditions in Alberta and Saskatchewan are not the same as they are in Manitoba. In a large part of Alberta and Saskatchewan the trouble is to get water on the land, whereas, in a large part of Manitoba, the trouble is to get water off the land. That is the difference between the two conditions. Just as irrigation is an important question in parts of Alberta and Saskatchewan, drainage is an important question in a large part and a very valuable part of Manitoba.

I think the government of Manitoba, if I am permitted to criticise it, as well as this government, in this transaction whereby swamp lands are returned to the Dominion in consideration of a money payment, has made a mistake because this is not good business either for the province or for the Dominion, it does not tend to the development of the province and it does not tend to the progress of the Dominion.

As to the amount of money that is provided for in the last part of the resolution, a sum of $201,723 to be paid to the province in two annual payments, that is a small amount and it is not perhaps necessary to delay the committee in discussing it. So far as this resolution goes with regard to the increase of subsidy to the province of Manitoba, either on debt account or land account, I have no objection to it. I think the government are ill-advised in dealing with the debt account as they do. I think it would have been very much wiser, if it were desirable to increase the allowance to Manitoba, that the whole sum should have been put on land account and that the question of debt account should not have been raised. But, the government has seen fit to take the responsibility and, of course, it will have to take the consequences of what it has done. I am prepared to support the resolution so far as the debt account is concerned as a western man believing that the debt account of all the provinces should be subject to a readjustment with the increase of population just the same as the per head allowance and just the same as the allowance for civil government. If Manitoba is satisfied with the arrangement in regard to land account I have no reason to complain except in so far as the handing back of the swanp lands to this government will be a detriment to the development of the province, as I see it.

But, there is one feature of this resolution, as it is brought out in the speech of my hon. friend and as I find it in answer to the question which I placed on the order paper, that I must take very strong exception to. I refer to the arrearages which are paid there. I find that an arbitrary sum under the heading of arrearages, amounting to $2,179,000 is to be paid to the province of Manitoba aside from and over and above the increase of subsidy on debt account, the increase of subsidy on land account and the special allowance made in regard to buildings. It is not because the sum is very large, it is not that anybody would wish that Manitoba should not have that beyond the grant which it gets now, if it had a right to it, but the principle of this payment is, it seems to me, absolutely objectionable.

My hon. friend has said that the province of Manitoba has claimed the payment of these so-called arrearages from the date of the organization of the two new provinces, but the government compromised with the provinces by giving payment for one-half that period. Well, if the province of Manitoba is entitled to arrears for a period of three years, or, as they claim, for a period of six or seven years, why were not the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan entitled to arrearages upon their being organized into provinces, because of the subsidy payments that the adjoining province of Manitoba had received during the previous thirty years, as against the amount that had been paid in regard to these provinces. If the principle of arrears is good in one case, it is just as good in the other. But the fact is that there is no ground for it in either case. This proposition to pay a bulk sum of two million dollars to the province of Manitoba is not a proposition that can be justified on any ground of fair-play to any other province in the Dominion, nor can it be justified on any argument of the right of Manitoba to that payment. If I appreciate the meaning of the payment, it is, on the one hand to compensate the province for the loss of its swamp lands, to make the people of the province feel that because they are getting a great big bulk sum in cash, therefore they are getting a great deal the best of this bargain.

And particularly, that they are getting a much better bargain out of the present Conservative government than they were offered by the late Liberal government. Or, on the other hand, it is to stand in the place of the granting of the demand that was made by the opposition in the Manitoba legislature, and that has been made by a large number of the people of the province. That demand, as I understand it, was absolutely conceded and promised by the Prime Minister no later than last summer, namely, that the natural resources of the province would be handed over to the province. This appears to be a proposal to pay two million dollars in a bulk sum without justification, without rhyme or reason, to the province of Manitoba, and I can only conclude it is done for a purpose. The only purpose I can see in it is to make the people believe they are getting value in the case of the swamp lands and to keep them from complaining because the leader of this government, who is the maker of this bargain, has not in the bargain implemented the promise he definitely made only last summer.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I would ask the Prime Minister for a little information. I would be glad to know if the government of the province of Ontario has been consulted in regard to the proposed boundary line and has it assented to the line which is set out in the resolution in the amended form in which it was proposed this afternoon by the Prime Minister?

Mr. BORDEN. When we dispose of this resolution which is concerned purely with the financial terms and come to the Bill, I will give to my hon. friend information with regard to that. I would like to say to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and to other hon. gentlemen who have discussed this question at great length, that I do not want them to understand that I refrain from answering all the arguments they have addressed to the committee for any reason of discourtesy but because I realize these matters must be gone into probably at considerable length on the second reading of the Bill and when the Bill is in committee. It is purely with a desire of not repeating arguments and to save the time of the House that I refrain from going into all these matters now. I am very glad indeed that these gentlemen have put forward their views and they are certainly deserving of consideration and a reply, and they will be replied to in due course so far as we are able to. I would say one word in answer to my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) with regard to the restoration of their lands to the prairie provinces. I understand perfectly the promise I made in that regard and I want to assure my hon. friend that that promise will be carried out. But I want to tell him this: that I do not think it could have been carried out at this session, nor could the necessary consideration have been given to it, nor the necessary inquiry made. This question of extending the boundaries of Manitoba has been before parliament for a very long time and therefore it seemed to the government, whether rightly or wrongly, that the best course now was to put the province of Manitoba as nearly as might be in the position of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and then take up after due consideration, and upon proper inquiry, the question of restoring to all these three provinces their natural resources upon terms that would be just and reasonable. I would like to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that one of his own colleagues on that side of the House has raised an important question this afternoon, and has expressed views with which perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) may not be inclined to concur; namely, that when this question does come to be considered, some regard will have to be given to the claims of some other provinces in Canada and especially the three maritime provinces whose boundaries have not been increased, whose boundaries cannot very well be increased on account of their natural situation. That is a matter that will have to be taken up in connection with the handing over of their natural resources to the three prairie provinces. I would like my hon. friends from the maritime provinces to understand that that is a matter which has not escaped the attention of the government. But, I want to say that I realize the importance of getting through with this session as soon as may be after the very considerably large dose of politics we have had for the last eighteen months, and in that view we realize that it would be utterly impossible to deal with all these matters if we are to prorogue at a date when most hon. gentlemen of this House would like to be rid of political affairs for an interval.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would the government think of increasing the representation of the maritime provinces even if the number of sixty-five representatives was not increased in the province of Quebec?

Mr. BORDEN. For the time being I do not wish to be understood as dealing with the question of representation; I was dealing with the question of the financial terms. The point was very distinctly made by my hon. friend from St. John as to the necessity of some consideration being given to the other provinces in Canada, particularly the maritime provinces; because the provinces of Ontario and Quebec are getting an extension of their boundaries and are re-

ceiving the public lands within those boundaries, while the maritime provinces have no opportunity to extend their boundaries; and some considération must be given to the feeling on their part, that when the public domain of the western provinces, a very valuable public domain, is being taken into consideration, they have a right to be consulted and to have some voice in regard to it. All of us, I am sure, will agree that they should not be permitted to labour under any sense of injustice in that regard. The proposal before the committee, so far as Manitoba is concerned, is to retain the public domain in the Dominion and to take back that portion already handed over to Manitoba in the shape of swamp lands. At the same time, in connection with the extension of the boundaries of Ontario and Quebec, the public lands within the extended boundaries will naturally follow under the terms of the proposed resolution, the lands already within the existing boundaries of Ontario and Quebec, as indeed was the case in 1898 when the boundaries of the province of Quebec were extended by an Act of this parliament. If the resolution is permitted to pass, I will endeavour to give to my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) on the first reading of the Bill the information to which he has just alluded.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not want to continue the discussion, but it is rather important to those of us who represent Ontario constituencies to know whether the government of the province of Ontario has been consulted by this government in regard to the line which it is now proposed to lay down as the extended boundary line of Manitoba. The resolution upon the order paper was indefinite upon that point. As pointed out by the right hon. leader of the opposition, it did not show at what point the boundary line would strike Hudson bay; but in its amended form it is to a point on the shore of Hudson bay at or near the 89th parallel of longitude. That is a reasonably definite point, and, in view of the fact that the discussion this afternoon and this evening has been almost entirely upon the financial aspects of the question, I think it would be well to have it pointed out as clearly as possible to those hon. members who represent constituencies in the province of Ontario, that the line proposed as the extended boundary line of Manitoba is an absolutely arbitrary line, and reaches a point on the shores of Hudson bay below both of the ocean ports of Fort Churchill and Port Nelson. That is the point which I think we in Ontario are chiefly concerned about. It may be said that in July, 1908, this House unanimously adopted that line, and that I, as a member of the House, while I did not dissent, must have assented to the proposal. Well, if I did, I have certainly had more light upon the subject in the meantime, and I most emphatically dissent from the proposal at the present time. Now, the shore of Hudson bay, upon which both of these harbours are to be found, is in territory which should really belong to the province of Ontario and not to the province of Manitoba, if you go upon geographical lines. If you draw a merely arbitrary line, as is proposed in this resolution, you may give those ports to Manitoba. But the natural boundary line of the extended province of Manitoba would be a straight line northward, following, not the 89th parallel, but the 95th parallel of longitude up to the 60th parallel of latitude. If that were done, the province of Ontario would get the ocean ports on Hudson bay. I think that we from the province of Ontario should bear this in mind in this discussion. I have always understood that the government of the province of Ontario had contended, and would continue to contend, for those ports, or one of them at least, but I see no reason why both of them should not be in Ontario, and, with a representation of 86 members in this House, I should think that we ought to be able to hold for the province of Ontario one or both of these ocean ports.

Resolution as amended reported, and amendments agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 115) to provide for the Extension of the Boundaries of Manitoba. He said: I will proceed to give my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) the information he asked for a moment ago, as to whether or not the province of Ontario had been consulted with respect to the line which will constitute the eastern boundary line of the province of Manitoba and the western boundary line of the province of Ontario. I would say, in the first place, that before this administration assumed office, I understand that the province of Ontario was consulted, and I think the return already brought down to the House in connection with this matter will show that I am not mistaken in that regard.

I would also like to inform him that the province of Ontario has been consulted since the present administration took office; and so far as that is concerned every hon. gentleman in this House who has given any attention to this country knows that there was a difference in the views put forward by the province of Manitoba, and the views which were put forward by the province of Ontario in that connection, and particularly in regard to the question of ports on Hudson bay. Negotiations have gone on in regard

to that matter. The importance of a port on Hudson bay to the province of Ontario was this: That province at the present time owns and operates a railway known as the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway. It is anticipated that that railway will be extended still farther to the north, or to the north and west, and it is expected by the government of Ontario, as I understand it, that one day that railway may require an outlet on Hudson bay, and, therefore, a port. The boundaries of Manitoba, of Ontario, and of Quebec, we are presenting to the House to-day are those which were agreed upon unanimously by the House of Commons on the 13th July, 1908. Now, it is apparent that boundaries so agreed upon unanimously by both sides of the House, should not be departed from lightly by a succeeding administration, and so, after a good deal of negotiations and consideration of claims which had really been passed upon by the administration which the hon. gentleman supported—and I would like to observe that, as he himself has said, he is one of those that assented to the boundaries of Manitoba, of Ontario and of Quebec exactly as they are proposed by this Bill and the other Bills which are to be brought before the House later on—the question arose as to how Ontario might be granted a port on Hudson bay, because it was desirable in the interest not only of Ontario but of the province of Manitoba and of the Dominion of Canada as a whole, that if Ontario desired to extend its railway to Hudson bay it should be given every opportunity of doing so. That is to the advantage not only of Ontario but likewise of Manitoba, and every hon. member in this House, whether representing Ontario, Manitoba, or any other province, will agree at once in the truth of what I have just stated. It is apparent to every hon. gentleman that the lands within the extended boundaries of Manitoba are to be retained by the federal government, so it was suggested, and eventually the suggestion was carried out, that a grant of certain lands, within the ownership and control of the government of Canada, might be made to the province of Ontario sufficient for the purpose of extending the Ontario government railway to a port on Hudson bay if it should desire in future to adopt that policy. In that view the Governor in Council passed on the 20th of February an order in council, which I will lay upon the table of the House for the information of hon. members, couched in the following terms:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report from the right hon. the Prime Minister submitting,— in connection with the proposed extensions of the limits of the respective provinces of Ontario and Manitoba as defined by resolutions of the House of Commons passed on the July 13, 1908, —that the government of Ontario represents that upon the enlargement of the territory of the province as proposed it would or might be desirable in the interests of the province to extend the provincial railway, known as the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, at present in operation between North Bay and Cochrane in the said province to a suitable port on Hudson bay. That it may be found necessary or expedient to select for such Hudson bay terminus a point at or near the mouth of the Nelson river, and that as the estuary of the Nelson lies some distance westward of the proposed western or northwestern boundary of the province, the government desires that such arrangements be made as will enable the province, or such commission or public corporation as may be thereunto authorized on behalf of the province, to construct, maintain and operate that portion of the proposed extension of the said provincial railway which may be projected within the extended boundaries of the province of Manitoba for the purpose of reaching the terminus to be selected as aforesaid upon the waters of Hudson bay.

The prime minister states that he considers that reasonable provision should be made to give effect to this request on the part of Ontario in so far as it is within the authority of the government and parliament of Canada, and, therefore, recommends that:—

1. The government of Your Royal Highness be authorized to transfer to the government of Ontario or to a minister of that government or to a commission as may be authorized or required by the government of the province of Ontario on behalf of the province, in so far as the lands hereinafter mentioned or described shall be vested in His Majesty in the right of the Dominion.

(a) A parcel of land of a uniform width of five miles commencing at a point to be determined by the government of Ontario on the proposed eastern boundary of Manitoba, within fifty miles of the point of intersection of the said boundary with the shore line of Hudson bay, and extending from the said proposed eastern boundary of Manitoba to the Nelson river, but so that no portion of the said parcel of land shall be more than fifty miles in a direct line from the shore of Hudson bay; also such further parcels of land not exceeding in width one-half mile upon the east side of the said river extending up river or along the shore of Hudson bay as may be necessary to entitle the province to a continuous water front of ten miles upon the Nelson river and Hudson bay, including the water front which will lie within the parcel five miles in width just hereinbefore mentioned or described with such right, interest or easement in the river-bed upon the eastern side and the foreshore contiguous to the land so to be transferred, as may be necessary or reasonably required for the erection, maintenance and operation of docks, elevators, or other structures for the purposes of the said railway, provided, however, that the total combined frontage of the said two parcels of land upon Nelson river and Hudson bay shall not exceed ten miles.

(b) If the terminus of the Hudson Bay railway be established at Fort Churchill, and if the government of Ontario prefer to make Fort Churchill the terminus of their said railway, a right of way two hundred feet in width from any point on the Nelson river to the nearest available point on the Hudson Bay railway, so that the provincial railway may connect with the Hudson Bay railway at that point, Your Royal Highness' government in that event agreeing for running powers over the Hudson Bay railway.

2. Your Royal Highness' government undertake in the event of the extension of the said provincial railway beyond the limits of Ontario, to promote such legislation as may be necessary within the powers of the parliament of Canada, to authorize such extension and the construction, maintenance and operation of the railway within the province of Manitoba, with powers to construct and operate telegraph and telephone lines, docks, elevators or other structures of every kind, to develop and operate water-powers, and generally to do all things necessary or convenient for the operation of the said railway.

3. A period of five years be allowed to the government of Ontario within which to select and designate the said lands intended to be transferred as aforesaid, and to notify the location thereof to Your Royal Highness' government, and that this order shall cease to be effective if such location be not made and duly notified within the said period.

The Prime Minister further recommends that, if the government of Ontario assent to the foregoing recommendations the necessary legislation for the purpose of carrying them into effect shall be submitted to parliament as soon as practicable thereafter.

The committee, concurring herein, submit the same for approval.

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

I might say in addition, that I understand that an arrangement has been made between the government of Ontario and the government of Manitoba that if the railway shall be constructed along the strip of land which it is thus proposed to transfer to the province of Ontario for that purpose, the province of Manitoba will agree to exempt the railway and structures connected with it from provincial taxation. This land will, of course, be within the province of Manitoba and will be subject to the provincial legislation; but, so far as ownership is concerned, it will be in some corporation, public body or minister selected by the province of Ontario. And, so far as we understand, there is no constitutional difficulty in bringing that about, inasmuch as it is competent for the province of Ontario to own land in the province of Manitoba or any other province of the Dominion, just as it would be competent for Ontario to own land or buildings in the city of London or any part of the United Kingdom. Under the arrangement which is made it will be entirely competent for the province of Ontario, should the government of that province see fit to do so, to extend the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway to the shores of Hudson bay. And in doing so it will have the co-operation of this government, and not only of this government but, I believe, also of the government of Manitoba, because the government of that province realizes that the extension of a great railway like that to the shore of Hudson bay would be eminently in the interest not only of the province of Ontario but of the province of Manitoba as well.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not follow very closely what the Prime Minister said. Is the transfer of this land contingent upon railway construction, or is it contingent merely for railway construction?

Mr. BORDEN. It is to go to the province of Ontario for the purpose of railway construction if the province of Ontario determines to extend the railway to the shores of Hudson bay; and when the land is once located and transferred to the province of Ontario—which must be done within five years—it becomes absolutely vested in Ontario and is not contingent upon the construction of the railway.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It seems difficult at first sight to completely realize this arrangement as stated by my right hon. friend, and involved in the order in council which he has read to the House. But it seems to me an extraordinary jumble, one of the most extraordinary that ever came before parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. Might I remind the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that it is not permissible to debate a Bill on the first reading. Rule 49 is as follows:

> When any Bill is presented by a member, in pursuance of an order of the House, or is brought from the Senate, the question, 'That this Bill be now read a first time,' shall be decided without amendment or debate.

If I understand it correctly an explanation should take place on the proposal to introduce the Bill, but other discussion of a Bill does not take place on the first reading.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling. But I have seen, and so have you, again and again, discussion upon the first reading of a Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. I think the rule might be waived if the right hon. gentleman desires to make any observations.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to ask the unanimous consent of the House, because then it will not be establishing a precedent which might be inconvenient should it be necessary to enforce the rule in the future.

Mr. BORDEN. Carried.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have only to say, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation which was introduced by my right hon. friend seems to be of a most extraordinary character. There has been a difference of opinion, naturally, between the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba as to the location of the boundary line, each endeavouring to have the line extended as far as it could in its own favour. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Guthrie), has taken the view that the province of Ontario did not get its share. I have heard this idea before; and, having heard it, we of the late administration, thought it desirable to give a decision in which we took the side neither of Ontario nor of Manitoba, but looked at the matter only with a view to the Dominion at large, and concluded that the best division as between the provinces was to fix the 89th meridian of longitude; the territory to the west of that point to be given to the province of Manitoba, and that to the east to Ontario. But my right hon. friend takes out of what is given to Manitoba a strip of land ten miles wide and gives it to the province of Ontario.

Mr. BORDEN. Five miles wide.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, it matters little, whether five or ten miles. At all events, the province of Ontario is allowed under this arrangement to encroach upon the province of Manitoba to the extent of five miles.

Mr. BORDEN. My right hon. friend is mistaken. The grant is being made to the province of Ontario just as it might be made to any individual or corporation for the purposes of the construction of a railway, but the land is not the less within the boundaries of Manitoba. But, inasmuch as we are not handing over the Crown lands to the province of Manitoba but retaining control of them, and as Ontario desires a port on Hudson bay, we are granting to Ontario within the limits of Manitoba a right of way five miles in width from the eastern boundary of Manitoba to this port on Hudson bay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understood that. But I see a difference between making a grant to a province and to an individual. Any grant to an individual or company must become subject to the legislative power of the province in which the grant is made. In this case such a company would be subject to the jurisdiction of the law of Manitoba. Do I understand that the great province of Ontario is to be subject to the laws of Manitoba and to become liable to the serious obligation involved in this arrangement? My right hon. friend stated a moment ago that he proposed legislation to hand over the natural resources of the provinces to each of these provinces—though he said also that he was not going to give them to Manitoba—and he disposed of five miles of the resources of Manitoba in favour of Ontario. How Manitoba will be satisfied with that is more than I can say.

Mr. BORDEN. I can say that Manitoba is perfectly satisfied.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sure that the government of Manitoba is perfectly satisfactory. But the government of Manitoba is not exactly the people of Manitoba. The government of Manitoba will be satisfied with anything that the right hon. gentleman offers them; but that the people of Manitoba are satisfied, there may be some reason to doubt. At all events we shall have the new problem in the Dominion of Canada of the great province of Ontario—the banner province as it likes to style itself becoming subject to Manitoba. We have heard that there have been considerable difficulties between Mr. Roblin and Sir James Whitney. All that is done now,—Sir James Whitney becomes the subject to Mr. Roblin.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not think my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is very very well satisfied with this arrangement. But I should have thought so old a parliamentarian as he is might have concealed his disappointment much more cleverly than he has done. Under the circumstances, his heat, is very natural, and we are not at all disturbed by it.

For the extending of the Timiskaming & Northern Ontario railway through Manitoba territory these 5 miles have been set apart just in the same way as they might be set apart for any great railway corporation desiring to build a line through the province of Manitoba to a port on Hudson bay. It is to be expected that any province would welcome the construction of such a line if built by any of the railway corporations of this country and I do not know why Manitoba should not welcome the construction of such a line by the great sister province of Ontario. I believe Manitoba will welcome it. As to the difficulty with regard to jurisdiction, my right hon. friend perhaps forgets that the Intercolonial Railway of Canada, extends through the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and that the Canadian government has a very considerable mileage in Prince Edward Island. My right hon. friend knows that each one of those provinces has jurisdiction within the territory through which those lines of railway run, and I do not see any greater incongruity in the somewhat alarming picture which he endeavoured to draw, than there would be in having the Intercolonial railway of Canada, run through those four different provinces, and perhaps in the future through

other provinces of Canada. There will be no difficulty in working out the proposal, at least none is apprehended by those who have given it a great deal of consideration. It gives to Ontario a port on Hudson bay and if the Timiskaming & Northern Ontario railway should be constructed to that port, it would be an advantage not only to Ontario, which will thus secure the desired port, but to the province of Manitoba, and to every province of Canada that that should be brought about.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my right hon. friend think that under the British North America Act the province of Ontario could build a railway in another province?

Mr. BORDEN. I have not the slightest doubt that the province of Ontario can do it, and I have not a doubt that the province of Ontario will do it, will extend that railway to Hudson bay when that northern country is more fully developed than at present.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I understand my right hon. friend to say that the government of Manitoba was perfectly satisfied with the arrangement, but I did not understand him to say whether the government of Ontario had consented to it.

Mr. BORDEN. The government of Ontario has assented to this arrangement and the government of Manitoba has assented to this arrangement, and every one has assented to it, except my hon. friends on the other side of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand then that there is some correspondence which has not been brought down.

Mr. BORDEN. I think not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I found nothing in the correspondence brought down showing the consent of Ontario or Manitoba to this new arrangement.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not think there is any correspondence on the subject. The government of Ontario has been represented here by a member of that government, who came and consulted with us on the subject. The government of Manitoba was represented here also by two members of that government, who came and consulted with us on the same subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All this has been verbal then?

Mr. BORDEN. It has all been verbal, but none the less satisfactory.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do we understand that the title to the lands east of the boundary between Manitoba and Ontario is to go to the Ontario government or is it reserved to the Dominion?

Mr. BORDEN. In extending the boundaries of the province of Manitoba the Crown reserves, as was done in the case of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the title to the public domain which has not passed to private hands. Therefore the Crown, holding title to the public domain in the district indicated in the order in council, proposes to make a grant of a strip five miles in width from the eastern boundary of the province of Manitoba to the mouth of the Nelson river. The point at which that strip is to begin has not been precisely defined.

Mr. MACDONALD. I was asking in regard to the title of lands in what would be New Ontario; does the federal government exercise the title or is it given to the province?

Mr. BORDEN. It passes as the other lands within the province of Ontario. It is to be administered by the Crown on the advice of the government of Ontario.

Mr. MACDONALD. In the right of Ontario?

Mr. BORDEN. Of course, my hon. friend understands that there is never any transfer made in such cases because the land is vested in the Crown in the one case as much as in the other. The only question is by whose advice shall that land be administered, by the advice of the federal government or by the advice of the provincial government. This land, like the rest of the land within the limits of Ontario, will be administered by the Crown on the advice of the provincial government.

Mr. MACDONALD. And on the other side of Manitoba it will be administered by the federal government.

Mr. GERMAN. Who will have jurisdiction over these five miles? Will it be the Dominion government or the government of Ontario or the government of Manitoba?

Mr. BORDEN. It will be subject to the legislative jurisdiction of the province of Manitoba just as any other portion of land within the boundaries of that province.

Mr. GERMAN. Then will the hon. gentleman tell me who owns the land? Is it owned by Manitoba or Ontario or the Dominion government?

Mr. BORDEN. It never has been owned by Manitoba, it is at present owned by the federal government and as soon as this grant is passed it will be owned by the Ontario government.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). What considerations induced the government to establish the width of five miles for this right of way?

Mr. BORDEN. We gave consideration to it and concluded that five miles would be a convenient strip.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—MONTREAL CIRCUIT COURT.

Mr. BORDEN moved that the House go into committee of Supply.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it the intention of the government to appoint additional judges for the circuit court of Montreal? I see there is a great agitation in Montreal about this and I have tried since the beginning of the session to get an answer from the hon. gentleman. I notice that the members of the bar of Montreal are very insistent and many delegations have called on the hon. gentleman or at least many letters have been sent to him. Has he given a decision?

Mr. DOHERTY. I have not had any delegation nor have I had a large number of letters. I have had communications from a representative committee of the bar of Montreal upon the subject and, co-operating with that committee, I have given the very best consideration in my power to the problem presented in connection with the circuit court of Montreal and I have to thank that committee for having devoted a great deal of time and consideration to the subject.

That committee have agreed to a suggestion made by me, and I understand that the Prime Minister and Attorney General of the province to whom that suggestion was communicated has no objection to it. It has been agreed that it would be desirable, before proceeding to appoint the three additional judges who have been suggested for the circuit of Montreal, to endeavour, by selecting three judges from the rural districts in Quebec where there is the least work to be done, to dispose of the arrears that have accumulated in the circuit court. It is the intention of the government to ask the House to vote such additional funds as may be necessary to provide for any expense that may be incurred, and if the arrangement can be carried out it will place us in a position to start the present court with a clean sheet. If I mistake not, a measure has already been introduced into the Quebec legislature, intended to provide for the simplification in some respects of the procedure of the circuit court, with a view to enabling the court to deal with cases more expeditiously. It is hoped that if the circuit court is given an opportunity of starting with a clean sheet, and its operations are further facilitated by a simplification of procedure, at all events, in certain cases, it will prove possible to carry on its work without doubling the number of judges. The present idea is that there should not be any immediate increase in the number of judges, but that an endeavour should be made to ascertain whether the work can be satisfactorily carried on with the present number of judges. I may say that the hope I have that that may prove possible is not confined to myself. It is shared by the members of the Bar who, on the selection of their confreres, have been specially dealing with this matter of the business of the circuit court of Montreal. I may add further that I have had a conference with the present judges of the circuit court and they have expressed their satisfaction with this proposed arrangement and stated that, while they do not feel quite confident that even under this arrangement three judges will be sufficient, they do believe, after carefully going into the matter and coming to a conclusion, that once they are relieved of all these arrears and placed in the position that I have suggested, four judges will prove quite ample. In order to carry out this arrangement effectually, to obtain the results we desire, it will be necessary that we shall have the co-operation of the judges themselves, and they have expressed their perfect readiness to facilitate it and to co-operate with us. We need and I believe have further the good will of the members of the Bar and the sanction and approval of the government of Quebec. As I say, I have seen the communications between the Attorney General of Quebec and the committee of the Bar to which I have referred, in which that gentleman declares he has no objection to this endeavour being made to ascertain whether the problem that presents itself—and which, as I think everybody knows who knows anything about the administration of justice in Montreal is a serious problem—may not be more satisfactorily settled in this manner than it would be by merely appointing three additional judges to the circuit court and leave the matter in its present position. I would not like to give rise to any hopes that might later on be disappointed, but I think I may add that it is hoped that if this plan can be carried out, and if the circuit court can be carried on with the present number of judges, or only with four, possibly this House may look more favourably upon a proposition in future to increase the salaries of the judges of the court.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT CRYSTAL BEACH, ONTARIO.

Mr. GERMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply I wish to bring up a question which I referred to about two weeks ago when the

hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) was not in his seat. It is a fact that the Postmaster General has dismissed in the county of Welland a young man by the name of A. or E. W. Buck, postmaster at Crystal Beach, and he has appointed a United States citizen to his place named Rebstock. There is no reason why my friend, Mr. Buck, who has held the position for many years should have been dismissed. The Postmaster General has received, I know, a large petition signed in favour of that young man retaining the position. He was not a partisan, he is not a politician and he never took any part in politics. Why the hon. gentleman saw fit to dismiss him I cannot understand. There was a large petition in favour of him retaining the position as postmaster and retaining the post office in the building where it has been situated in the past. I would not object so seriously to the dismissal of this officer if the Postmaster General had not appointed a United States citizen to fill his place. After all the waving of the flag by hon. gentlemen opposite I cannot quite understand why the Postmaster General should dismiss a good strong healthy Canadian citizen who will wave the Union Jack and appoint a fellow who is a United States citizen and who waves the Stars and Stripes. If the Postmaster General can explain that satisfactorily to me I will submit, but I doubt if he can. I would ask the Postmaster General to reconsider his decision in regard to the matter. The hon. gentleman dismissed the postmaster at Bridgeburg and reappointed a good Conservative. I did not make any complaint about that because I had that man dismissed some years ago and appointed a new man in his place. Therefore, he has simply restored the status quo. I am not objecting to that particularly. I think he made a mistake there, but I do ask that the Postmaster General should reconsider his position in regard to the Crystal Beach postmaster and reinstate a young man of good ability, and good habits and a Canadian citizen who has taken no part in politics.

An hon. MEMBER. He is not a good citizen then.

Mr. GERMAN. Some one says he is not a good citizen if he does not take part in politics. If he does take part in politics he is dismissed—so what is he to do?

I would ask the Postmaster General to look into the question of the dismissal of this postmaster and if he has to appoint any person in lieu of the man whom he dismissed and who should not have been dismissed, let him appoint some man who will wave the Union Jack instead of the Star Spangled Banner.

Mr. PELLETIER. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) has stated that I reappointed a man whom he got dismissed without reason or investigation and the inference is that he admits he was wrong when he did that, and that I am right in making restitution. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) any remorse for having deprived this man of his office during fifteen years?

Mr. GERMAN. No, he is worth fifty thousand dollars, and he did not need it.

Mr. PELLETIER. Well, if it was his own money, that was no reason for his dismissal. The hon. member for Welland got him dismissed without reason or investigation.

Mr. GERMAN. There was an investigation, and there was a reason. He was an absolute partisan. He would not allow a Liberal poster to go into the post office; it was a public Tory committee room. That is why he was dismissed.

Mr. PELLETIER. But the hon. gentleman has told us that he had not much fault to find with the reappointment of the man who had been dismissed.

Mr. MACDONALD. What about Crystal Beach?

Mr. PELLETIER. One at a time. I will come to Crystal Beach in a moment. I am afraid my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) has forgotten the usual courtesy of giving notice to the minister that a certain question is to be brought up on going into Supply, so that the minister may have the papers with him. I have fourteen thousand postmasters, whom I carry in my heart, but not in my head, and I fear that I am not capable of picking out any one of these fourteen thousand postmasters and tell on the spur of the moment all about the case, when I have not received notice. If my hon. friend from Welland gives me notice, I will have the files here and I will be able to give him satisfaction. The hon. gentleman tells me that I have appointed a gentleman from the United States to be postmaster, but that is news to me. The hon. gentleman from Welland was strong against reciprocity at one time, but he has now joined the party which is keeping reciprocity as one of its platform planks.

Mr. GERMAN. No.

Mr. PELLETIER. Well, I will inquire if the gentleman who has been appointed is a United States citizen, and if he has not taken the oath of office as a British subject, we will have to see about it.

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

SUPPLY.

Interior Department—Immigration contingencies—Canadian and British and foreign agencies and general immigration expenses, $800,000.

Mr. GERMAN. I wish to call the attention of the minister to certain regulations of his department which, in my opinion, operate very unjustly. The regulation now is that, if a foreigner starts for Canada he cannot remain in any intervening country, say the United States, for a week or two, and then come into Canada. This is a very serious matter, and I would like the minister to consider it. . I shall give one instance as an example of what is happening continually. About two years ago the Ontario Iron and Steel company employed a foreman from Pittsburg who was an expert iron worker. He had worked in the Pittsburg mills for several years, he had never become a United States citizen, he being a Swede. He came to Welland and he had to put up seventy dollars as security that he would go back to the United States within thirty days.

This man stayed for thirty days. He had to go back or lose his $70. He could not stay in Canada unless he was a United States citizen. That is happening continually. There are good men, who would make excellent citizens of Canada, who have come from a foreign country and have lived in the United States for a year or two or three years; they have not become naturalized as citizens of the United States, and they cannot come into Canada and stay here. This is the most absurd problem in connection with the immigration matters that is confronting the Minister of the Interior at this moment. I have talked it over with the chief immigration officer, Mr. Scott, and he sees the difficulty. The only way out of it that I can see is to allow the immigration officers some degree of discretion in the matter, if you have the right kind of officers, as you have in Welland, because I saw that they were appointed. Make the regulations more elastic and give the officers some sort of discretion. This is not the first time that I have called this hard and fast rule to the attention of the Minister of the Interior. I called it to the attention of the former Minister of the Interior. I hope that the present minister will see some way of getting over a very serious difficulty that stands in the way of our getting first-class settlers into Canada.

Mr. PARDEE. I want to supplement the remarks which my hon. friend from Welland has just made. I can understand that, with the hard and fast regulations which the United States has against us, there should be something along the same line in Canada. But it does seem ridiculous that persons coming from one part of Canada through the United States to another part of Canada, should, under the regulations of the Immigration Department, be disturbed and put to the trouble of proving exactly who and what they are, and going through a course of sprouts which, if nothing else, is humiliating to the person who is subjected to this treatment. A short time ago I brought to the attention of the minister a case in which an officer, acting entirely in accordance with a memorial that had been sent out a day or two previously, had stopped a person who had come from Winnipeg, had passed through the United States, and was coming to Sarnia, and had almost turned him back because some slight part of the regulations promulgated by the department had not been lived up to. Having regard to the regulations of the United States in regard to our workmen going into their country, I think we should have as high a wall against them as they have against us; but when you have a set of officers, as you have on the border, who are above the ordinary intelligence, and who realize that they hold a more or less delicate office, in which a mistake on their part might lead to trouble between us and the United States, I think the minister should allow them to a certain extent to use their discretion. In some of the smaller centres, it is necessary at certain times to bring in labourers to perform local work, and in those cases I think the immigration officers ought to have power for a certain length of time to allow labourers to come in, in order that not only public works, but private enterprise, should not be kept back. I think it would be well that both the Department of the Interior and the Department of Labour should take this matter up, and see if the immigration regulations cannot be so framed that they will work more smoothly with regard to people who come to Canada with the intention of becoming good citizens and helping the country along.

Mr. ROGERS. I appreciate the force of the argument made by my hon. friend from Welland and my hon. friend from West Lambton; but I am free to confess that I am not sufficiently conversant with the regulations to give the hon. gentlemen an answer off-hand. While the regulations may entail a certain amount of hardship, I am sure that they were not adopted without some good and sufficient reason in the judgment of the department. I shall be glad, however, to take the matter up at the very earliest opportunity with the officers of the department, and see if some modifications along the lines suggested,

consistent with safety to the administration of this very delicate matter, cannot be made in the regulations.

Mr. GERMAN. I do not wish to criticise for a moment the administration of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers), I do feel more like criticising the administration of his predecessor, because I took the matter up with him, and wanted him to do something but I could not get him to act. All I want is that the present minister will take this matter into consideration and decide upon some beneficial action. This situation, as I understand it was created in order to keep the Hindus out of British Columbia. But that does not apply here. This is a grievance which must be remedied, and it will be remedied, I am quite sure, by the minister.

Mr. BEATTIE. I think these troubles are largely caused by want of judgment on the part of the officer. A case came under my notice the other day where a lady who had lived all her life in a Canadian town along side the border paid a visit to the United States. On returning to Canada she was stopped by an officer who would not allow her to pass. Fortunately there was another officer present who knew this lady, and so she was allowed to proceed. She was a very respectable, well dressed lady, and there was no reason whatever for the indignity to which she was exposed. The trouble is that a lot of messengers have been taken out of this House and appointed to positions on the border. I think if good officers were appointed there would be no trouble whatever. It is simply due to the stupid officers that were appointed by the late gouvernment.

Mr. PARDEE. I do not at all agree with my hon. friend from London, in the remarks which he has made concerning the officers. It is not at all, in my opinion, a question of the fitness of the officers, but the responsibility lies with the regulations which have been made in the past, due perhaps to certain exigencies which arose. From my experience, which has been very considerable, along the border, the officers have been men above the ordinary intelligence, but they have simply done these things from a desire to live up to the regulations, and thought they were only carrying out their duty in that regard.

Mr. BEATTIE. Do you consider a man is fit for such a position if he refuses to admit to Canada a respectable lady who lives here?

Mr. PARDEE. The officers have to act according to the regulations.

Mr. BEATTIE. I do not think such conduct is the indication of intelligence on the part if the officer.

Mr. GERMAN. I cannot allow the statement of the hon. member for London to go uncontradicted, because I know these officers, I realise that they would like to use a certain amount of discretion, and discrimination, but they are tied down hard and fast by the regulations, and as I have already said I tried to get the ex-Minister of the Interior to change them, but he would not do it, and he deserved to be turned out I think. I hope the present minister will do better and make these regulations more elastic so that the officers in whom he has confidence may exercise some discretionary power.

An hon. MEMBER. If they do not give efficient service put them out.

Mr. GERMAN. I do not think the minister should take such an extreme course in the case of officers who are intelligent and efficient. Let these officers have some power of discretion, and let the regulations be sufficiently elastic so that an intelligent immigration officer can admit a foreigner possessed of means, who is on his way from the United States into Canada. Under the regulations at present the officer cannot do that.

Mr. LALOR. I agree with the arguments presented by the member for Welland (Mr. German) and the member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee). Undoubtedly a great many very objectionable cases occur at present in connection with the officers questioning people who are coming into Canada. Only last Saturday I was coming across the border and saw a poor woman being stopped, and one time I was afraid she was going to be put off the train by the officer. It turned out afterwards that although she could not speak very good English she lived a short distance from the border at a village called Sherkston, where she lived with her family. I believe these officers are painstaking and careful and do anything they possibly can to assist immigrants, and it may be the regulations are too strict. But at the same time I call attention to the fact that these troubles do not all exist on the Canadian side. I live close to the border, as my hon. friend from Welland does, and travel backwards and forwards to Buffalo very often, and I think he will agree with me that we see more objectionable cases on the American than on the Canadian side.

Mr. GERMAN. That is quite right.

Mr. LALOR. If some international arrangement could be made between Canada and the United States under which there could be a change in the regulations with respect to people who have to cross backwards and forwards, it would be a

great advantage, because I have seen cases of very great hardship. I know the case of a respectable young lady, whose father lives in my own town. She was taken off a train on the way to visit her sister and had it not been for my intercession she would have been detained and not allowed to proceed. These cases occur on both sides of the line, but by means of an international arrangement there might be some beneficial relaxation of the regulations as regards people travelling both to the United States and to Canada.

Mr. BELAND. I would like to call the minister's attention to the fact that some of the officers in the port of Sherbrooke are not very conversant with the French language. Trains of the Boston and Maine and Grand Trunk railways enter Canada through to Sherbrooke from all points in New England. The New England states are inhabited largely, as you know, by French population, and during the summer months their relatives in the eastern townships go down to visit them. Sometimes aged relatives go there and spend a few weeks, but when they return home they experience a good deal of trouble. I have a case in mind which happened last summer of an old French settler returning from a visit to his son in the state of Maine, but who was turned back at a point below Sherbrooke and had to go back to his son before he could get home. These cases are quite frequent. I would impress the minister with the necessity that all immigration and customs officers, for instance, in eastern townships, should be thoroughly conversant with both languages. I think that it is a fair request to make to the minister who knows the importance of the French language as he speaks it very well himself.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not know who the officers are at Sherbrooke, and I am not conversant with the conditions to which he refers. But I certainly can appreciate the point that it would be very advisable that the officers in charge should speak both languages. I shall be very glad indeed to see if we cannot arrange that at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MICHAUD. Living as I do near the border, between the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine, I am in a position to know that Americans are dealt with very fairly by our people. They are allowed to come with their teams or to walk across the boundary line, and our immigration agents are very considerate in dealing with these visitors. But it is entirely different when we go to the other side. At St. Leonard when an international bridge was under construction I went there to see the work. I crossed on the ferry, and when I landed on the American side I had to give a long account of myself to the United States immigration officer before I was allowed to proceed. I explained that I wished to stay there for only about ten minutes, but he told me that I must give my pedigree or he would not allow me to cross. Other Canadians there have had a similar experience. Canadians walking or driving to the other side of the line have to give an account of themselves. If a man has his wife with him, he has to give an account for her; if they have children with them, it must be explained to whom the children belong. It is very annoying to our New Brunswickers. If the minister could bring about arrangements under which people from our side could be allowed to drive or walk across on telling the immigration officer their names and what they are going for, it would be an advantage to many of our people.

Mr. McKENZIE. This will probably be my only opportunity to bring to the attention of the minister the facts with regard to a matter of importance to the people I represent. There is an agent of the Department of Immigration at the port of North Sydney, and quite a number of immigrants from the other side of the Atlantic arrive at that place. But in case of those who are sick a different situation arises from that at Halifax or Montreal. The immigrant from Liverpool goes direct to Halifax, and he can be sent back, I presume, if the officers deem that course proper. But immigrants coming to the port of North Sydney generally come from St. John's, Newfoundland. Restrictions upon immigration such as are known here are not in force in Newfoundland. Immigrants land in Newfoundland whose real destination is Canada.

After staying in Newfoundland for as long as they please, they take the train from St. John's to Port aux Basques thence cross in the steamer 'Bruce' to North Sydney. It often happens that immigrants arrive there suffering from trachoma. The immigration officer at North Sydney is not in a position to send them back to the old country, because they do not come to North Sydney from the old country, but from Newfoundland. The only thing he can do, is to send them back to Newfoundland. But to send an immigrant to Port aux Basques is to send him to a place where there are no hospitals, and where he cannot get treatment. Sometimes cases arrive involving no little distress. A wife may arrive with her children to join the husband and father, who may have been in Canada for years preparing a home for them. But if one of them has trachoma, they may all have to be sent back to Newfoundland, and the husband,

though a Canadian citizen, can do nothing for them. But at North Sydney we have excellent doctors, and two excellent hospitals, one at North Sydney and one a mile and a half further down, with a tramway from the terminal wharf to both hospitals. If the regulations permitted it, we could treat these people on the spot. If it turned out, after a fair term of treatment that a cure could not be effected, the immigrant might then be deported. But in some cases those sent to Newfoundland afterwards find their way into Canada without complying with the regulations. These people are mostly Assyrians. Many of them are already in Canada. We find them honest, industrious citizens, willing to do any work that comes their way. All I ask is that these people should be put on the same footing as Europeans in regard to this matter. We are anxious to have them in Nova Scotia, for we need people to work in our mines or about our steel works, and we find these are good people. I hope the minister will give this matter consideration and place these Assyrians on the same footing as Europeans coming into Canada.

Mr. ROGERS. The point the hon. gentleman raises is a rather important one. Some of the hon. members who have participated in the discussion this evening have pointed out the difficulties in connection with immigrants coming from the United States. It is true, we need to have fairly close regulations to prevent people coming in who are undesirable. And I understand that some attempt has been practised in connection with their finding their way around through Newfoundland to avoid certain regulations they would meet if entering by other ports.

For that reason the point raised by my hon. friend is rather a difficult one but the chief officer of the department is present and has heard what my hon. friend has said; it will have very careful consideration in order, if possible, to remedy the trouble and remain consistent with our rules and regulations. I understand we have a doctor at North Sydney who looks after any person coming in who requires medical attendance.

Mr. McKENZIE. He is not permitted to treat them?

Mr. BELAND. Why?

Mr. ROGERS. He is permitted to examine and see what is the matter and if there is nothing serious the matter he passes them on to some other doctor.

Mr. McKENZIE. If he finds they have trachoma he is not permitted to treat them but must send them out of the country.

Mr. ROGERS. In that case I understand he returns them to Newfoundland.

Mr. McKENZIE. And they cannot get treatment where they are sent.

Mr. ROGERS. That is unfortunate for them. However, it is a matter that is worth looking into.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. In the early part of the session I made some suggestions in regard to improving the immigration system and I hope the minister will be able to say to-night that he has adopted those suggestions. One of them was that the inspection should take place before the immigrants go on board the vessels.

Mr. ROGERS. There is reasonable precaution taken in that way in view of the fact that all immigrants are examined by the ship's doctors and by the board of trade doctors before they are allowed to take passage for Canada. In that way the department feels they are fairly well protected. Less than 1 per cent of the immigrants have been returned.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If the same care was taken in inspecting them before they embark at Liverpool, the trachoma would be discovered there and that would relieve the troubles we are experiencing at Montreal. The expense would be great but surely it is worth while to go to any expense. The introduction of cholera to this country some years ago was owing to lack of inspection on the other side.

Mr. ROGERS. When we looked into this matter we found that the question arose whether we had authority to undertake the inspection on the other side. The cases of trachoma that have been reported are very few.

Mr. BELAND. Has the department immigration hospitals in St. John and Halifax?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). In granting aid to the provinces in the matter of immigration, does the minister intend to vote money directly to each province to supplement expenditures made by the provinces for immigration work, or will the aid merely be limited to the payment of salaries of persons named by the provincial governments to attend to immigration work in England?

Mr. ROGERS. It would not be wise for the government to make a direct grant, because you have to keep control of your whole machinery to make it as effective as it should be. We are suggesting to the provinces that we are prepared to carry out any reasonable policy that they will recommend that will be in keeping with that effort to improve, if possible, the conditions of the different provinces, and we

shall endeavour to circulate literature that in consultation with them we will agree upon as being the most desirable for each province.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that one office is occupied by the provincial and federal immigration branch at Toronto. Where is the office, and who pays the rent?

Mr. ROGERS. The office is in the Union station and we pay the rent.

Mr. OLIVER. I am interested in this matter of immigration work, especially in the project of co-operation with the provinces which my hon. friend has put forward as the leading feature of his immigration policy. What is the intention in regard to the number of provincial agents to be appointed and paid by the Dominion, and are these agents to be nominated by the provincial governments?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not know that we have any special rules as to nomination of officers. We have not accepted any nominations or asked any government to nominate any special officer, but we have asked them to give us all the information they possibly can. I thought we ought to have about two agents for each province to work up this matter of co-operation and work together. That was the suggestion with relation to the maritime provinces, which, with Ontario, have taken the most active interest in the plan.

The work in the prairie provinces has been pretty actively canvassed and in so far as the western country is concerned my hon. friend quite understands that we will give it every possible attention in order to continue as aggressively as we possibly can the policy in that direction in co-operation with the provinces, or in any other form that will be best calculated to bring in all the immigrants that we can secure.

Mr. BELAND. Will the agents be sent abroad or will they remain in Canada?

Mr. ROGERS. That is a point in regard to which we will take advice from the provinces concerned and we will be guided by their judgment.

Mr. OLIVER. Will this force of provincial agents be in addition to the Dominion force that is now at work in Europe?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, it is extra over and above the officers now engaged.

Mr. OLIVER. That would mean the addition of eighteen salaried agents to the staff at work in England and on the continent?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, two for each province.

Mr. OLIVER. It would be a very important addition to the cost of the Immigration Department and I will risk the expression of the idea that the expenditure of such a large sum as would be necessary under that proposal with the special view of introducing legislation into the eastern provinces where there is no free land, nor the same opportunity as there is in the prairie provinces, will certainly not produce the same result to the Dominion as like effort or like expense would if directed towards the prairie provinces where the opportunities at present exist.

Mr. ROGERS. I can appreciate what my hon. friend says in respect of the western provinces and their possibilities. At the same time we must all realize the feeling that exists in the maritime provinces with respect to the matter of immigration. They have certainly not received much attention in this regard. In the province of New Brunswick they have adopted a very aggressive policy involving the purchasing of considerable tracts of land and dividing it up something in the form suggested by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) when he was discussing the same thing in respect to the province of Nova Scotia. I certainly think it is worth while for the department to lend what assistance they can to the provinces which are so desirous to secure immigration and which are putting forth such an effort as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are. We would be failing in our duty in administering the immigration work of this country if we did not lend that assistance that their energies appear to entitle them to. If it does not turn out as they expect it would be their misfortune and we would be very sorry but at the same time they have possibilities that entitle them to the consideration that we are suggesting.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). When Mr. Hawkes was in the maritime provinces conferring with the governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in connection with immigration matters, a suggestion was made to him by the Secretary of Immigration for the government of Nova Scotia as a means of inducing immigration. There was brought to his attention the idea of organizing a corporation sufficiently strong to purchase a great area of vacant or abandoned farming lands in that province and to help along intending settlers who might eventually determine to locate on this land. I think I mentioned this suggestion to the minister during the debate on the resolution of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes). I know that such a thing is now receiving the consideration of some people in Nova Scotia with the view of organizing a company for that purpose. I would like to inquire of the minister if he would consider it a prac-

tical thing from his view point to aid a corporation of that kind in some form or another, such as a guarantee of interest upon bonds, or the payment of a subsidy according to the results, and if it would be possible to enter into any contract with the department. That suggestion has been made, I know, to the Department of the Interior by the government of Nova Scotia. Possibly the minister has not had an opportunity of seeing it or of giving it consideration. I would like to know if any suggestion in that form would be apt to meet with the favour of the minister?

Mr. ROGERS. I have not seen or heard of a proposition of that kind as coming from the government or as a suggestion in the department up to the present time. I would rather fear that the suggestion might be surrounded with a certain amount of difficulty in connection with the department being a party to any undertaking of this kind which might be regarded as speculative in its nature. I would want to have that matter very carefully considered before I would venture to make my hon. friend anything like a definite answer. I have not heard of it yet and I have not had under consideration the representations which he said have been made to the department.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I think they were made to Mr. Hawkes, as a matter of fact.

Mr. OLIVER. In the case of agents who will specially represent the various provinces, are they selected by the provincial governments or will they be selected by the Immigration Department?

Mr. ROGERS. We propose to consult every government and agree with them as to what agent we will select and as to who will be a desirable and useful man as publicity man for the province that he represents. We propose to invite every government to give us their advice and join in the recommendation of the man who will be useful to carry on the work.

Mr. OLIVER. As a matter of fact the federal government will actually engage the man and pay him?

Mr. ROGERS. That is right.

Mr. OLIVER. And he will actually be under the federal government's supervision from start to finish?

Mr. ROGERS. That is right.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to know if the $50 as laid down in the regulations is in force during this season?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, until the end of this month. The money qualification for immigrants other than Asiatics is $50 from the 1st of November to the 1st of March and $25 from the 1st March to the end of October, just the same as it has been.

Mr. OLIVER. When the estimates were up before I made an inquiry in regard to the closing of offices in Great Britain and I was informed that none had been closed. Have there been any changes in England?

Mr. ROGERS. No changes.

Mr. OLIVER. And the same on the continent?

Mr. ROGERS. No change either.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Has the Boston office been opened?

Mr. ROGERS. No, but we hope to open it on the 1st of March.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Who are the officials to be appointed?

Mr. ROGERS. They have not been named yet.

Mr. OLIVER. I have been informed that the immigration agent at Edmonton has been dismissed.

Mr. ROGERS. What is his name?

Mr. OLIVER. Webster. I would be glad to know what was the reason of his dismissal.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not remember the case now, but I will supply the information to the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Webster was a gentleman of very considerable standing in the community when he was appointed, and I believe he was a very competent agent. Mr. Webster was a Liberal, but I am well aware there were no grounds for his dismissal because of partisanship. He certainly did not show any partisanship during the recent election. I am therefore, entirely at a loss to understand on what ground he has been dismissed. I want to place on record the facts in connection with the appointment of the man put in his place. I understand that the man who is to be appointed is one W. H. Clegg, who was president of the Conservative Association in Edmonton during the last election, and who was a party to an attempt to discredit me in the elections by giving an order for the manufacture of a ballot box which was put before the public as having been made in my interest, and improperly made for the purpose of misdirecting the results of the election. This is the man who has been appointed in Mr. Webster's place, and I must say that I do not think the appointment reflects any credit upon the minister or upon the department.

Mr. ROGERS. I am very sorry to learn the information which my hon. friend has imparted to the House. I will have the matter looked into and if the information

is well founded I will deal with it in the proper manner.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some years ago there were appointed in different towns and villages of Ontario a number of agents whose duty was supposed to be to bring in farm hands or domestic servants, and some of these agents were very active and some of them did little or nothing. They were paid at the rate of two dollars per head for each farm hand or domestic they induced to come into the country. Now, in my view these agents have not been a very great success, to say the least of it, and I wish to know if it is intended to continue them.

Mr. ROGERS. The returns for last year show that 4,224 males, 2,144 females and 157 children were distributed by these agents, in the province of Ontario. We have about seventy-five of these agents and the amount paid them last year was $5,152. I discussed this question with Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, a short time ago, and although he is thoroughly informed in matters of this kind, he was not in a position to say definitely and off-hand whether, in his judgment, it was a wise thing to discontinue the agents. He is making inquiries into the matter, and we expect to hear from him in the near future, when I shall be glad to communicate his views to my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Judging from the fact that $5,152 was paid to these local distributing agents in Ontario last year, it would seem that 2,576 farm hands and domestics were placed by them in the province. A return brought down to the House some time ago shows that about two hundred and fifty of these agents were appointed throughout Ontario in 1907 and that the number has been reduced from year to year until last year there were eighty-eight. The demand of western Canada has drawn heavily on some of the oldest and best agricultural counties in the province of Ontario, and consequently there has been in some of these counties quite a decrease in the population. In my opinion, these local distributing agents have proven nothing less than an absolute failure in carrying out the business for which they were supposed to be appointed. The fact is that many of the Ontario counties which are most in need of people have not received one man or one woman through these agencies during the past two years. During the last ten years there has been a decrease of 3,476 in the population of the county of Dufferin, and not one person was placed in that county in the last two years by these agents. The same remark applies to Lennox and Addington, where there has been a decrease of 2,965.

In the county of Prince Edward, the population is less now by 714 than it was ten years ago, and not a single person was placed in that county through the medium of these local agents. In the county of Lambton, where the population in ten years has decreased by 5,380, there was just one person placed there by the local agency last year and nine in the year 1910. I do not believe there is any excuse for continuing a system of that kind, which in my opinion was devised for no other than political purposes. The province of Ontario has given liberally of its people to meet the demand of western Canada, and, Sir, it is the duty of this government to see that justice is done to that province with respect to this question. You may talk as you please about the demands of the maritime provinces and of western Canada, but, if this heavy drain on Ontario is continued, disaster will overtake the province, there is, in my opinion, danger of opening and developing the west more rapidly than the circumstances appertaining to the whole country would justify.

According to a return brought down there were 4,177 people placed by these agents in Ontario in the last two years. In twenty-one counties there were 1,450 people placed; yet in one county alone there were placed more than half of that number or 767, leaving 683 for the other twenty counties. Surely nobody can defend such a system as that; there is no equality or right of justice in it. Many of these counties are so handicapped to-day by the labour situation that many of the farms are not producing one half what they otherwise would do, and are used for grazing purposes because of the lack of labour. For instance, the county of Lambton received only ten men in two years, and yet, notwithstanding the increase of the towns and cities, it has fallen off in population 5,380 in ten years. The county of Oxford showed a falling off of 1,032 people in ten years, yet it received only 125 in two years. Prescott received only 5 last year and none in 1910. The county of Durham received none in 1910 and four in 1911; yet there is a falling off there of 1,555. Middlesex received six in 1910 and 15 in 1911, and shows a falling off of 4,285. The census returns show an alarming condition of affairs in the province of Ontario, and the absolute necessity of the government seeing that something is done to meet the conditions that have arisen in that province.

A few days ago I urged on the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he was putting the grain Bill through, to do something to offset the spread of noxious weeds in the province of Ontario and provide for the destruction of weed seeds in screenings at the elevators, and thus prevent them being fed on the farms.

The absence of farm labour and the spread of noxious weeds in Ontario demand the consideration of the government. I do not believe that this government can afford to place the responsibility on any other shoulders than their own. I do not think they can depute their responsibilities to the provincial government or to any one else. I believe it is their first duty to see that in the older provinces that are annually denuded of farm labourers by the excursions to western Canada to harvest the crops there, that something is done to meet the conditions that exist, as a result of the policy that has been in force for many years. I do not object to these people going to western Canada. We are glad to have our people go and settle in that country; but I believe that the previous government lost sight of the fact that it was their duty to see that other people took their places in the older provinces, where they would find the conditions more congenial and the training they would receive such as better to equip them for their experience in the newer country. I am glad the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has brought up the matter of the local distributing agents in Ontario. Any one who knows the circumstances of their appointment and the manner in which they have discharged their duties knows that they have not been satisfactory. I understand that they were to receive applications from farmers and forward them to the superintendent of immigration to Ottawa, who was to send them to government agents in the old land and they to the boking agent there. This would entail a delay of several months before the farmers could be supplied. That policy has proven so unsatisfactory that very few of the booking agents to-day care to have men sent out in that way. I believe it is the duty of the government to see that there is a labour bureau establishment in every province of Canada, and that the booking agents in the old country are kept in touch with the conditions here. The labour bureau would receive applications from the farmers, and the immigration authorities would have absolute knowledge of the conditions in this country, and would see that men were sent out and placed by the bureau which would be in direct touch with farmers. I know as a matter of fact that at the present time the provincial department of immigration in Ontario has about 800 applications for men; yet we have in force a regulation preventing immigrants from coming here between the months of November and March unless they have $50 in their possession. As far as Ontario is concerned, I do not think it is advisable to enforce these regulations. particularly in face of the conditions that exist in this province at the present time. In 21 of the very best counties of the province of Ontario, there has been a falling off in the population of 56,352 people, and the farmers are handicapped by the lack of farm labourers. There is a great outcry in the newspapers that the farmers of Canada are not producing enough to meet the requirements of the people. Why do we devote all our energies to the growing of wheat for the people of Europe, and fail to look after conditions in our own country, and to see that we do not have to import butter from Australia and New Zealand and eggs from Kansas and potatoes from Ireland as at present. Our friends opposite were very anxious a few months ago that reciprocity should be adopted, not for the relief of the farmer but for the relief of the consumer; but if they had done their duty by the older provinces, the conditions that are in existence here would not be in existence. I would therefore earnestly urge the minister to see that different methods are adopted, and that the province of Ontario receives at least equal treatment to that extended to the other provinces, and to see that the whole energy of the government is not devoted to western Canada as it has been heretofore.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman please inform the minister and the House, if he can, how emigration from the older provinces can be prevented?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know that it can be prevented or that it would be advisable to attempt to prevent it. I believe that in the west, with the opening up of new territory and the building of railways, there is a considerable spirit of speculation.

The rapid increase in the values of land is going to attract people there. The young men of the older provinces are bound to go out there, and you cannot blame them. They can get a homestead there, which is going to be worth by the time they obtain their patent, $10, $15, $20 or $25 per acre. Is it any wonder that the people are flocking to the west? But here are the conditions in Ontario: We have the demand for labour and there are splendid opportunities for farm labourers on our farm lands. After they have been here for a number of years and become acquainted with our methods of farming, they are better qualified to succeed in the west if they wish to go there.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). I have heard it stated—I do not know whether it is correct or not, or to what degree it is correct—that it was the practice some time ago in the province of Ontario to secure farm labour, employ that labour for a few months during the summer, and when the crops were all harvested, to permit that labour to go away. If that is true it is a very unfair and unjust thing to Ontario or any other province.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may tell the hon. gentleman that that statement is not correct. I have been connected with immigration work in the province of Ontario for nearly three years and at no month in the year have we been able to supply the demand for farm labourers in that province. That may seem unreasonable. A few years ago there were people in the city of Toronto clamouring for assistance from the city authorities, yet those people would not go and work on a farm, although there was an abundance of such work to be had. If they were not qualified for farm work they would not be of any use on a farm. There are applications on the books of the Department of Immigration at Toronto, as I said a few minutes ago, to the number of upwards of 800, at the present time. Many of these applicants are asking for married men by the year, undertaking to provide them with houses, offering wages of at least $300 or $350 and more per year, and free fuel, free milk, a garden and other things. There is in the old country an abundance of such labour to be had. Last year the Ontario government advanced upwards of $25,000 to assist farm laborers and domestic servants to come out here, and place them on farms in Ontario, the provincial government is still pursuing that policy. Why should they be compelled to do that? Is it not the duty of the federal authorities to see that that is done, and to see that these demands are met, thus freeing the provincial governments from the necessity of entering on work of that kind? I may say that two years ago I was compelled to cable to a booking agent of the old country because the Dominion regulations were so strictly enforced by the late government as to prevent a number of men accepted by an Ontario government agent from coming out here and assure them of employment. I was told that the booking agents had been threatened with the loss of the bonus which was paid to them if they continued to send immigrants to the provincial authorities and not to the local distributing agents. But notwithstanding that, we find from the return brought down, that many of the best counties, counties that are most in need of men, are not getting one single man through the medium of the machinery which has been in existence in Canada for many years past.

Mr. LALOR. Does the Ontario government or the federal government conduct any system of assisted immigration, or do immigrants coming out to Canada for employment have to pay their own fares?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The provincial government has been advancing $20 towards paying the fare of each farm labourer that came here.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax).

Mr. LALOR. I have had some little experience in regard to importation from the old country, not of farm labour, but of a different class of labour, and I must say that assisted immigration has been, so far as my experience is concerned, a failure. I have paid out a good deal of money for assisted immigration in connection with institutions with which I am interested, and I do not think I would be very far astray in saying that in nine cases out of ten these immigrants jumped their bonds, beat us out of the money, and proved very poor labour indeed. Therefore, I am not a very strong advocate of assisted immigration. I believe the proper class of immigrants to come to this country are men that will pay their own way. They will make better help and be more dependent on their exertions than immigrants who are assisted by benevolent or manufacturing institutions, or by the government, be it provincial or Dominion. My experience has been that assisted immigrants have been a complete and absolute failure.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to say a word in connection with the information my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has been good enough to give. We can well understand that the views of a gentleman who has had such a large and varied experience as he has had in the past in connection with immigration are of great practical importance, not only to the minister, but also to the department which carries on immigration work. I have listened with much attention to the hon. gentleman's statement as to how matters have been working in the province of Ontario, and I am bound to think that perhaps these local agents, as they are called, have not been the greatest possible success so far as regards contributing anything to the immigration policy in that province. I find on glancing over the return that 2,000 of these immigrants were distributed by the Salvation Army, and I am glad to say—in so far as the west is concerned, at all events—that the officers of the Army have been very satisfactory, very energetic and very honest in their business dealings in connection with the immigration work which they undertook. In my judgment, it would not be desirable to discontinue in any form whatever the efforts which they are now making with respect to immigration work. I appreciate very much what the hon. member for South Oxford has been good enough to say in connection with immigration, a matter which is of such deep interest to himself personally, and I hope he will do me the honour of calling on me some time in the near future so that we may have an opportunity of discussing in more detailed form

the views which he holds and gathering more detailed information on the subject with the idea of doing the best we can on immigration work in Ontario.

Mr. OLIVER. If the figures are available, would the minister state the number of persons excluded from Canada last year coming from Great Britain, from the United States, from the continent of Europe and from Asia?

Mr. ROGERS. Persons excluded last year: British, 247; United States, 21,466; European, 607; Asiatics, 60. Total, 22,580.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to have the number deported, if that can be given.

Mr. ROGERS. I have not that at hand, but will be glad to give it later.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly at some other time, when the minister's estimates are up, these figures can be given. I wish merely to get them on record. I ask also with regard to the Boyce-Sneed case in Winnipeg. These two parties come from Texas, and one of them was deported while the other was not. On what grounds was one of them allowed to remain in the country?

Mr. ROGERS. The immigration officer in Winnipeg, when I was there last Christmas, gave me the explanation verbally, and his statement, as I recollect it, was that the woman was deported on the ground that she had just come out of an asylum, and under the Act such people are subject to deportation. In the case of the man we had not the same right in the judgment of the officer, and, therefore, he did not order the deportation of the man.

Mr. OLIVER. Does not the minister think that both man and woman were subject to deportation regardless of the fact that one of them had lately been in a lunatic asylum?

Mr. ROGERS. I am free to say I am inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman. But Mr. Bruce Walker, the officer in charge, did not take that action. I do not know what reason influenced him. Perhaps he thought he was going to save the life of the man; perhaps he did.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to ask a number of questions with regard to Asiatic immigration, if convenient. How many Japanese arrived within the last calendar year?

Mr. ROGERS. There were 727 men, and 337 women.

Mr. OLIVER. How many Japanese are estimated to be in Canada now?

Mr. ROGERS. The figures are not available.

Mr. OLIVER. How many Chinese arrived in the past calendar year?

Mr. ROGERS. The number was, men 6,794; women, 79.

Mr. OLIVER. How many Chinese were exempt from the head tax?

Mr. ROGERS. I have not the number, but I have the class of people exempt.

The members of the diplomatic corps or other government representatives, their suites, their servants; consuls and consular agents; the children born in Canada of parents of Chinese origin who have left Canada for educational or other purposes on substantiating their identity to the satisfaction of the officer of the port or place where they seek to enter on their return; merchants, their wives and minor children; wives and minor children of clergymen, tourists, men of science, subject to such regulation as may from time to time be made by the government; duly certificated teachers.

Mr. OLIVER. In connection with the Japanese students, would the minister give a statement on a future occasion of the number of Japanese returned to Japan, and the same of the Chinese returned to China?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Can the minister give me an idea of the means now taken to check the arrival of Chinese, to see that they comply with the law with regard to the head tax.

Mr. ROGERS. They are examined at the ocean port under the Chinese Act.

Mr. OLIVER. Are there special officers to deal with the Chinese?

Mr. ROGERS. They are dealt with by the immigration officers.

Mr. OLIVER. Under special instructions under the Chinese Act?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. How many Hindus arrived during the past year?

Mr. ROGERS. There were 13 men and 1 woman.

Mr. OLIVER. I have seen in the papers a statement that two Hindu women had arrived and were held for deportation. Have they been deported?

Mr. ROGERS. They arrived and were held for deportation, and their time was up on the 6th of February, but the time was extended in order that we might ascertain whether they came by direct passage or otherwise. When we get that information we shall be able to decide what course to take.

Mr. OLIVER. Is there any special regulation to prevent Hindu women from coming in?

Mr. ROGERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Hindu women can come in the same as Hindu men?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. So, if the women in this case are rejected, it is because they did not comply with the ordinary regulation?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). Are there many Hindu women in Canada?

Mr. ROGERS. Very few—half-a-dozen or so.

Mr. OLIVER. How many Hindus are resident in Canada?

Mr. ROGERS. From 2,300 to 2,500.

Mr. OLIVER. How many is it supposed returned during the past year to India?

Mr. ROGERS. I have not that information.

Mr. OLIVER. Would it be in the department?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, we can supply it very readily.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the minister make any statement as to his conclusions in regard to the relaxing of the regulations for the admission of Hindu women, the wives of Hindus living in Canada?

Mr. ROGERS. We have had a special officer investigating those conditions and as far as we can judge from the information we have been able to obtain about 5,200 Hindus have come to Canada and to-day we have less than 2,500 left so that they are evidently finding out for themselves that either the climate or conditions are not suited to their wants. Some of their number were anxious to promote immigration and increase their numbers in Canada and to bring as they claimed their wives. But on investigations the report I get is that the class of Hindus we have in British Columbia are not a class who would possibly bring their wives to settle in that province. I do not of course mean that in every case; I am speaking in general terms. The police of Vancouver complain rather bitterly that some of the Hindus are rather a troublesome class and the health officers of Vancouver make a similar complaint that they are not a desirable class of settlers to have if it is possible to avoid doing so. In view of the condition and class of Hindu that we happen to have in Canada I do not think there is any chance of women coming out to take up their homes here and continue as residents in Canada. I am speaking only from the information handed me by the special officer detailed to ascertain this information. I think that 300 of these Hindus left Canada last year, but I hope to have the report of the special officer in a short time and to submit to the House.

Mr. OLIVER. The committee may assume that it is not the intention of the minister to relax the conditions in regard to Hindu women?

Mr. ROGERS. Not at present, no.

Mr. OLIVER. Can the minister explain the apparent fact that the number of Japanese who have arrived in the past year is in excess of the number provided for in the understanding with the Empire of Japan? I think the understanding is that about 400 labouring people may be admitted in a year. Last year 727 entered. Of course the difference may be made up of Japanese of other classes.

Mr. ROGERS. In 1911 we had 427 and in this year apparently 727.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a serious question. If the arrangement made is being adhered to by the government of Japan it is perfectly satisfactory but if not it is desirable that parliament should be advised of the fact. There is really a total of over a thousand.

Mr. ROGERS. I shall look into that.

Mr. OLIVER. Is there any change in the regulations regarding the admission of Chinese that would increase the exemptions from the head tax formerly in force?

Mr. ROGERS. No there has been no change.

Mr. OLIVER. Is the Chinese immigration increasing?

Mr. ROGERS. To some extent, but not very largely.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the appropriation of $75,000 which is not required for 1912-13?

Mr. ROGERS. That is for seed grain. We will have a supplementary for seed grain this year.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. ROGERS moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the order of business for to-morrow?

Mr. ROGERS. We will take up government Bills.

Mr. OLIVER. Which will have precedence?

Mr. ROGERS. We will take up probably the Tariff Commission Bill. I think that will be ready to go on to-morrow.

Mr. OLIVER. The Grain Bill is first on the list.

Mr. ROGERS. Probably the Grain Bill too. I expect my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce will be ready to go on with that.

Mr. OLIVER. And if not that, the Tariff Commission?

Mr. ROGERS. If not that, the Tariff Commission.

Mr. OLIVER. And the highways?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, and then we will go into the estimates if we get through with those.

Mr. OLIVER. The boundaries question will not go on to-morrow?

Mr. ROGERS. No, not till Thursday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 28, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SEXSMITH moved:

That the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be referred to the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is adopted I would like to say that it seems to involve a different procedure from what we have been accustomed to in past years. Formerly the House ordered at once the printing of the report of the evidence taken before the committee on Agriculture and Colonization and members were able to get copies during the session and send them out into the counties. Now, if we have to await the action of the Printing Committee, which only sits now and again, I am afraid we will not receive these copies until after the House prorogues and the result will be that they will be sent home to us when we will be too busy, or when we will not have the facilities for distributing them, and they will practically be unused. I would certainly favour very much the old procedure in which the House adopts the reports and recommends the printing of them forthwith.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to remind my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) that we adopted a different rule this very session, only a few days ago. Everything now has to go to the committee on printing.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was not aware of such a rule. If such a change has been made I do not think it is in the interest of this report.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to say in reference to this report that it was handed in before, that the committee have sat at least once or twice since and it might have been passed long ago. But, at any rate, the rule was adopted that no printing of this nature would be ordered unless it was submitted to the Printing Committee appointed for the purpose of considering such questions.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to questions Nos. 2 and 3, I notice that they are not in proper form, and therefore will stand until they are brought within the rule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand you to rule, Mr. Speaker, that question No. 2 is at variance with the rules of the House. The question is as follows:

Is the government aware that Frederick Passmore Gutelius, recently appointed to the National Transcontinental Commission, is not a British subject?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is an allegation of fact in the question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A statement of fact is allowed in so far as it is necessary for the purpose of the question. Rule 37 says that 'no argument or opinion is to be offered or any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same.' I think the facts stated in this question are only stated so far as is necessary to explain the question.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister). I do not agree with the right hon. gentleman in the view he takes. The proper way to ask a question of that kind, according to my apprehension, is this: has Frederick Passmore Gutelius been appointed to the National Transcontinental Commission? If so, is the government aware that he is not a British subject?' As a matter of fact, he has not been appointed to the National Transcontinental Commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a sufficient answer, that he has not been.

Mr. BORDEN. We are not dealing with the answer, but with the propriety of the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement of fact is that he is not a British subject. The ques-

tion should have been asked, is he a British subject?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, about your ruling on the question of Mr. Lamarche respecting the resolution of Mr. Sevigny, relating to the repeal of the law respecting the naval service of Canada? I understood you to rule that it was out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not rule that question out of order. I merely requested that it stand to be a little differently arranged. My attention was drawn to it hurriedly just before coming into the House, and I thought it well to let it stand until I could consult the member who is asking it, and have it put in proper form.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY COMPANY—INSPECTOR OF ROUNDHOUSE EXTENSION, STELLARTON, N.S.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is John Fraser still acting as inspector of the roundhouse extension at Stellarton, Nova Scotia?
2. If not, when did he cease to act as inspector?
3. How much has been paid him for his cervices?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.
2. February 23, 1912.
3. Two hundred and twenty-five dollars ($225).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—INSPECTOR OF STATIONS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Is there in the service of the Transcontinental Railway Company, as inspector of stations from Lévis to Ste. Perpétue, an employee named Goulet, and what is his Christian name?
2. When was he appointed, and what is his salary?
3. What was his former occupation?
4. What qualifications has he for the position of inspector?
5. Who recommended him?
6. Where does he live now, and where did he live before his appointment?
7. Is it the intention of the government to keep him in the same position?

Mr. COCHRANE. The following information has been received from the National Transcontinental Railway Commission:

1. Yes. Theodore.
2. September 12, 1911, salary $100 per month and $25 monthly for board.

3 and 4. Saw mill operator and building contractor.

5. Recommended by Division Engineer Dick, and appointed by the commisioners.

6. He lives at St. Anselme now and lived at Indian Lorette before his appointment.

7. Yes.

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA—EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. What is the eastern boundary of the territory to be added to the province of Manitoba, in accordance with the resolution of which notice has been given by the Prime Minister?
2. What is the approximate area of the territory to be added to the province of Manitoba by the resolution?
3. What annual sum is to be paid as and from the 1st day of July, 1908, in accordance with the terms of subsection (b) of the resolution, and on what date is the first of these payments to be made?
4. What is the basis of the deductions to be made from the payments of interest on capital allowance in lieu of debt mentioned in subsection (b) of the resolution, and what are the details of such deductions?
5. What deductions are to be made on account of swamp and university lands, or on any other accounts, from the annual payment of $562,500 to the province of Manitoba under subsection (c) of the resolution?
6. Upon what basis are the deductions mentioned to be made and what are the details of those deductions?
7. Is any portion of the swamp and university lands mentioned in subsection (c) of the resolution to be returned to the Dominion? If so, what acreage is to be returned?
8. What amount is to be paid annually to the province of Manitoba as and from the first day of July, 1908, in accordance with the terms of subsection (c) of the resolution, after all deductions mentioned in said subsection (c) have been made?
9. On what date is the first payment under subsection (c) of the resolution to be made??
10. What is the basis of the calculation upon which the sum of $201,723.57 is to be paid to the province of Manitoba towards the construction of public buildings?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know whether it is present to the mind of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) but I notice that this refers to a Bill which is before the House. Perhaps the question was asked with the intention of bringing out this information at a time when the Bill may not have been before the House.

Mr. BORDEN. I think the information was sent to the hon. gentleman yesterday. It was also given in debate as far as I know. Perhaps the question might drop.

Mr. OLIVER. The information given in the debate may have covered the points embraced by the questions, but the questions were asked before the Bill was brought forward. Certain consecutive, and at the same time, pertinent questions are asked, and I think they are entitled to an answer.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not agree with my hon. friend that a question can be asked about a Bill which is to be founded upon a resolution on the order paper. At all events I do not agree with him upon the necessity of answering any such question before the Bill is introduced. However, it is not necessary to argue the question because although the information has been communicated to the House there is no reason why it should not be given again in answer to these questions. That, however, is entirely without prejudice to the position I have just taken and which I shall maintain in the future.

The question was answered as follows:

1. The eastern boundary of the province, including the added territory, is as follows: Beginning at a point on the international boundary dividing Canada from the United States, in the southwestern portion of the Lake of the Woods, where said international boundary turns due north; thence north along the said international boundary to a certain monument thereon at or near the northwest angle of the Lake of the Woods; thence continuing due north along the western boundary of the province of Ontario, by virtue of 'The Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889,' chapter 28 of the statutes of 1889 of the United Kingdom (the said western boundary being the eastern boundary of the province of Manitoba) to the most northerly point of the said boundary common to the two provinces under the said Act; thence continuing due north along the same meridian to the intersection thereof with the centre of the road allowance on the twelfth base line of the system of Dominion Land Surveys; thence northeasterly in a right line to the most eastern point of Island lake, as shown in approximate latitude 53° 30′ and longitude 93° 40′ on the railway map of the Dominion of Canada published, on the scale of thirty-five miles to one inch, in the year one thousand nine hundred and eight, by the authority of the Minister of the Interior; thence northeasterly in a right line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longitude intersects the southern shore of Hudson bay.

2.

	Square Miles.
Approximate area of Manitoba as at present constituted (land and water)	73,732
Proposed addition:	Square Miles.
Land	166,100
Water	12,000
Land and water	178,100
Total approximate area of province if the proposed extension of boundaries is made	251,832

3.

(a) $381,584.19 from and after July 1, 1912.

(b) Arrearages for the four years, July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1912, payable as soon as any Act founded on the resolutions comes into effect:

Annual allowance in lieu of debt under Bill	$381,584 19
Annual allowance already received	178,947 06
Arrearage each year	$202,637 13
Arrearages for four years (July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1912)	$810,548 52

4. During the years preceding 1898, the Dominion had made advances from time to time to the province of various sums for various provincial purposes, the aggregate of these sums at that date being $475,816.15. A deduction of five per cent on this amount has been made from the allowance to the province in lieu of debt annually since 1898. Before that date a deduction of five per cent had always been made from the allowance in lieu of debt, according to the amount of advances by the Dominion to the province for provincial purposes then outstanding.

5 and 6. As to the future, an approximate annual deduction of $134,230 will be made from the annual payment of $562,500. This deduction is arrived at by taking five per cent upon the difference between the aggregate of the sums for which the swamp lands have been sold by the province, and the aggregate of the sums from time to time charged to the province by the government of Canada, in connection with the survey and transfer of these lands, and the sums expended by the province which may be fairly chargeable to the administration and sale of such swamp lands. The difference referred to will be determined by the Governor in Council after audit on behalf of the government.

A deduction of $15,000 per annum will also be made from the $562,500 on account of university lands. This sum of $15,000 is arrived at by taking five per cent of $300,000, or at the rate of two dollars per acre for the 150,000 acres granted as an endowment to the University of Manitoba under chapter 50 of the Acts of 1885.

7. Section 1 of chapter 50 of the Acts of 1885, under which swamp lands have been transferred to the province, will be repealed and all lands known as swamp lands transferred to the province under said section 1, and not sold by the province prior to the time at which the terms and conditions of the Act founded upon these resolutions shall have been agreed to by the Legislative Assembly of the province will

be transferred to the government of Canada. Approximately 838,484.16 acres have been sold by the province out of the 2,005,439.96 acres of swamp lands conveyed to Manitoba under this section up to the end of 1909. No portion of the university lands will be returned to the Dominion under the resolutions.

8 and 9. As to the four years, July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1912, there will be payable to the province approximately an estimated arrearage for each of the four years of $342,000, made up as follows:

Allowance in lieu of lands		$562,500
Swamp lands deduction, average say	$105,500	
University lands deduction	15,000	
Heretofore received under section 3 of chapter 50 of the Acts of 1885	100,000	220,500
Estimated arrearage for each year		$342,000
Estimated arrearage for the four years, payable whenever any Act founded on these resolutions comes into effect		$1,368,000

There will be payable to the province of Manitoba yearly, after July 1, 1912, in respect of indemnity for want of public lands, until the population of the province exceeds 800,000, as follows:

Indemnity for want of public lands		562,500
Swamp lands deduction, approximately	$134,230	
University lands deduction	15,000	
		149,230
		$413,270

10. The provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan respectively received, under 'The Alberta Act,' and 'The Saskatchewan Act,' to provide for the construction of public buildings, the sum of $468,750, the payment of which was spread over five years. The province of Manitoba has heretofore received from the Dominion, on account of the construction of the legislative buildings and Government House at Winnipeg, the sum of $267,026.43. The $201,723.57 referred to in the resolutions is the difference between the amounts already mentioned.

INTERCOLONIAL—GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION.

*Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. When was the Arbitration Board, provided by Chapter 16, 4th Edward VII., respecting arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company relative to the Intercolonial railway, appointed?

2. What matters are still undetermined that were referred to that board?

Mr. BORDEN.

3. How often have extensions been obtained under the fourth section of said chapter, and when was the last extension?

4. What explanation, if any, is given for the delay in closing this arbitration?

5. Is the Grand Trunk still continuing the alleged violation of the agreement with the Crown as to routeing of freight?

6. What sums of money have been paid by the Crown to arbitrators and to counsel and solicitors up to the present time, and what are the names of the recipients of the respective amounts?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The dates of the appointment of the members of the board are: Eugene Lafleur, Esq., K.C., on the 12th October, 1903, and on his refusal to act the Hon. Charles Peers Davidson, Esq., was appointed on the 5th day of May, 1904. George F. Shepley, Esq., K.C., on the 21st day of August, 1903; the appointment of Mr. Justice Killam as third Arbitrator was assented to by the government on the 26th day of April, 1904; on the decease of Mr. Justice Killam, Chief Justice Falconbridge was appointed in June, 1909.

2. A claim by the Crown known as the Quebec Central railway dispute and having reference to the deliveries by the Intercolonial of freight received from the Quebec Central railway.

A claim by the Crown in reference to the improper division of through rates.

A claim by the Crown in reference to diversion of traffic by the Grand Trunk railway.

A claim by the Crown in reference to diversion by Intercolonial railway.

A claim of the Crown in reference to the improper division of through rates under the contract of February 1, 1898.

A claim in reference to a number of disputed accounts.

3. No extension has been obtained. Section 4, of chapter 16, of 4, Edward VII, having been amended by chapter 15 of 5 Edward VII.

4. The matters involved being of an extremely complicated and difficult character; the death of Mr. Justice Killam and later the illness of Mr. Shepley.

5. No.

6.

A. C. Killam	$6,250 00
Hon. Sir C. Falconbridge	1,000 00
George F. Shepley	11,262 20
Judge Davidson	750 00

The following amounts have been paid to solicitors:

William Cook	3,750 00
J. W. Cook	11,572 91
A. Falconer	4,215 00
R. C. Smith	4,065 73
Cook and Magee	121 50

MARRIAGE LAW.

Question not in order.

The following question having been called:

Mr. BURNHAM.

1. Has the right hon. the leader of the opposition seen the article from the Toronto 'Star', as quoted below:—

THE MARRIAGE LAW.

Although Judge Charbonneau's judgment clears the air, it does not settle the question. It is not the judgment of a final tribunal, and there are other decisions which conflict with it. Even if a judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada or the Judicial Committee be obtained it may not cover the whole ground.

The Dominion parliament ought to enact a law covering the full extent of its power. At present, although it is generally admitted that the Dominion Parliament has full power to declare who shall and who shall not be competent to marry, the federal statute legalizes a marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The law should set forth exactly what are the prohibitions to marriage. It should declare that no spiritual court has any power to annul a marriage or grant a divorce, and impose a penalty upon any person attempting to exercise that authority.

Mr. Holmested, in his book on the marriage law, says that all provincial courts which now grant divorce should be superseded by a Dominion court. At present the law is not uniform, and the administration is not uniform. In the maritime provinces and in British Columbia there are divorce courts; and there is a different law on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. In the other provinces there is no divorce court, and resort must be made to the Senate. It is easy to see how this diversity would facilitate the making of unfounded claims to authority in the province of Quebec.

A Dominion statute, covering the grounds thoroughly, would be a strong assertion of the civil power, which would tend to discourage usurpations and unfounded claims to authority. It is true that the provinces have power to deal with solemnization. But the question of solemnization may be confused with that of competence. Thus, in Quebec, the attempt was made to distinguish between the kind of solemnization necessary for Protestants and the kind necessary for Catholics.

It may also be found that provincial legislation is necessary. Mr. Holmested, for instance, says that a minister should be forbidden to exact, as a condition of solemnizing marriage, any condition as to the education of children. It may be necessary also to make further provisions for surrounding the solemnization of marriage with safeguards, and protecting innocent parties from deception. The more strongly and definitely the civil power asserts itself, the less danger will there be of clerical interference. The State has been neglecting its duty; the remedy lies in its doing its duty.

2. If so, does he approve of the sentiments contained in the same?

3. If not, wherein does he disapprove of them, speaking generally?

Mr. SPEAKER. In my opinion this question cannot be asked as at present worded in that it does not comply with the rules. Under the rule, it is the right of an hon. member to ask any question of a minister of the Crown or of a private member as to a Bill, or motion, or some order before the House in which that private member is interested, and beyond that I do not think the rule goes. I shall quote several decisions of Mr. Speaker Brand, which apply to questions of this kind, so that hon. members may have knowledge of the rule and be guided by it in puting questions on the order paper. Mr. Speaker Brand says:

A question which involves a matter of argument and statements of opinion is irregular.

This question asks for a statement of opinion from an hon. member and is, therefore, irregular. Mr Speaker Brand further says:

A question must not contain a statement of fact which is disputed nor a matter of opinion.

This question contains a statement of fact which may be disputed and it asks as well for an expression of opinion, all of which is irregular. Then, Mr. Speaker Brand says:

Expressions of opinion cannot take the form of a question.

This question asks for an expression of opinion and to that extent it is outside the rule. Mr Speaker Brand further says:

An argumentative question, not referring to anything arising out of debate in the House, or with intention to draw an argument from a comparison of two statements is out of order.

In my opinion this question to some extent violates that rule. Mr. Speaker Brand also says:

An allegation of fact which is disputed ought not to appear in a question.

This question deals with an allegation of fact which is, of course, disputed, and to that extent it would be irregular. For these reasons I will have to ask the question to stand until the hon. member puts it in proper form.

NAVAL SERVICE ACT.

Question out of order.

The following question on the order paper, having been called.

Mr. MONDOU.

1. Does the government intend to repeal the Naval Service Act?

2. Will the proposal for the repeal of this Act be followed immediately by the proposal of another Act containing the new policy of the government in the matter?

3. If so, will this new policy be submitted for the approval of the people before being put in force?

Mr. SPEAKER. In my judgment this question ought to be put in different form before it is properly permissible to be asked in the House.

HUDSON BAY PORTS.

Mr. AIKINS:

1. What steps have been taken during this year, or are being taken, to ascertain the practicability of Port Churchill or the mouth of the Nelson river as ocean ports, and as to which of the two will be the better for a terminus of the Hudson Bay railway?

2. What steps are being taken to provide for the better navigation of Hudson straits?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Department of the Naval Service.—In the season of 1910 a hydrographic survey was made of Port Churchill by the Department of the Naval Service. A chart of the harbour has been prepared, which is at present in the hands of the printer, and will shortly be published.

In the seasons of 1910 and 1911 hydrographic surveys were made at Port Nelson by the Department of the Naval Service. A chart of the harbour has been prepared, which is at present in the hands of the printer, and will shortly be ready for publication.

Department of Railways and Canals.—The department is sending engineers to make observations, and report, as to the conditions of the harbours of Port Nelson and Churchill, that may assist in reaching a conclusion as to the suitability of those points for the terminus of the Hudson Bay Railway.

2. Department of Railways and Canals.—This department has taken no steps in the matter.

MONTREAL HARBOUR EMPLOYEE, J. A. MASSE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is the honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries aware that J. A. Masse, employed by the Harbour Commission of Montreal, is said to have published over his signature in 'La Patrie' of February 22nd ultimo, a letter censuring the conduct of the Hon. C. J. Doherty, Minister of Justice, in the matter of patronage?

2. Is it the intention of the honourable minister to dismiss Mr. Masse?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has no knowledge of the letter in question.

Mr. MONDOU.

2. No. The power of dismissal is not vested in him.

MONTREAL HARBOUR OFFICIALS.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Who appointed the various officials employed by the Harbour Commission of Montreal?

2. Are said officials allowed to canvass members of parliament to obtain promotion?

3. Are any of the officials of the Harbour Commission of Montreal to be shortly superannuated?

4. Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to promote Toussaint Bourassa, deputy harbour master of Montreal?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

2 and 3. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has no information on this subject.

4. No. Under section 18 of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act, 1899, the right of appointment is vested solely in the Harbour Commissioners.

BOUNDARIES OF QUEBEC.

Mr. BORDEN moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions:—

Resolved, that it is expedient to extend the limits of the province of Quebec so that the boundaries thereof shall include, in addition to the present territory of the said province, the territory bounded and described as follows:—Commencing at the point at the mouth of East Main river where it empties into James bay, the said point being the western termination of the northern boundary of the province of Quebec as established by virtue of chapter 3 of the statutes of 1898, intituled 'An Act respecting the Northwestern, Northern and Northeastern Boundaries of the Province of Quebec,' thence northerly and easterly along the shores of Hudson bay and Hudson strait; thence southerly, easterly and northerly along the shore of Ungava bay and the shore of the strait; thence easterly along the shore of the said strait to the boundary of the territory under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland; thence southeasterly along the westerly boundary of the said last mentioned territory to the middle of Baie du Rigolet or Hamilton inlet; then westerly along the northern boundary of the province of Quebec as established by the said Act to the place of commencement.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

Mr. BORDEN moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committe of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution.—

Resolved, that it is expedient to extend the limits of the province of Ontario so that the boundaries thereof shall include, in addition to the present territory of the said province, the territory bounded and described as follows:—Commencing at the most northerly point of the westerly boundary of the province of Ontario as determined by the Canada (Ontario) Boundary Act, 1889, chapter 28 of the statutes of 1889 of the United Kingdom (the said westerly boundary being the easterly boundary of the province of Manitoba); thence continuing due north along the same meridian to the intersection thereof with the centre of the road allowance on the twelfth base line of the system of Dominion Land Surveys; thence northeasterly in a right line to the eastern point of Island lake, as shown in approximate latitude 53° 30′ and longitude 93° 40′ on the railway map of the Dominion of Canada, published, on a scale of thirty-five miles to one inch, in the year one thousand nine hundred and eight, by the authority of the Minister of the Interior; thence northeasterly in a right line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longtitude intersects the southern shore of Hudson bay; thence easterly and southerly following the shore of the said bay to the point where the northerly boundary of the province of Ontario, as established under the said Act, intersects the shore of James bay; thence westward along the said boundary, as established by the said Act, to the place of commencement.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all charges made against Dr. J. R. McLeod, port physician at Port Hawkesbury, N.S., the evidence taken before H. P. Duchemin in support of such charges, and his report on the same, and of all correspondence and telegrams between the said H. P. Duchemin and the Department of Marine and Fisheries or any official thereof in relation thereto.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges made against Dougald R. Boyle, fishery overseer at West Arichat, Nova Scotia, and of all correspondence and telegrams between the Department of Marine and Fisheries or any official thereof and any other person in relation thereto.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all petitions, correspondence, orders in council, memoranda, or other papers or documents bearing date after January 1, 1910, in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to the granting of licenses to fish for herring, salmon and all kinds of fish in the waters on the coast of the province of British Columbia, and also relating to the transfer of such licenses to any person other than the original licensees, also relating to the licenses to pack fish in British Columbia.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all documents, letters, requests, reports and recommendations in the possession of the Post Office Department, relating to the dismissal of Done Daoust, postmaster at Alfred county of Prescott, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Proulx.

For a copy of all papers, recommendations to council, orders in council, or any other papers in connection with or having reference to the promotion of Mr. Binks to be superintendent of the Dead Letter Office.—Mr. Henderson.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. PARDEE. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a return which was asked for on the 22nd of January, regarding certain harbour improvements in the town of Sarnia, and which has not yet been brought down.

Mr. BORDEN. I will direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the question of my hon. friend.

ST. JOHN VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. CARVELL. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a question which was answered on the 14th of February, regarding a proposed agreement between the Dominion government and the government of New Brunswick, and the Quebec & New Brunswick Railway Company. In his answer to that question the minister stated:

As soon as the necessary documents are prepared a copy of the same will be laid on the table of the House.

I would ask the hon. minister if an agreement has been entered into, and, if so, will the document be laid on the table of the House?

Mr. COCHRANE. It has not yet been entered into; it is under discussion.

IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHWAYS.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 77), to encourage and assist the improvement of highways.—Mr. Cochrane.

On section 5—provisions of agreement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would like to ask my hon. friend if it is intended to have a general rule with regard to the maintenance of highways, applicable to all the provinces, or is each case to be dealt with by itself?

Mr. COCHRANE. There is nothing in the Bill about maintaining highways. It refers to the construction and improvement of highways.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This section says: 'That provision may be made for the future maintenace of such highways in good condition, according to a specified standard and to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council.' This legislation is altogether new, and everybody can foresee that in the application it must meet with several practical difficulties. It has been observed in the discussion of this Bill that the

maintenance of the highways may be as costly as their original construction, if not more so. What I asked my hon. friend is, whether he intends to have a general rule, applicable to all highways or whether each case shall be left to itself. That is to say: Will the Dominion itself undertake to maintain any highways or will these be left to the local authorities? Or is it intended by my hon. friend to maintain some highways and leave others to the care of the province? In many provinces the municipality within which the highway is situated, is charged with the maintenance, and it would seem to me to be obvious that a general rule should be applied in the case of all highways, otherwise serious difficulties are liable to be encountered.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is a great deal in what the right hon. gentleman says, but I think that for the first few years at least the money should first be expended on the improvement of highways leaving the other matter to the counties in the province until later on at all events. The object of the Bill is to obtain good roads all over this Dominion as soon as we can possibly get them, and I think it would be a safe policy to leave their maintenance, for a time at any rate, to the provinces or to the counties in which they are situated.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the minister tell us what he proposes to do in a case where the right to open a new highway in a province is vested in the municipal council, and the provincial council as such has nothing to do with the matter? Apparently under this section the minister proposes to leave that as a matter of agreement to the provincial government, but that may not give them any right whatever in the road at all. In the province of Ontario, I think, the title to a highway is vested in the municipality. The right to open a new road, or to divert or close any existing road, or anything of that kind, must come from the municipality. How does the minister propose to reach the municipality in such a case?

Mr. COCHRANE. Through the provincial governments. I do not anticipate any trouble of that kind. I think the hon. gentleman is right about the municipality having control of the roads within its boundaries, and if it objected I do not know but that we would have to stop unless some amicable arrangement was made. I do not think there is any law to compel the municipality to give up control. However I do not anticipate any trouble, on the contrary I think the municipalities will welcome the proposal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Obviously however there is some difficulty. At the present time in the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec the highways are all under the control of the municipal council. The municipal council would have no objection at all—

Mr. COCHRANE. In Ontario the county council has jurisdiction too I think.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The county council has jurisdiction over some roads, the local council has jurisdiction over others. I am prepared to believe there is no municipal council, whether it be a county council or a local council, which will have any objection to its roads being improved, but the law may be of such a character as to make the maintenance of highways more expensive than it is at the present time. I foresee some difficulties in regard to this matter—difficulties not unsolvable by any means, but certainly of a real character—and what I was anxious to know was, whether my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) intended to have a set of rules published and made known so that all municipalities might be aware of them, or whether if it is his intention to have each case determined by itself as it arises?

Mr. BORDEN. Conditions of course might vary, not only as between provinces but within a province—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that.

Mr. BORDEN—and I do not know whether it is possible in considering this matter to foresee how best to deal with all those varying conditions. It was in the mind of the members of the government, in framing this measure, that it would not be a wise policy to spend a great deal of money in bringing any particular road up to a high standard, unless some reasonable arrangement could be made for maintaining that standard. The right hon. gentleman says very truly that that might perhaps be a larger burden than the province or municipality might be willing to undertake. I appreciate that fact, and certainly it must be taken into consideration in carrying out the assistance which is proposed by this Bill. I do not know at the present moment that we can foresee what difficulties such considerations may absolutely present, but I do thoroughly realize that these difficulties will have to be met. I agree with the right hon. gentleman that such difficulties ought not to be insuperable; that where a road has been constructed, according to a certain standard, by the assistance of moneys contributed under this Bill, it would be practicable to provide some measure of assurance that that road would be maintained at the standard at which it had been constructed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What I had in mind was, that unless the minister in charge of this Bill came to the conclusion

that we must have a general set of rules which ought to be applicable in all cases—not in any absolute manner, because it would not be possible—that he will be led into very serious difficulties. If such a set of rules were published, which every municipality would be aware of, and to the standard of which it would endeavour to attain, I think a great many difficulties would be obviated.

Mr. BORDEN. I think there is a great deal of force in what the right hon. gentle- has observed in that regard, and we shall certainly bear it in mind. As I understand him, he thinks the government should prescribe some general standard, for a particular district at least—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN. And that standard must be lived up to before aid is to be given. I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of that idea.

Mr. G. H. BAKER (Brome). Before the clause passes I have a word or two to say in reference to the matter. It seems that on the second reading of this Bill the general principle of road aid was pretty well admitted, and for very apparent reasons. The roads form an important part of the large problem of transportation, to which the government has given great attention. We can understand that the broad question of aid to roads would be a principle to be generally admitted. Transportation is one of the principle factors in the nationalization of our country. It is an important factor in commerce and in production, for without good roads the development of our country would be absolutely impossible. Of what avail would be the great crops of our farm and the products of our mines if there was not proper transportation to carry these products to the markets of the world? The good roads question has received the attention of the several provinces. Within comparatively recent years the province of Quebec took the matter up, and has now a measure before it to deal with the matter. Last year the province of Quebec spent about $400,000 on the development of highways. Previously its policy took the form of aiding the different parishes and the different municipalities, by making to them certain grants and paying for a certain proportion of the work. That scheme went on for several years and some advantage has been derived from it. Now it seems they are departing from that mode of giving aid, and have set aside $10,000,000 by which they propose to pay interest and a sinking fund to aid municipalities. That is to say the municipalities will borrow money for the purpose of the construction of roads, and the provincial government will undertake to pay two per cent on the interest and two per cent on the sinking fund so that the debt will be eventually wiped off.

The amount of aid granted under this new system will not be materially more than the aid under the old system. Under the old system about $400,000 was granted, which is just the interest at 4 per cent on $10,000,000. But, for some reason or other the Quebec government felt that they would rather have the money in their pocket in order to deal with the matter in this new way. I would not presume to venture an opinion, but perhaps they feel that the way to their return to power in the next provincial elections would be improved, if they had the money in their pockets——

Mr. BUREAU. Is that the way you feel about this measure so far as the federal government is concerned?

Mr. BAKER. I have no particularly keen feeling about the measure, Mr. Chairman; I am only remarking that though the scheme in relation to Quebec is changed, yet the amount of aid is not really materially increased; and some of us are of the opinion that the fact that the general elections are about to come off in Quebec may have something to do with the change of system, and the desire of the government to have cash in their pockets before they discuss the question of highways. That may or may not be, but from experience in the past, some of us hold that opinion. Now, in Quebec the dealing is directly with the municipality; each parish, each township is dealt with directly by the government in constructing these good roads. In Ontario, the system is different. Before the Ontario government will aid in the development of roads, the county must take over the roads, lay out a large county system and then expend the money in the development of that system. In that way in Ontario they would have between forty and fifty county systems, which, you can readily understand, could be developed into a provincial system. But in the province of Quebec, dealing as they do with municipalities, parishes and townships, they would have about six hundred separate systems, about six hundred different modes of building roads, making it much more difficult to reconcile differences and unite all in a provincial system. Viewing this question from a Dominion point of view, my opinion is that we must not come in too close contact with the separate municipalities. We must keep at a view point from which we can see the system as a whole and consider its advantages to the Dominion as a whole. Therefore, it seems to me better to deal with the provinces than with the municipalities. Although I am interested in getting all possible aid for for the province of Quebec, yet I am in

duty bound to say that with a system of dealing directly with the municipalities it will be difficult to form a workable provincial system. I would warn this government not to expend large amounts of money in any system with a province until they can feel sure that the province has a definite provincial system to carry out. The difficulties of dealing with the different municipalities are obvious. Some are wealthy; some are not so fortunate in their wealth; some feel that they can take up the burden of road building and bear their share; others do not. For that reason, if we dealt with the municipalities we should have a varied system under which a uniform good road movement would be impossible, and the work when complete could not form part of a great Dominion system. Therefore, I would urge upon the government that, when the time arrives, they should impress upon the different provinces, the necessity of adopting such a method as will lead to a provincial system of roads, so that there may be uniformity and not patch-work—a piece of mud road followed by a piece of gravel road, and then macadam—but uniformly good roads, each made to meet the needs of the traffic which is likely to go over it.

Far more importance than the question of money subsidy, in my opinion, is the question of organization, the question of getting ready to spend the money. With the proper understanding by the people of the provinces, with plans laid before them in such a way that they can understand them, you will find all the provinces ready and willing to do what they can and what is necessary in order to provide these good roads. You will find the people of this Dominion ready to grant almost unlimited money for the purpose of carrying out the work. But the great point to begin with is organization, providing a method by which the people's money will be expended to good advantage. By organization, I would mean the establishment of a bureau in one of the departments—preferably the department which now has this matter under considération,—with men qualified by education and experience to deal with the work, men who have had experience in road building and who would give the matter their attention. In that organization probably would be included a laboratory, under skilled experts who would give the provinces the benefit of their investigations into the nature of soils and of the materials to be used in the building of the roads. In that organization also I would include a system of education, by pamphlets and other literature, of the people of this country in the importance of this great road-building movement. For I believe that at the present time the real significance of this great movement is not understood by the rank and file of the electors of this country. When it is understood, I am sure, they will with one accord help that movement forward.

I have the honour to represent a rural constituency; and I feel that it is a most important factor in our life as a community to have this system of good roads go into operation. The farmer, above everybody else, will benefit by this improvement. It means a profit on his produce the moment it leaves the farm; it will mean a saving in transportation to the markets of the country on every pound of produce that he raises. For that reason it will benefit the farmers generally from a financial point of view. It will affect them in a larger sense in that it will give them attractive social advantages, and will therefore offset the lure to the cities which is now so strong. For instance, it will enable them to get better schools for their children, and help them to unite school districts in order to procure greater benefits for their children in the way of education; and will thus tend to draw families together in social intercourse and enjoyment. For that reason I am strongly of the opinion that the present legislation will promote the interest of the farmers in various ways.

Now as regards the mode of conducting the work. I think, in dealing with this matter, we should, as I have already said, deal with the provinces, and lay out large provincial systems as Ontario has already begun to do. It is not necessary to lay out a plan with the idea of carrying it into operation within one year or two years; but a definite plan should be laid out that will meet the needs not only of to-day but of to-morrow, and of a still more remote future. I would suggest laying out provincial plans, on a map as it were, in order to reconcile them the one with the other, with the object, eventually, of harmonizing them all into one Dominion plan. Of course this development must take place by degrees. I would lay out provincial plans with roads between market places and various important towns, which should first engage our attention, because they are the most essential to meet present needs. It might be that before all these provincial systems are fully developed the Dominion government would think it wise to join together the main provincial roads before the smaller arteries are completed. Some hon. gentlemen have advocated great trunk systems extending from one end of the Dominion to the other, but I am not at present in favour of that idea. But I am convinced that in the first place we must lay out provincial systems that can be linked together. Let me illustrate what I mean. We have heard hon. gentlemen opposite say that reciprocity is not dead,

despite the lesson they were taught last September. I do not believe the people of Quebec are still of that opinion, but suppose that the provincial authorities were still of that opinion, and were to proceed to lay out roads north and south, with the expectation that when a Liberal government came into power it would carry out reciprocity. In that case the Dominion government would have to oppose the system of roads north and south, and would have to insist on the roads running east and west, to join the roads of the other provinces also running east and west to form one great Dominion system.

In the past the work of building roads has been left, as we all know, to the local efforts of the farming communities, and to inexperienced men. That system has done good service in the past, it is what we call the statute labour system. It prevails in Ontario, Quebec, and in some of the other provinces, and has worked fairly well to meet the needs of the farming communities up to the present time. But the country is developing too fast to make that system any longer sufficient. The importance of road building is too great to allow that method any longer to continue in the haphazard way it has gone on in the past. Under the statute labour system the work in each district was done under the direction of a wide-awake farmer, who was called the path master, and it was done at certain seasons of the year only by the collective efforts of the farmers of a road district. But the time has come when such primitive methods of road making will no longer meet the necessities of our agricultural communities. Conditions are changing rapidly, and we must prepare to meet them as they develop. The fact that during the past year Ontario has spent $553,000 on roads alone, that Quebec has spent $400,000 and the Dominion government is contemplating spending more, shows that we must look forward to spending large sums of money on this kind of improvement. The capital to be expended is so great that the government will need to employ scientific men to oversee the work, capable road engineers, who understand, for instance, that the road must be rounded in such a way as to shed water, and that the ditches must be kept open in order that the roads may drain.

In constructing the main portions of a provincial system it would seem to me essential to bear in mind that Canada has a great future before her and that what might be sufficient for the needs of to-day will not be sufficient for the needs of to-morrow. We must see to it, therefore, that the main arteries of these provincial systems are laid broad, and firm, and sound, so that they may be fitted to form part of the greater Dominion system when that comes about, and be sufficiently well made to deserve the name of national highways. We shall be shortsighted if we content ourselves with building these main arteries to satisfy only the provincial needs of to-day.

I would not expect the municipalites to bear all, or the great proportion of the expense of such main arteries which would be more substantial, more luxurious than their own needs would require, but I would arrange it in such a manner as that the Dominion government would bear the larger proportion of the cost of construction of such broader and better highways. There is one other factor in connection with these roads and that is the repairing of them. Our roads in Quebec have suffered materially from want of systematic repairing. Holes and ruts have been allowed to develop and wear for months without any attention in the way of repairing. If we get, as we are looking forward to have, broad, national highways, I submit that there should be some system by which repairing should be done continuously, by the constant overseeing of the highways, so that the moment a rut is discovered there will be some officer on the spot whose duty it will be to fill it up. In that manner you would keep the roads up to the highest possible degree of efficiency with the least possible expense. There can be no comparison between the cost of repairing, when the work is done from time to time as it is required, and the cost of repairing when the hole or break is allowed to wear for several months until the damage becomes serious and the repairs costly. In dealing with the provinces the Dominion would have reliable, substantial parties to the agreement who would be in every way responsible for any agreement they entered into, who would have under their jurisdiction the different municipalities which form the component parts of the province and who could regulate the matter in accordance with the requirements of the work to be carried out. That, in my opinion, is another reason for dealing directly with the provinces. You have responsible parties to the contract who have the right and power to enforce any regulations which the minister desires to carry out. There may be a question as to whether new roads should be constructed or old roads repaired. In many parts of the country in general it will be found more expedient and less costly to construct new roads than to repair old ones. In many instances old roads have been laid down by ordinary laymen without a full appreciation of the effect of grades, of the rise and fall of the land and without due

regard to the topography of the country. In many cases it will be found expedient to build around grades and hills which will make the road very much easier and, therefore, much more useful to the public. Under the direction of a scientifically trained engineer, who understands the technical requirements of road planning and construction and who is familiar with the topography of the country, a road could be built in such a way that its usefulness to the public would be very materially increased. By forming these roads in the provinces, by joining them up into Dominion roads, by having a Dominion highway when the time comes for it, and I trust it will not be very many years, an extra bond will be created to bind the different parts of this country together. The present bond of the railways has worked wonders, but the great distances between the stops, travelled at a high rate of speed, lessens the advantages of this mode of intercommunication as compared with the advantages that will be derived from a national highway. There will be upon the national highway greater intercourse between the people of the different provinces, there will be slower locomotion and the life on the roads will tend to bring the citizens of the different provinces shoulder to shoulder in daily intercourse, and will do much in the way of enabling the citizens of the different provinces to understand each other's weaknesses, and each other's strength. In that way there will grow up, I believe, through the aid granted to these national highways, one great Dominion fellowship the effect of which will be greatly enhanced by the existence and influence of such a gigantic work as that which is contemplated by the measure now before the committee. For these reasons I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—the minister may undertake construction and improvement of highways,

Mr. PROULX. I think the government is making a mistake in going into the construction of roads and not giving the money to the provinces. The provinces have now a system of road construction. Ontario went into the construction of roads some years ago. The government of Sir George Ross provided $1,000,000 to help the counties in building roads. About twenty counties received the provincial aid. What the people want is not trunk roads. The Ontario Good Roads Association met the other day in Toronto and that opinion was expressed by many of its members, amongst whom was the president, who said that the people wanted township and county roads, and not trunk roads. The province, I think, is in a better position to build township and county roads than trunk roads. If the government is going to undertake to build roads it is going to duplicate the work of the provinces, and, therefore, it is going to spend the money uselessly. I think the proposition of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), was right that the money should be given to the provinces according to population. The province of Québec also inaugurated a system of good roads a few years ago, and it is going into the work this year very extensively. I believe that the people would get much more benefit from the money spent in this way than if the work were left to the Dominion. We want roads leading to the villages and towns, especially the county towns, to the local markets of the farmers, since we cannot get the American market. I therefore, propose that section 6 be stricken out.

Mr. MACDONALD. Before this clause is considered I would like to say a word or two in order that I may understand really just what is the position of the government, in regard to this whole Bill. On the first reading of the Bill my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked the Minister of Railways, the following question:

I would ask the hon. gentleman to tell us if there is any basis of allotment among the provinces. The provincial subsidies are based on population; is this based on population?

The Minister of Railways and Canals said:

It is to be on the same basis as that on which subsidies are granted to the provinces, in other words, by population.

Mr. BLAIN. What page? ,

Mr. MACDONALD. That is read by the minister at page 3734 of 'Hansard.' When this Bill was introduced and discussed on the second reading it clearly went on the assumption that we were dealing with a proposition by the government to grant to each one of the provinces, under a system which would be on a parity with that which exists in regard to subsidies, a certain sum of money to be devoted to the improvement of roads.

Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Bill contemplate the federal government making a grant to the provincial government in aid of the construction of roads, the presumption being that the expenditure would be made by the provincial government. I do not think there can be any objection to that method, but if that method be not pursued, then we will have a most curious jumbled up system of road expenditure in the country. Apparently, under the first five sections of the Bill, the idea is, that the Dominion gov-

ernment will, in agreement with the provincial government, utilize all the provincial and municipal machinery and have a unification of authority and a practical working out of a system under which the roads will get the benefit of the money without any unnecessary expenditure for supervision or inspection by the federal government. But section 6 is entirely out of touch with that theory. Under section 6 it apparently is contemplated to originate a new system of expenditure by the federal government in the construction of roads, entirely apart from the provincial and municipal arrangements. The Prime Minister argued the other day that at the end of section 6, there was a limitation, because the federal government had to obtain the authority of the provincial legislature and the consent of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but that addendum does not mean anything at all, because it was not possible for the federal government to enact any law that would enable it to spend any money upon any provincial road in this country without the consent of the provincial government or the municipality that owned the roads. The officers of the federal government would be trespassers if they ventured to go on any road anywhere in Canada without the consent of the provincial government. The important feature of this is that under section 6, the minister is given power to take the whole amount allotted to any province to expend it as he pleases. We ought to be frankly told what the policy of the government on this question is, because if it be as I have indicated then I would move that the clause be stricken out. I submit that the provinces are the proper authorities to deal with the roads; they own them, they have for fifty years provided machinery for making and approving them.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did you not say that the townships owned the roads?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, according to your view, we would have to go back to the townships.

Mr. MACDONALD. Certainly, you would have to go to the municipalities. If the minister expends any money on roads in Nova Scotia he would have to go to the municipalities. Not only that, but we have the statute labour system there under which every person who lives along the highway is compelled to contribute in labour or money annually for its maintenance. The provinces have had years of experience of working in conjunction with the municipalities; they have provincial engineers who know all about the character of the soil and the difficulties to be met with in permanent road construction and drainage, all of which must be considered when you come to expend money on roads, and if the federal government is to spend the money, exercising only its own judgment, then we will be throwing away the experience of fifty years that the provinces and the municipalities have had in road construction. Where you have had wise expenditure on roads by municipalities and provinces, and in view of the growing public opinion and the growing interest in favour of good roads, it seems to me that the federal government should not directly enter into the arena and complicate the whole situation. I can conceive that the federal government could render valuable aid in this matter by the establishment of a good roads bureau such as the federal government has established in the United States, and by which uniformity of conditions could be brought about throughout the Dominion. But, if the federal government is going to undertake the work of constructing roads themselves, I believe they will throw away a tremendous lot of money on inspection and supervision before they get down to actual real expenditure of money on the roads themselves. The first five clauses of the Bill, with certain amendments which have been suggested, would meet with my approval, but section 6 is entirely in subversion of the principles laid down in the previous clauses.

Mr. BORDEN. It seems to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) is unduly disturbed about this. The first part of the Bill provides for grants out of the federal treasury to the provinces, under certain safeguards as to expenditure, cost of construction and various other considerations which ought be taken into account, and my hon. friend is willing that these sections should become law, while to section 6 he strongly objects. Well, the sixth section provides that where the government of a province is willing, the federal government may undertake the work itself instead of handing the money over to the province, and that seems to be a very proper provision. The hon. member inquires whether there is to be a general policy of federal expenditure under this section in every province of Canada.

No one could give him that information in the first instance, because I am sure he would be the first to understand that the efficiency of the organization may vary greatly in different provinces. In one province you may have a thoroughly effective system, under which the construction and improvement and maintenance of highways are carried on. In such a province it is perfectly clear that the best course would be to hand the money over to the provincial government or under some ar-

rangement with the provincial government, so that the existing official organization might be made use of in the expenditure of money. But it may happen that in some other province the organization is not very effective, and that the provincial government itself, under the authority of the provincial legislature, might desire the expenditure of the proposed aid in this way. If such a condition should arise, the money could only be expended in that way with the consent of the province. I see no reason why authority should not be given in this Bill to enable a proposal of that kind to be carried out. It was for that reason that this clause was inserted in the Bill. It is possible that it may be used only very occasionally, but, whether occasionally or otherwise, it seems to me to be one to which no valid objection can be made, and one which might be found very useful in carrying out the proposal of the government for the improvement of highways in the various provinces.

Mr. DEVLIN. What organization does the right hon. gentleman refer to when he says that the organization in some of the provinces may be effective?

Mr. BORDEN. The organization of the road service.

Mr. GORDON. I want to ask the Prime Minister a question in reference to this matter. This is one of the most important proposals ever made in the country, and the government deserve great credit for it. What I want to see is something that can be worked out in a practical way to bring the greatest good to the farmers who use the highways. The federal government might make a grant of a certain percentage, to be supplemented by the provincial government wherever the people in any community agree to raise a certain amount for the purpose, and then have the counties take over and maintain these roadways thereafter at their own expense. The community in which I am interested is ready at the present time to raise a certain amount of money; but how can it under this Act get the assistance it wants from the provincial and federal governments, and then get the money expended in a way that will secure permanent roadways by having uniform specifications and a method of construction that will ensure the judicious expending of the money? If the community wishes to get the assistance that is supposed to be within its reach through the medium of this Bill, how can that be worked out so that the parties will all come together and build these roadways?

Mr. BORDEN. I can say to my hon. friend, who has made a very practical suggestion, that in the course of preparing this Bill a good many suggestions more or less along the line which he has mentioned were brought to our attention. We had under consideration the placing in this Bill of some percentage which must be provided by the province and by the municipality if a certain other percentage were provided by the federal government; but it was impossible to get the necessary information as to conditions in all the provinces of Canada to justify us in fixing a hard and fast rule of that kind in this Bill. I would like to assure my hon. friend that the idea which he has just presented very clearly to the House is one that has been in the mind of the government, and I would like also to assure him that it would be perfectly possible under the provisions of this Bill to work out a scheme of that kind, and it is for that reason that the provisions of this Bill are couched in the general form in which they now appear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question at present before the House is not one connected with the general purpose of the Bill. That general purpose is to aid out of the federal treasury in the building of highways. Up to the present time this has been considered to be not only a provincial work but a municipal work. Section 6 is not at all a corollary of the previous sections. All the previous sections converge to one idea, that is, that the money should be voted by parliament and should be expended by the provinces or in concert with the provinces. But the section now under consideration defeats to a large extent the previous sections. It provides that the money, instead of being handed over to the provinces to be by them expended, may be expended by the Dominion government or by the Minister of Railways. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has I think very properly suggested the objection there is to investing the Minister of Railways with such a power as is described in that section, and the only answer which the Prime Minister has made is that if it is to be done at all, it must be done by the Governor in Council. So far so good. What I say is that there should not be even the power to make such a bargain with the local governments. This work is not intended and cannot be intended to come within the purview of the federal parliament. It cannot be contended that it was ever the intention of the British North America Act, in making a division of powers between the local legislatures and the Dominion parliament, that the Dominion government should become highway constructors. The fathers of Confederation laid down very clearly what should be the duties of the local legislatures and what should be the duties of the Dominion parliament. We are going to some extent out of our way, but still we are within our

jurisdiction, when we provide that out of the federal treasury assistance shall be given to the provinces, not for general purposes, but for one specific object, that is to say, the making or improving of highways.

But, Sir, it is conceivable if the Railway Department is going to become a constructor of highways that it will be able to do the work to-day which is done by the local legislature? It is part, and a most important part, of the duties of the local legislatures to look after highways, and as has been stated by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), a moment ago, they have a special organization for that purpose. That money should be supplied to them, more than they have been given, for the purpose of making or improving highways, is accepted by everybody, but, Sir, power is given now to the Minister of Raiways to inaugurate a new system altogether, and himself to become the contractor or builder of these roads. That in my humble judgment, is reducing very much the usefulness of the Minister of Railways. At present the minister has only to do with administering the railways and canals of the country. If, in addition, to that, he is given the subsidiary task of looking after the highways of the country he must have a new staff, a new organization. What reason can there be why the organization which now exists in all the provinces should not be continued as it is at the present time? The policy proposed can be carried out with the consent of the provinces I know, but I repeat that it is not at all in accordance with the spirit of the constitution, and I can conceive of no reason why there will be more advantage in having this work performed by the Minister of Railways than by any of the provincial governments. The minister is not equipped for this work, it has never been the object of his department to do it, it is a new thing altogether, and when the machinery already exists in the provinces to carry out the work which is intended, I cannot see why new machinery should be organized, which, in the nature of things, cannot construct highways as efficiently as that construction must and can be done by the local authorities.

Mr. DEVLIN. Unfortunately when the first discussion in connection with this measure took place I was not in my seat. Like a good many hon. gentlemen opposite I was engaged in examining the highways—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And the byways.

Mr. DEVLIN—and the byways of the county of South Renfrew, and so I must apoligize if some of the remarks I may make this afternoon might have been delivered at an earlier stage. I want to say that I am entirely in favour of any aid which may be given to the highways of our country, but I think there should be some provision in the Bill by which the money grant to be made under it shall reach the municipalities and the portions of a county where the money is most needed. I asked the Prime Minister a moment ago what nature of organization he was referring to when he said that the money would be given either to the organization or to the Minister of Railways, to act in conjuction with the organization in this province. From my modest experience in matters of organization when dealing with the government of the day, the only organizations I know of are political organizations, and I hardly think that it would be in the interest of the country, much less in the interest of the rural municipalities, that the Minister of Railways should be let loose to deal with political organizations in handling the money of the country given for the purpose of aiding in the construction of roads. I would very modestly suggest to the government that they go about this matter of improving our highways in a more systematic manner. Speaking more particularly for the province of Quebec, I know of no particular organization such as that to which the Finance Minister refers. The custom there is for the legislature to vote a certain amount which is placed at the disposal of the Minister of Colonization. That minister visits the different parts of the province and studies the local needs personally and accepts advice from those who are most concerned in the matter of municipal roads, how best to expend the provincial funds in improving colonization and other roads. There is absolutely no such provision in this Bill. In the province of Quebec the money is handed over to some party who is directly interested—and preferably to the municipalities—somebody who is authorized by the municipalities to expend that money. If the government of the day were to establish a system by which they would hand first to the provinces a set sum of money with the understanding that the provinces would get into touch with the counties, and that that money should be expended for the purpose first of municipal roads, then county roads, and then provincial and interprovincial roads, all parts of the country would be benefited. But to say that the Minister of Railways shall go forth with a sum of money in his pockets and meet his friends in the different counties and have the right to expend that money is simply ridiculous. That money will not reach the portions of the country where it is most needed for the highways. On the other hand, if by this Bill the gov-

ernment of the day, through the Minister of Railways, is forced to expend that money right in the municipalities where it is needed, then I conceive that this Bill will work for the greater advantage of the country. I believe that no amount of money, properly expended, will be too great to aid in the construction of roads in this country; but I want to see the money reach the proper source, and under the Bill in its present form I cannot possibly see how that will occur. I know that the Minister of Railways, having power to expend this money right and left, will want to disburse it for the greater advantage of the country, but if he goes into the county of Wright, for instance, I hardly think he will go to any of those who may be friends of this political party and ask their advice. Rather will he go to the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and spend that money in those portions of the county which will benefit the party to whom that expenditure has been entrusted. I say without taking a partisan view at all of the subject——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am in earnest in that statement because I foresee that the moment this Bill becomes law it will be placed in operation by the present government. But in a few years' time, perhaps sooner, hon. gentlemen may have changed places, and we on this side of the House may take their seats and operate the Bill to the disadvantage of municipalities that may not be exactly in sympathy with the political views which they entertain. Now is the time, whilst the Bill is under consideration, to insert provisions which will prevent any operation of the measure against the advantage of the whole country, so that neither hon. gentlemen opposite, nor any other political party for the time being in power, will be able to use the people's money for any other purpose, good, bad or indifferent, than the improvement of the highways and the byways of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I think this clause, giving the minister power to go throughout the country with the people's money in his pocket, and to expend it where he will, without any rider attached to the clause, is a very dangerous power to give to any gentleman in this House or in the government. I do not wish to hamper the government in any way in improving the highways of this country, but I would like to see the people's money reach a proper object.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Living close to the province of Ontario as the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) does, and having taken, as he has always taken, a lively interest in Ontario provincial politics, he has probably heard from hon. members on his own side, who have been in the local legislature, how their friends, when in power in Ontario, annually dispensed an amount of approximately half a million dollars on roads in that province. And he probably knows that his political friends got good political results from the plan which he says might be followed by this government in the expenditure of the moneys under this proposed new system. But I hope for the sake of the government, and for the reputation of the Dominion, that this government will not resort to the means resorted to by the hon. gentleman's friends in Ontario in road expenditure.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question? Under the clause as it stands, if the political party in power in this country, wishes to do so, will they not be able to carry out the plan which he condemns?

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). I think my hon. friend is unduly afraid that the bad example set by his friends in Ontario—and it may be also in the province of Quebec—will be followed. And, knowing that this plan was used very successfully from a political point of view by his friends in Ontario, he thinks the same force may be arrayed against him under the present proposal. But the principle here is a larger one. It contemplates probably a very large expenditure. And as this whole plan rises above the realm of party politics, I think the people of the Dominion will feel secure in the belief that this fund will be administered rightly, and not merely for political purposes, as was unfortunately the case in the province of Ontario for so many years. Speaking for myself, and I think I voice the sentiments of hon. gentlemen on this side, I would be loath to believe that a Minister of Railways and Canals, representing the government of the day, would ever resort to mere pettifogging in the matter of this expenditure. I believe the whole scheme will be a broad, comprehensive one that will enure not only to the political advantage of the party now in power, but to the practical advantage of each province where the work may be undertaken.

Mr. DEVLIN. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe) I want it to be clearly understood that I was not referring in any way to the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, nor to any other hon. gentleman. But, to cite the example given by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is to prove conclusively that the case of which I have spoken might arise. The hon. gentleman tells me that it actually did arise in the province of Ontario. I have not known it to arise in the province of Quebec, and I hope it never will. But should such a

case arise in the province of Quebec, it will only be an addition to the proof that is already conclusive that a gentleman occupying the position of the present Minister of Railways, a gentleman perhaps less scrupulous than he—he may be a Liberal; I am not speaking of Liberals or Conservatives, but of the power given to expend the money in a way beyond the control of parliament—may do what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett, Simcoe) accuses his opponents in Ontario of doing.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) answer me a question? Is there not every year in the estimates a very large aggregate amount voted for dredging? And is not the Minister of Public Works empowered to spend that grant as he will? I have not charged my memory with the amount of this vote for each province, but it is a very large sum, and it is not voted for any particular work.

Mr. DEVLIN But tenders must be called for.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). Not necessarily in every case. But the point is that the work is undertaken at the discretion of the minister. The expenditure of the money may be safeguarded afterwards by calling for tenders which is right; but the Minister of Public Works can allot the money to this work or that, as he chooses, without asking the authority of parliament for that distribution of the vote.

Mr. DEVLIN. If I may be allowed—and I do not wish to speak too often—that is a purely administrative matter. But here is a case where one gentleman will have the right to go about this broad Dominion expending money right and left wherever he likes without parliament being able to say a solitary word about it, and not always, perhaps, applying the money to an object to which this House would wish to have it applied.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe). But is it not exactly the case of the Minister of Public Works under the general grant for dredging?

Mr. TURGEON. I desire to say only a few words in support of the arguments of the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on the constitutional aspect of this clause. We have heard a great deal about the conservation of our wealth, the conservation of our resources and the conservation of our flag. I am in favour of conservation, and especially of the conservation of the flag. But, as a Canadian, I am in favour of the conservation of our constitution which is the best protection that our flag can have. A few years ago, the government of the day, increased the allowance made to the several provinces. This was done upon a plan which received the unanimous assent of the provinces themselves. For my part, I stated at the time my regret that the increase of subsidies to the provinces was not made larger, as I believed that the time would come when the provinces would have to come back to the Dominion government for still further additions to their subsidies in order to efficiently maintain the schools and roads for which especially these subsidies are granted. I agree that it is an advantage to have more money spent upon our highways with a view to improving this means of communication throughout the Dominion. But I believe, as the right hon. leader of the opposition has said, that we should give the money to the provinces according to their population, the basis adopted years ago, and allow the provinces to distribute that money. This plan would avoid the friction which is certain otherwise to arise. It was stated in this debate a few days ago, I believe by an hon. gentleman on this side representing a Nova Scotia constituency, that. as the government of the province of Nova Scotia is a liberal government, it was likely to be discriminated against in the distribution of this money. I come from a province where the provincial government is to-day Conservative. But, as every member on the other side of the House knows, I am rather indifferent to the influence of any provincial government in my own riding, regardless of the money that may be at their disposal.

I say that according to the constitution, when you give money for local and provincial purposes, you should give it to be distributed by the provincial legislatures themselves, who are the properly constituted authorities for that purpose. That is the only way in which we can avoid future friction between the Dominion and the provincial governments. I have no doubt that the present Minister of Railways will endeavour to do the best he can. I am in favour of the federal government assisting the provinces to build roads; but my objection to this clause is based altogether on the constitutional ground that the money should be spent by the provinces and not by the Dominion government, and that is why I shall oppose this clause.

Mr. CARVELL. I think the Minister of Railways would do well to take the advice tendered him this afternoon by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Baker). Of course, the member for Brome was not discussing section 6, he was discussing the general principle on which this money is to be spent. It is all very well for the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to defend the Minister of Railways, and say that he

will not do what the local government in Ontario did prior to 1905. I want to tell my hon. friend from East Simcoe that the old government of Ontario were human, the present government of Ontario is human, and so is the present Minister of Railways, and so will all the gentlemen be who will compose the Dominion government in all time to come. Now it may be that the Liberal government in Ontario were able to do everything crooked and wrong and that the present government may be able to do everything right. But I want to say that there is a Conservative government in power down in New Brunswick to-day who can do everything which the old Liberal government did in the province of Ontario; and I think I can ask this House to believe that it is possible that the present Minister of Railways may be influenced by his friends, at least in the province of New Brunswick, to do the very things that the member for East Simcoe objected to. Why, Sir, there is no use in mincing matters; the most of us have had a hand in provincial politics, I have for one, the Minister of Railways has for another, and we all know how this road money has been bandied about and used as a matter of barter and sale from time immemorial. What I fear is that notwithstanding the good intentions of the Minister of Railways and the government as a whole, notwithstanding all their professions, the actual result will be, if this clause 6 becomes law, that they will be doing the very things which have been pointed out by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) and others on this side of the House. If you want to know what the result will be, you have only to go back to South Renfrew during the last three weeks. There you find half-a-dozen government members of this House going the length and breadth of that riding, and telling the people: You should vote for the Conservative candidate because we are going to give you a great slice out of this road money.

Mr. TURRIFF. What did the minister say?

Mr. CARVELL. I am only speaking of the men who are behind the minister. This will be the result if you place the Minister of Railways and Canals in a position of an ordinary road builder, and the pressure behind him will be so great that, I do not care who he may be, he will not be able to resist it. Even if this Bill provided that he should build permanent roads, it would not be so bad; if he had even said that he was going to drain his roads, it would not be so bad; it would have been much better if he had said: we must build a macadamized road with steel bridges and culverts. But without one specification anywhere, without saying whether it is to be a permanent road or a mud road, every time an election is brought on, even a municipal election, you will find the changes will be rung, the party whip will be cracked and men will be told: 'If you don't vote for the county council we want you to vote for, you won't get any portion of this grant.' The member for Simcoe says: But we are bigger and broader than all that, this is a great national enterprise, we are going to run it on big broad lines. That is what we were told in New Brunswick before the elections of 1908; we were told that when the Conservative party got into power they were going to take the roads out of politics and hand them over entirely to the municipalities. They appointed in each parish a road board, composed of two municipal councillors, and a third man appointed by the government, and let me show you how it works out after three years of experience. In that province, we do not have local councils as they do in Ontario, we have municipal councils, consisting of two members from each parish, and all meet together in a county council. Wherever we have a Liberal and a Conservative on the road board, the government appoints a Conservative as a third man, and naturally he is the whole thing, he is president, secretary, treasurer, and the board is run on Conservative lines. Where we have two Liberal councillors, then invariably they are wholly ignored, and the road money is handled entirely by the man appointed by the government. I can tell him that there are dozens and dozens of road boards in the province of New Brunswick, that only meet once a year when they have to have an annual meeting, and they have squandered the money just as bad as it was squandered by these men that the member for East Simcoe was telling us about. Now they will be able to do these things in the future, just the same as they have done in the past, they will make these roads grants for purely political purposes. They will rake up the mud which was raked up the year before, and put it on top of the road, and they will pay the good money of the country for doing so, if they can get votes out of it. That is what they are doing in New Brunswick, and what they will continue to do under this Bill. Therefore, I think my hon. friends opposite must realize that this legislation is not in the spirit of the British North America Act. Does anybody suppose that when the British North America Act was framed a proviso was put in making the Minister of Railways a road builder with a right to go on any highway and by way in any province and build roads?

Mr. COCHRANE. This Bill does not give the minister that right.

Mr. CARVELL. Of course it does not say so, there is a saving clause which says that permission must be obtained from the legislature. But does the Minister of Railways suppose that any legislature in Canada will refuse to allow him to go into that province and spend money on its roads? He knows better than that, he is not sincere in making that statement. Under the wording of this Bill he can give a $5 grant to build a little culvert if he thinks he can get a vote out of it; he can spend money on any road wholly or in part, and do absolutely as he likes with it. He does not even have to call for tenders. The hon. member for Simcoe told us about the expenditure of a general grant for dredging; but there at least tenders were supposed to be called for. But here the Minister of Railways is not even supposed to call for tenders, and he proposes legislation in the most vicious form known in order to get political support. Wherever a by-election comes on, he can appropriate a portion of this road money, and put it into the hands of his political friends, and they will say to the electors: Now you vote right and you will get so much. They will go further than that and they will say: You will not get this grant until the election is over, and if the election does not go right, you will not get the money at all. I am only pointing out what they are doing in New Brunswick, and I am pointing out what they will do all over this country, if this legislation goes through. Therefore, I say it is a piece of vicious legislation, and ought not to be passed.

Mr. PROULX. Under the Ontario system the initiative was left with the counties. The county passed a by-law and adopted the system and the government had to contribute a portion of the cost of the road to the county. If this government gave the money to the provinces then the provinces could increase the sum to the counties and still leave the initiative with the counties. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Kent is a very good one. The people should be interested and the initiative should be left with the counties.

Mr. MACDONALD. I asked the right hon. leader of the government (Mr. Borden) in the few remarks I made a few minutes ago, to explain to the committee whether he understood the effect of clause 6, to mean that the federal government were to enter practically into the business of looking after the roads of the country. That, I submit, would be the effect of the section because it would give them the power to do so. The right hon. gentleman stated that this was intended to apply to a case where, for instance, a province did not have an adequate system in regard to the expenditure of its road money, under which circumstances the government could go in and expend the whole of the money that was appropriated for that province itself. That answer is not a satisfactory one because it is not to be supposed that any province would consider itself as not having an adequate system for spending road moneys and it would not therefore give to the federal government an opportunity of making that expenditure. The right hon. gentleman has given no reason why the government should enter into the arena of provincial powers and engage in the task of looking after the roads of the country. He was good enough to say to the hon. member for Kent, who made a very practical suggestion as to the utilization of the road money generally, which meant nothing more nor less than a suggestion that we had previously made, that the wisdom of the expenditure of road money depended on the unification of the authority so that the roads would get the benefit of the assistance that came from the different quarters. If that was the proposal that came before the government it can never be worked out under section 6. It would be impossible to work conjointly with the provinces or with the municipalities along the lines proposed here. Manifestly the Minister of Railways and Canals has not the equipment in his department to deal with roads at all. Before the minister could pass judgment upon the question as to whether the roads system of any province was good or not, or the engineering facilities and equipment of the province were such as that the country could expect a wise and prudent expenditure of the road money entrusted to him, the minister would need to gather around him a very large staff of specialists on that subject, not a staff which would be adequate for any particular province, but a staff greater and more numerous than that which they have in any province to-day. The minister would need to have such a staff before he could safely expend a dollar of the money that was put in his hands for better roads. Are we going to originate a system of that kind? The government disclaim any such idea. Still, they have power to do it at any time and, as my hon. friend from Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) has pointed out, evil results will follow from it. My right hon. friend said, with regard to the constitutional difficulties that were suggested the other day, that no province would object to the federal government giving them money, or spending money in the province, and that therefore there was no constitutional obstacle. Well, the fathers of confederation, fifty years ago, said that it was a wise and prudent thing for Canada that the provincial governments should look after the roads of the country. Having regard to that distribution of power they said: We will provide the provinces with funds from the

central treasury in order that they may look after the roads of the country. They have been doing it for fifty years. This government say that they propose to continue that system by giving additional aid, yet they put in the Bill a power which will nullify the rest of it and endanger the constitutional system adopted fifty years ago. It certainly will dislocate the system under which municipalities all over the country, look after the repair of the roads because it will nullify the system of statute labour. I submit that this is not a wise measure and I would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Proulx, that the clause be struck out.

Amendment negatived (Yeas 48, nays 52.).

Mr. KNOWLES. I would ask whether the hon. member for Perth was in the chamber when the motion was read.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The vote has been declared. Put your question on the order paper.

Mr. KNOWLES. I want to know whether the hon. member for North Perth, or South Perth, was in the chamber when the question was put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand this rule does not apply in committee.

Bill reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT—CUSTOMS, OUTSIDE SERVICE.

House in committee on the following proposed resolutions:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act and the Acts in amendment thereof, and to provide as follows:—

1. (As section 39, subsection 2), that a person who has served seven years as a chief clerk in the outside service of the Customs may be appointed to the rank of senior chief clerk, subject to such examination on the duties of office and other qualifications as is prescribed by the deputy head in a report to be concurred in by the head of the department. The salary of such senior chief clerk shall be from $2,200 to $2,800 per annum.

2. (As section 39, subsection 3), that a person who has served over three years as a clerk in the outside service of the Customs may be appointed to the rank of senior clerk, subject to such examination on the duties of office and other qualifications as is prescribed by the deputy head in a report to be concurred in by the head of the department. The salary of such senior clerk shall be from $1,200 to $1,600 per annum.

3. That the part of schedule 'B' of the Civil Service Act which relates to Customs be repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

SCHEDULE 'B' CUSTOMS.

Higher Classes.			
Collectors, salary per annum	from	$ 300 to	$4,500
Chief inspector, salary per annum	"	3,200 "	4,000
Inspector of ports, salary per annum	"	2,000 "	3,000
Assistant inspectors, salary per annum	"	1,600 "	2,000
Chief clerks, salary per annum	"	1,200 "	2,200
Senior chief clerks, salary per annum	"	2,200 "	2,800
Surveyors, salary per annum	"	1,200 "	2,800
Assistant surveyors (comprising tide surveyors, chief waiters and chief lockers), salary per annum	"	1,200 "	1,600
Technical Officers.			
Dominion appraisers, salary per annum	from	$2,200 to	$2,600
Apraisers, salary per annum	"	1,200 "	2,200
Assistant appraisers, salary per annum	"	900 "	1,600
Gaugers, salary per annum	"	900 "	1,600
Other Classes.			
Senior clerks, salary per annum	from	$1,200 to	$1,600
Clerks and landing waiters, salary per annum	"	400 "	1,200
Examining officers (including preventive officers whose duties are not chiefly clerical, and lockers), salary per annum	"	100 "	1,000
Packers and messengers, salary per annum	"	400 "	800

Mr. BORDEN. I understand from the Minister of Customs that this is practically the same legislation as was introduced by the late government last session, but on account of the sudden dissolution, no doubt, it was not proceeded with. I would suggest that the resolution be passed and the discussion, if any, take place on the second reading.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The policy involved in the proposition made requires some discussion, but we will take it on the second reading of the Bill.

Resolution concurred in and reported.

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116), to amend the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—MOOSEJAW ARMOURY.

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

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I

would like to draw the attention of the government to the need of an armoury in the city of Moosejaw. I want, for the benefit of the Prime Minister, to read certain correspondence which has passed between the city of Moosejaw and the government, or rather the Minister of Militia and Defence. The following is a letter addressed to the Hon. Colonel Hughes by Mr. W. F. Heale, city clerk of Moosejaw:

Honourable Colonel Hughes,
Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I am instructed by the Moosejaw City Council to communicate with your department re the delay in bringing the armouries on the Fairford Street site. The following resolution was passed by the council at their meeting held on January 8th and I am instructed to forward it to you with the request that you kindly deal with the matter as early as possible.

That the council very much regret that no move has been made to construct the armouries so long promised, and that the Minister of Militia and Defence be requested to state as early as possible the intention of his department in this connection, as the council are desirous of using this very valuable site for other purposes unless used by the department without further delay.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
W. F. HEALE,
City Clerk.

A reply was made to that letter, and it is to that reply that I ask the very particular attention of the Prime Minister. This is it:

Minister's office,
Ottawa, February 1, 1912.
Re Drill Shed.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 10th, 1912, with the 'instructions' from your city council re 'the delay in building the armouries on the Fairford street site.'

I do not understand what your letter means. Nor can I comprehend what you mean by your use of the word 'delay.' Nor can I imagine what your reference is about the 'armouries so long promised.'

I have been Minister of Militia since October, and am responsible for no promise made before that time. Will you permit me to say that I think it would be much better taste on the part of your council, instead of passing a resolution of regret and fault-finding, to have quietly made a request and placed the facts before me.

Your fault-finding letter is the first intimation I have had officially that there is such a place as Moosejaw or that you want an armoury. While in the west, I met a number of splendid fellows from Moosejaw, officers and others, who spoke to me like gentlemen on this matter, and I promised them, and have carried out my promises, to recommend a sum of money, not for an armoury, which is of no use for a large and growing place like Moosejaw, but for a drill hall and armouries.

I also suggested the formation of a city corps for Moosejaw.

Might I suggest that as your council seems to go about it in a blundering sort of fashion that they should appoint some of those gentlemen whom I had the privilege of meeting in the west to carry on the negotiations in the matter? They seemed to know their business and were very judicious.

If it were left to them, I think Moosejaw would soon have a splendid drill hall and armouries attached and would also have a city regiment.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) SAM HUGHES.
City Clerk,
W.F. Heale, Esq.,
Moosejaw.

I wish to say that the property offered by the city of Moosejaw had been accepted by the government, but there was a slight cloud on the title, the circumstances being that the prior holders of the title had passed it over to the city as part of a park, and in the deed to the city it is stated that it must not be used for commercial purposes, and must not be alienated. The city of Moosejaw naturally can only give the same kind of title to the government that they themselves have, and I understand that between the Department of Public Works, the Department of Militia and the Department of Justice who are mixed up in it, there is delay because of this. In reference to the answer given to the city of Moosejaw by the Minister of Militia, without saying anything offensive to the Minister of Militia, I deem the letter he wrote to be unworthy of the high and dignified position that he for the moment holds.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Knowles), is scarcely within the amenities of debate when he says that a certain tion is unworthy of any member of the House.

Mr. KNOWLES. Well, it is quite worthy of the Minister of Militia. I submit to the government and especially to the right hon. the Prime Minister, that I would be very pleased if any technical difficulties with regard to the transfer of this site to the government could be overcome as soon as possible, so that the city may not use this property for any other purpose. I would be personally very glad to see an armoury erected on this property, and I trust that a good substantial armoury and drill hall will be erected there such as the minister suggests.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member did not do me the honour of sending me word that he was going to bring this matter up to-day, or I would have been in my place in the House when he began his remarks. I may inform him that the negotiations in reference to the mat-

ter to which he has referred have been handed over to the Moosejaw Board of Trade, the city council being too hidebound a Grit institution to treat any one with proper courtesy. This action has had this effect: The city council of Moosejaw, having been relieved of the necessity of sending letters of a blustering and threatening description, the matter is working out very nicely. It appears that the property which Moosejaw is offering does not belong to Moosejaw, but was handed over to that municipality by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for public purposes, and it cannot be sold or used for any other purpose.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think the minister is in error. They never said they would alienate the property. They would use it for other purposes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The city may use it for public purposes, but it cannot sell it to any one. These gentlemen talk as if they owned the property and were giving us a $40,000 site. However, the matter is proceeding very nicely now. The Moosejaw council has come to its senses, and the board of trade is dealing with the matter.

GRAIN CONGESTION IN THE WEST.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to move the following resolution, of which I gave notice some time ago:

That all the words after 'that' in the main motion be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

That the House heard with satisfaction from the Minister of Trade and Commerce that as a result of a conference recently held by him and at his request with representatives of the three railway systems operating in western Canada, these railways have 'lowered their rate, making the rate to Duluth and Minneapolis the same as to Fort William and Port Arthur.'

And that as a further result of the conference mentioned, 'application has been made to the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States for leave to file grain rates from the Northwest down to Minneapolis and Duluth, and to ease the pressure in the congested districts by taking the grain away by more western routes down towards the south.'

The House is informed by the public press that the reduced rates as mentioned have been granted by the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern railways on wheat and oats for export only.

As the reduction of rates so announced can only affect the situation to a limited degree, the House would urge upon the government the advisability of securing further consideration of the matter by the Railway Companies with a view to having the reduced rates apply to wheat and oats for grinding in bond and for consumption in the United States as well as for export;

The House would further urge that such means as may be practicable be taken by the government to have the through rates on barley and flax to Duluth and Minneapolis which became effective on January 23 reduced to the Fort William rate.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If my hon. friend will allow me for a moment, this motion was given notice of, I think, some two weeks ago. As a great many things have happened, and some of them began to happen about that time, and as nothing has since been said about it by my hon. friend, I had supposed that it had passed out of the region of discussion, and was not aware that my hon. friend intended to bring it up. Now, this will bring on a discussion on a very wide subject, and I imagine that my hon. friend wants to have the matter discussed with all the information possible. If it is agreeable to him to postpone his motion to another day, it would be much more to the interest of a general discussion on the whole matter. I suggest this to him; it is for himself to make his own decision.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection, if my hon. friend will fix a day this week for the discussion; but I have been anxious to press this discussion forward ever since I gave notice of the motion, and this is the first occasion on which it seemed convenient to bring it up.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Does my hon. friend intend to press the matter to a vote?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that is the intention.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). If not, Friday might be agreeable to both of us. If the hon. gentleman intends to press it to a vote, he might let it go over to Monday or Tuesday of next week.

Mr. OLIVER. I certainly could not move such an important motion without bringing it to a vote, and either Thursday or Friday would suit my purpose very well; but I would not like to postpone the discussion any longer than is absolutely necessary except on the responsibility of the government. The conditions which the resolution takes notice of are urgent, and, as my hon. friend has said, many things are happening and I would wish to have this matter considered before the condition to which it relates has passed out of existence by effluxion of time. I have been ready to bring the motion forward on every day since I gave notice of it, but this is the first occasion on which it seemed convenient to bring forward a motion of such importance.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Well, my hon. friend can go on.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to call attention as strongly as I can to the condition of affairs which exists today in the western provinces, and which is generally spoken of as the grain blockade. I do not suppose it will be necessary for me to spend any serious length of time in demonstrating that there is such a blockade. About the time this notice was given the leading newspaper of the west took measures to inquire into the conditions as they then existed. That paper wired on January 29 to 150 points. At the time notice was given of this resolution it had heard from 49 points, and at only nine of them was it reported that there was no blockade.

I will not trouble the House with any long list of the facts as shown by the newspaper mentioned, the 'Free Press.' They are, I have no doubt, within the knowledge of many members of the House. But here is one instance, the very first one I took down. The wire is from Quill Lake, Saskatchewan. There were 52 orders or cars. A car was ordered on November 9, which was placed on January 23, and 50 per cent of the grain was still in the farmers' hands. At Foam Lake, Saskatchewan, there were 60 orders on the order book, the elevators were full, there were 100,000 bushels in the farmers' hands, and 50,000 bushels threshed. Other members of the House will, no doubt, give the committee further information as to the existence of the blockade. But it may be of interest to give some facts as to why there is a blockade, and why that blockade should be of such an extraordinary character and at such an extraordinary time of the year as this information establishes it to be. A blockade is the condition in which grain is offered for sale beyond the quantity that can be, or is being, transported to market. In every year there is shortly after the beginning of threshing, and before the close of navigation, in the nature of things, if the markets are good, necessarily a rush of grain, and a car shortage, or a blockade, or a partial blockade, during that period of the year is something that has occurred frequently, and may be looked for to occur in the future on many occasions. Last year it did not occur. The year before it did occur, and so on from year to year, as the occasion was, the blockade existed or did not exist. But this year the conditions were extraordinary. In the first place the acreage under crop was much larger than it ever was before. In the next place the crop, so far as its growth was concerned, was probably generally heavier than it ever was before in the history of the country. Over and above that, the season was unfavourable for harvesting, and the harvesting did not begin as early as usual. When the work of transporting the crop to the lake front began, it began later than usual, and the result has been that from the time transportation of the crop to the lake front began until the present time, there has been a condition of grain blockade. Under ordinary circumstances the car shortage or blockade that would exist between the beginning of the transportation of the crop and the close of navigation, would be to some extent practically eliminated after the close of navigation. The rush to get the grain forward would stop at that period, and the gradual movement of grain out of the terminal elevators by the all-rail route to the seaboard, and the gradual coming forward of the grain, would militate against a condition of car shortage or grain blockade shortly after the close of navigation.

This season the condition is that instead of the close of navigation marking a finish of the grain blockade, it was after the close of navigation that the grain blockade became more acute than before, and that the damage to the business interests of the country resulted more strongly than before. The conditions have been aggravated by the fact that, owing to the bad weather of last fall, it is practically impossible to get all the grain threshed, and a great deal of the grain that has been threshed was in a damp condition at that time, and having been placed in storage, in the farmers' granary or in a country elevator, has become liable to destruction, because of being heated as the result of its being damp when it was stored. So that we are in the face of a condition which not only operates against the price which the farmer received for his grain, but that tends to the actual destruction of a considerable part of the total crop of the northwest by reason of the blockade.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Have you any definite, or fairly definite, information as to what percentage of the grain has not been threshed as yet, and what percentage is in a damp condition and likely to be destroyed?

Mr. OLIVER. The most definite information that I can give is the representation of the manager of the Ogilvie Milling Company, who reports that there are 30,000,000 bushels of damaged wheat in the west unfit for milling, and about that amount was unthreshed in the middle of January. This is the condition as it exists at the present time. With a larger crop than we ever had before, and with that crop in danger of being destroyed to a considerable extent, because it is not going forward, we have a more extraordinary condition of grain blockade than ever before existed in the northwest. Just as

to the magnitude of the damage, I will not say the disaster, to the interests of the country let me give the figures as to the amount of grain that has to be handled. I take the estimate of Sir Byron Walker as placed before the directors of the Bank of Commerce at their annual meeting. He estimates the total yield as 400,000,000 bushels of grain, of which 175,000,000 bushels are wheat, 180,000,000 oats, 35,000,000 barley, and 6,000,000 flax, and he values this crop at $200,000,000. He also states that the crop of wheat was expected at one time to be 200,000,000 or 225,000,000 of bushels, so that the condition is that the farmer of the west who—by reason of the area that he had sown, by reason of the expenditure that he had incurred, by reason of the conditions that prevailed in the early part of the growing season—had reason to expect 200,000,000 or 225,000,000 bushels of wheat, has only, as a matter of fact, secured 175,000,000 bushels. That is to say by reason of the unfavourable season the farmer is short, according to Sir Byron Walker, between 25,000,000 and 50,000,000 bushels of his reasonable expectation.

And let it be remembered that these expectations are not pencil and paper estimates, but are based upon the expenditure that the farmer has incurred. He has ploughed his land, he has sown his seed, he has maintained his help and, having incurred all these expenses, he might reasonably have expected results aggregating 200,000,000 or 225,000,000 bushels. But, notwithstanding these expenditures on his part, he has secured only 175,000,000 bushels. That is, he is between 25,000,000 and 50,000,000 bushels short of his reasonable expectations of the result of his investment, the shortage being due to the unfavourable conditions of the harvest season.

Mr. BLAIN. Does that include the three western provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. I assume that it does. I am merely giving the House Sir Byron Walker's statement, which, I understand, covers the three western provinces. And I know of no place where I could get a more complete, comprehensive and, I presume, accurate statement.

Mr. BRODER. That result might follow great drought as well as too much rain.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly. I am merely giving the facts Sir Byron Walker has stated. My hon. friend need not be alarmed; these facts have only an indirect bearing on the argument I wish to make. Of the movement of this crop, Mr. Thompson, of the Ogilvie Mills, estimates that there were 100,000,000 bushels of wheat marketed by January 11. Estimating that 25,000,000 bushels would be needed for seed and bread, that would mean 50,000,000 bushels of wheat still to be marketed on January 10. Then, as I have already said in answer to the hon. member's inquiry, the same authority estimates that there was from 25,000,000 to 30,000,000 bushels of wheat still in the farmers' hands at that time much of it unthreshed, most of it damp, and all of it unfit for milling. As to the grain going forward, there was inspected at Winnipeg up to January 10, of wheat 67,000,000 bushels, of oats 17,500,000 bushels, of barley 250,000 bushels, of flax 250,000 bushels. So that, of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat marketed up to January 10, only 67,000,000 bushels had reached Winnipeg up to that time.

Deliveries began about September 10. Owing to unfavourable conditions of weather, the deliveries were not very strong at first. About November 10 the blockade became acute and continued until the close of navigation. It was expected that at the close of navigation the blockade would be to some extent relieved. But, contrary to common expectations and the experience of previous seasons, the blockade has been more acute, not less acute, since the close of navigation. At the close of navigation there was 6,000,000 bushels of wheat in store at the terminal elevators. At last account there was 18,000,000 bushels in store at terminal elevators at Fort William, and these elevators were full. The total capacity of the elevators is, of course, much greater than the figure I have given; but, owing to the great number of grades this season and to the damaged crop, the actual capacity of the elevators is reduced to this extent. So, we have this condition: A blockade beginning on September 10th which continued until the close of navigation, and which after the close of navigation became more acute, and continued to January 10th, the date I have mentioned. Of the 100,000,000 bushels of wheat marketed —according to Mr. Thompson's statement —up to January 10th, at least half must have been marketed under blockade conditions. That is the season began on September 10th. We will assume that there was no blockade until November 10th. Two months marketing, free of blockade up to November 10th, and from that date to January 10th two months of actual blockade. Therefore, it is fair to assume that if we had 50,000,000 bushels marketed free of blockade, we must have had the other 50,000,000 bushels marketed during the blockade. So, whatever loss would occur from blockade conditions would have to be suffered on not less than 50,000,000 bushels.

When I gave notice of this motion, the terminal elevators were full of grain, and no matter what the world's market price might be, the grain in the farmer's hands

must remain in his hands. It could not be stored in country elevators, for the country elevators were full; the country elevators could not empty into the terminal elevators because the terminal elevators were full; and apparently it was not possible to transport the grain from the terminal elevator to the eastern seaboard at a rate that would give any substantial relief to the condition of blockade existing. I have here a despatch appearing in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' of January 25, which states the condition in regard to the elevators at Fort William:

There were in the Fort William books last night 3,577 cars on order not loaded——

That is, cars ordered for eastern shipment.

—representing over 4,326,500 bushels of grain of all kinds; and for over three weeks there has never been less than 3,000 cars on order, but not loaded. The daily storage on 3,577 cars is $1,300 and the interest on money thus tied up is over $600 per day, making a direct daily loss to the shippers of $12,000 or $14,000 per week, making no allowance whatever for the heavy losses sustained because shippers cannot fill contract while these cars remain undelivered at destination. Railways promised to load 200 cars a day. Evidence that they have requested terminal elevators not to load grain. Situation worse now than two weeks ago. Fort William key of situation. Without relief at terminals situation in interior becomes increasingly acute. Must move 300 cars a day from terminals.

At six oclock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. When the House rose at six o'clock I was reading a dispatch to the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' dated January 25, which showed that on that date a condition of blockade existed in the terminals at Fort William. How long previous that condition had existed we are not able to say. But I assume, for the purposes of my calculation, that it began not later than January 10. At that time there was about 18 million bushels of all kinds of grain in storage in the terminals, and I find by the latest report of the Department of Trade and Commerce that on the week ending February 2 the amount in store at the terminal elevators was still approximately 18 million bushels, showing that whatever the condition was at the time mentioned, it still continued up to February 5. What I desire to bring to the attention of the House is the statement made by the 'Free Press' that the railway company was not able to forward the grain from Fort William at the rate of 200 cars a day, and allowing a period from January 10 to April 1 for the relief of the blockade conditions in time to be of any use in the case of damp grain, we have eleven and a half weeks. Moving that grain at the rate at which this despatch says it can be moved, something less than 200 cars a day, the railway company would be able to move 12 million bushels during that time, and they would relieve the terminal storage to that extent. If they were also able then to bring 12 million bushels forward from the wheat fields to the terminals they would relieve the conditions in the wheat fields to that extent. But on the statement of Mr. Thompson, of the Ogilvie Milling Company, that on January 10 there were 30 million bushels still in the wheat fields, that is to say, in the farmer's hands, either in the stook or threshed, there would still be from 13 to 18 million bushels left in the fields or on the farmer's hands on the 1st of April, after which date the grain that was damp and liable to heat would practically be useless for commercial purposes. Unless damp grain is kept in condition by cold weather or reaches a drying plant before the 1st of April, it has, in all human probability, become destroyed, so far as commercial value is concerned. Therefore, on the statement which I have before me, and I am sure it is a very moderate statement, the country is face to face with a probable loss of some 13 to 18 million bushels of wheat by reason of this blockade.

I have said that the loss to the farmer on the expectation of his crop was estimated at about 25 million bushels. At 60 cents a bushel the loss to the farmer will be $15,000,000. But, unfortunately, besides the shortage of the crop is the loss to the farmer by reason of depreciated quality, owing to the unfavourable season of late growth and harvest. What the depreciation actually is must be a matter of estimate. But we can form a fair estimate by taking the quality of grain in store at the terminals at a certain date. I find also in a statement of the Department of Trade and Commerce that there was in store in the terminals in January, twelve and a half million bushels of wheat. Of this, four and a half million bushels graded No. 3 and upwards; 3 and a quarter millions graded 4, 5 and 6; 4 and three-quarter millions were below No. 6. That is to say, speaking roughly, one-third of the total was good milling wheat, one-third was poor milling wheat, and one-third was unfit for milling. As to the depreciation in price because of the depreciation in quality, I quote Winnipeg prices of January 25. No. 1 Northern was worth 96¼ cts.; No. 3 Northern, 88 cts.; No. 5, 73 cts.; Feed, 57 cts.; Feed tough, 51 cts; a spread of 8 cents between 1 and 3 Northern, of 15 cents between 3 and 5 Northern, of 16 cents between 5 Northern and Feed, and a spread of 6 cents between

Feed tough and Feed, or a gross spread between Feed tough and 1 Northern of 45½ cents.

I think it would be fair on this showing to say that the total crop actually harvested is depreciated in value by reason of depreciated quality not less than 14 cents a bushel. A loss of 14 cents a bushel on a crop of 150 million bushels for sale is $20,000,000. Therefore, on the crop of the past year, from natural causes, that is, from shortage of crop and from inferiority of quality, the farmer may be presumed to have lost $15,000,000 by reason of the shortage, and $20,000,000 by reason of depreciated quality, a total loss to the farmer from natural or unavoidable causes upon the crop of the past season of some $35,000,000, as compared with his reasonable expectations. This sum is about one-third of his total expectations for his whole crop—wheat at 60 cents a bushel would have been about $105,000,000. That is, he goes into the season of marketing with one-third of his reasonable expectations cut off by natural causes. I dwell on this point for the purpose of showing how important it was to the farmer and to the country at large when he had suffered so greatly from unavoidable causes, that every possible means should have been taken to prevent any further loss from causes which could by any means have been avoided.

The loss which results to the farmer from the condition of grain blockade or car shortage may be thus described: When the operator of the country elevator becomes impressed with the idea that he cannot get the grain that he buys on the country market forwarded promptly to the lake front in the ordinary course of business, he must reckon on the consequence of delay and as the season for the close of navigation approaches he must take into account that the delay in the forwarding of the grain that he buys is going to throw him into winter storage at the terminals. It will be plain, Mr. Speaker, that if by reason of the delay of a week in the forwarding of a car of grain, the country dealer is thereby saddled with the cost of from five to seven months storage upon that grain, he must make allowance accordingly in the price that he pays. Just as soon as there is a suspicion of a car shortage or blockade condition, then and there that condition is reflected in the price that the operator of the country elevator is able to pay to the farmer. The operator must allow in such a case for interest, insurance, storage and risk of the market. He must, in fact, allow as the minimum, from six to eight cents a bushel. Remember that the first effect of a car shortage or blockade condition to the farmer is a cut of from six to eight cents a bushel in the price that he receives as compared with the then market price. Usually, at the close of navigation, conditions settle. The grain goes into storage, it is not forwarded as rapidly, some relief is given by transportation eastward, and, generally speaking, the condition of blockade ceases at or soon after the close of navigation. But, in the case of this season, instead of the expectation of relief being realised, the condition of blockade was made permanent and was accentuated. While there was a reasonable reflex on the farmer in his price because of the blockade condition existing before December 10, after December 10 a panic condition ensued and panic prices became the rule to the farmer. Instead of the country operator paying the farmer the winter price subject to the reduction that I have made for storage, insurance and other charges, being faced with the possibility that he could not get the grain forwarded at all, or did not know when he could get it forwarded panic prices resulted to the farmer, panic conditions prevailed and have prevailed ever since.

I have already said that unless the damaged grain gets to the hospital elevator by the first of April it is, in all probability, destroyed. This fact, of course, accentuates the panic condition that prevails this season. Of course, all figures must be estimates, actual accuracy cannot be demonstrated, but the figures which I propose to give the committee are unquestionably within the mark. On the 50,000,000 bushels of grain marketed between November 10 and January 10—that is marketed between the first blockade condition and January 10 when the blockade condition was demonstrated to be impossible of relief—estimating the loss to the farmers at six cents a bushel, the loss to the farmers would be $3,000,000. But, on the 50,000,000 bushels remaining to be marketed after January 10, and, which, according to the statement of Mr. Thompson of the Ogilvie Milling Company, must be marketed under panic conditions, I think it is a very moderate estimate to say that the loss would be ten cents a bushel to the farmers, or a loss of $5,000,000 from January 10 to the end of the season and of $3,000,000 from the beginning of the blockade on November 10 to January 10.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that 50,000,000 bushels was the amount of wheat in the farmers' hands on January 10?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I presume that the hon. gentleman must know that it has never been the custom of the western farmers to ship all their grain out, but that a great deal of the grain is kept over until the following summer and that it would

not have been shipped if there had been ever so many cars.

Mr. OLIVER. I have already said to the committee that the fact of so much of the grain being damp, makes it necessary that the grain shall be got forward to the drying or hospital elevators, or it will go out of condition. It will be seriously damaged or altogether destroyed. The conditions this season differ from ordinary conditions.

Mr. STAPLES. What percentage of this 50,000,000 bushels was damaged?

Mr. OLIVER. I have the statement of Mr. Thompson, of the Ogilvie Milling Company, and also of a Mr. Black, I think—at any rate of two gentlemen connected with the Ogilvie Milling Company—both estimating that 30,000,000 bushels will be remaining in the farmers' hands or damaged by reason of being damp, a large part of it unthreshed at that time, and a considerable part of it is unthreshed yet. My hon. friends, who are acquainted with farming conditions, know that if grain in the stook when the snow comes on, is threshed, that grain must get to where it will be dried before the hot weather comes on, because, otherwise it would be very much damaged.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is not threshed yet, is it?

Mr. OLIVER. A great deal of it is not threshed. When a blockade exists, and it becomes impossible for either the farmer or the dealer to get the grain forwarded, then certainly the grain is safer in the stook than it is in the farmers' granary or in the country elevator.

There is no doubt that there is a great deal of grain to-day remaining unthreshed in the stooks, that if there was no blockade would have been threshed and gone forward, and the farmer would have got the money for it.

Mr. STAPLES. How does the hon. gentleman make that out?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Staples) lives in a farming constituency, and he knows perfectly well that what I am saying is correct, and there is no use arguing it between us.

Mr. STAPLES. I am only asking the hon. gentleman for information. I am proud to say I am a farmer and have a fair knowledge of what takes place amongst the farming community, and I can state that every available threshing machine has been working overtime trying to get the grain threshed.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I am not disputing that at all. I have said that there is a great deal of the grain still unthreshed, and I have said that in my judgment it is more than likely that a great deal of that grain would have been threshed if there had been no blockade. But, there being a blockade, there was no object in threshing it when it would have suffered greater damage after being threshed than it was suffering by remaining in the stooks, when it was not possible to get it forwarded properly.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the threshing machines in the west have been idle instead of operating?

Mr. OLIVER. I mean in some cases they have undoubtedly.

Mr. STAPLES. I can assure you they have not.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Staples) is no doubt familiar with the constituency he represents, but the conditions in that constituency, as the House knows, are not the same as they are in other parts of the west.

Mr. STAPLES. I have a fair knowledge of the whole west.

Mr. OLIVER. Then my hon. friend will have to allow us who represent other parts of the west to speak for our own constituencies just as we will be glad to have the hon. gentleman speak for the part of the west he represents.

Mr. STAPLES. Then I understand the hon. gentleman to say that in the part of the west he represents the threshing machines have been idle.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, at some parts of the year undoubtedly. I was giving the House an estimate, a conservative estimate I believe, of the direct loss to the farmer as the result of the blockade conditions. I got as far as the estimated loss on wheat, but I wish to add that in my judgment it is reasonable to consider that on oats, barley and flax, which are subject to the same blockade conditions, there would be a loss of no less than two million dollars. My estimate is that on wheat, oats, barley and flax, and because of the depreciation in price to the farmers resulting from blockade conditions in this season the farmers have suffered a loss of not less than ten million dollars.

Mr. STEVENS. The hon. gentleman stated that there was a loss of five million dollars on wheat, taking fifty million bushels at ten cents a bushel, but a moment afterwards the hon. gentleman admitted that there were about thirty million bushels of this which was damaged and it would necessarily be forced to go forward, and, as we know, it is the custom of the farmers to hold a large quantity over. So, I think,

if he is fair in his estimate, it would be right to cut his five million bushels down to at least three million bushels. We want to have as fair an estimate as we can.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to say to my hon. friend and to the House generally that I have made this estimate as moderate as in my judgment the circumstances will admit in accordance with truth. When my hon. friend suggests that we have thirty million bushels of damaged grain which must go forward or be lost, and which cannot go forward by reason of the blockade, he surely must also admit that my estimate is below the mark rather than above it. But I want to dwell a little on this point of the damaged grain and the liability of the total destruction of that grain. I have only dealt with the loss that is accruing to-day, and it is a very moderate estimate of the loss that I have given on the grain that is going forward; that is, the grain upon which the commercial value is not altogether destroyed. But there is no doubt that there is a large part of the grain crop—and the evidence of Mr. Thompson and of Mr. Black and the evidence of the sense of any man who has travelled in the west this winter shows it, there is a large part of the grain crop that stands in danger of total destruction. To repeat: every man knows that when wheat is threshed in a damp condition, when that wheat is stored as it must be stored, unless it is dry before being stored it is bound to heat and if it heats its commercial value will either be destroyed or be depreciated to such an extent as to be a very great loss. That is the condition we are face to face with. Remember, I have shown that on the statement made as to the possibility of transportation out of the terminal elevators there must be left in the farmers' hands anywhere from thirteen million bushels to eighteen million bushels of wheat until April 1st.

Mr. BURNHAM. Can they not feed that wheat to anything?

Mr. OLIVER. If they had something to feed it to they could—well, perhaps I had better stick to the subject. I was going to make a remark about certain classes of live stock that might be used to feed the wheat to if we had our farms near Peterborough, but I won't. I said, Mr Speaker that on Mr. Thompson's estimate there were thirty million bushels unfit for milling, on Mr. Black's estimate there were thirty million bushels unthreshed at the time he made the estimate, and I say that if the damaged grain is not in the hospital by April 1, its value will be either altogether or largely destroyed. The farmers have been advised to build granaries; the farmers have been advised to do a great many things, but I want to say to the House that the farmers' granary does not meet this case. Let the farmer have as fine a granary as he may please, if he stores that grain in it that grain will be damaged or destroyed and the same exactly applies in the case of a country elevator which has no drying facilities. The damaged grain must get forward to the drying plant before the warm weather sets in or it will be lost. I am assuming that out of the thirty millions that are said to be unthreshed there is a possible loss of fifteen million bushels. If the value of that is estimated at forty cents a bushel to the farmer—because understand it is damaged grain and not grain of full value—that would be a loss of six million dollars. I want to impress upon the House and upon the Government the contingency which they are face to face with in this case. I therefore estimate the unavoidable loss to the farmers from shortage of crop and from damage to grain in this season at thirty-five million dollars, or one-third of the total value of their wheat crop.

But if he is to lose $10,000,000 by reason of the grain blockade—and any man who is interested in either the growing or marketing of grain will say that he is going to lose a great deal more—and if on top of that, he is to lose $6,000,000 by reason of damaged grain, his loss will be on account of unavoidable causes, $35,000,000, and on account of avoidable causes, $16,000,000; a total of $51,000,000, or one-half of the total value of his crop. We have heard that the west is a rich country and that the people there are optimistic and recover from a condition of difficulty very easily; and it is pointed out to us that parts of that country have been settled for 30 years, and that the farmers should be in a condition to take care of their crop, and should not be in such a condition as to have no place to store it safely when it is out of condition. Let me remind the House that 150,000 homesteads have been taken in the four years from 1908 to 1911, as many as were taken in the years from 1875 to 1903. That is, there were as many homesteads taken in the western provinces in the last four years as were taken in the 28 years which ended in 1903. That is to say, we have as many absolutely new settlers in the country as we had old settlers between those dates. It is a necessary condition of the rapid expansion of settlement in that country that there must always be, so long as that rapid expansion continues, a very large proportion of people who are only in the beginning of establishing themselves who are not by any possibility in a position to protect themselves on such an occasion as the present season. It is well, I

think, that the House and the country should understand that at least one-third of the homesteading population of that country, have come there within the past three years; and let it be remembered that it is on the new settler, who is not well fitted with buildings and equipment, who is farthest from the railroad and therefore, under the greatest disabilities, that the bulk of the loss falls. I want to impress upon the House the serious damage that is being done to the progress of that country by reason of the losses that are being suffered this year.

It is not only the settler who suffers loss. The farmer buys largely on credit, and the storekeeper sells when he knows that the farmer has no money. They all expect to get their money out of the crop. So that the store bills, and all other bills and notes mature in November or December; and when the whole business of the country depends upon the collection of the year's accounts in either of these months, and the accounts cannot be collected, because the grain has not been marketed, although it has been grown, there is a disarrangement of the business of the country, which is damaging to its every interest. The damage is not confined to the farmer; it spreads into every line of business. Cases have come to my notice, and I have no doubt to the notice of many other members of the House, of not only farmers, but business men who have been actually put out of business by reason of the grain blockade this year. Farmers and business men who were doing the best they could, and would have succeeded, even in the face of the unfortunate weather conditions that prevailed; have been put out of business absolutely because the money that the crop was worth, could not be realized because of this blockade.

As the resolution which I have placed before the House mentions, action has been taken by the government to give some measure of relief. The railway companies have been consulted. and I presume, in response to suggestion or pressure by the government, have made certain arrangements which will result in their being able to give transportation to elevator accommodation by shorter hauls than up to the present time exist. I have inquired into the measure of relief that has been proposed, and I desire to give to the House some of the particulars. The Canadian Pacific railway has issued a rate sheet on wheat and oats to Minneapolis and Duluth, giving the same rate of freight to those points as to Fort William. This rate became effective on February 16, and it expires on April 30. It is effective for 74 days. But 34 days expired between the date of the issue of the rate sheet, and the date of its coming into effect, and 67 days expired between the close of navigation and the coming into effect of this rate. This rate applies only to the province of Saskatchewan and only to grain for export.

The Canadian Northern railway have given a rate on wheat to Duluth and it is also the same rate as to Fort William, which applies only on shipments in transit in bond through the United States for exports. It was approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission on January 20, 1912, and became effective on January 29. It expires on April 30, and will be in force 91 days. It became effective 49 days after the close of navigation, and was effective 9 days after it was approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Canadian Pacific railway also gave a rate on barley and flax to Minneapolis. This rate was issued on December 20, 1911, and became effective on January 23, 1912. It expires on April 30, and is effective 98 days. It became effective 43 days after navigation closed, and 34 days expired between the date of its issue and the date of its coming into effect. This rate on barley and flax is not the Fort William rate. It is 4 cents higher per 100 pounds than the Fort William rate, on barley and flax from Manitoba, and 9 cents per 100 pounds higher than the Fort William rate on barley and flax from Saskatchewan. The difference is practically 2 cents a bushel for barley and flax in Manitoba, and 4½ cents a bushel in Saskatchewan. I want to give the House some facts in regard to the possibilities of the marketing of barley under this arrangement. Because it will be observed, that while the wheat rate is only for bonding in transit, the barley and flax rate is for consumption in the United States, and so it is interesting to us to know if there is any market for barley for consumption in the United States. I have here a statement in regard to a car of feed barley shipped from Carman, Manitoba, to Minneapolis, on December 8, 1911. The car contained 1,253·06 bushels, and was sold at Minneapolis at $1.07 a bushel realizing $1,340.84. That is to say less freight charges $72.53, customs entry charges $1.20, weighing charges 40 cents, switching charges $1.50, commission in Minneapolis $12.53, commission in Winnipeg $12.53, total $100.69; net proceeds of the car in Minneapolis $1,240.15. The Fort William price was 50 cents a bushel, the Minneapolis price was $1.07 a bushel. The Minneapolis net price, that is less the expenses I have mentioned was 99 cents a bushel.

Mr. BRADBURY. What was the duty?

Mr. OLIVER. The duty was 30 cents a bushel, and the Minneapolis net price less duty, was 69 cents a bushel. The value of the car at Fort William was $626.54, and the net value of the car at Minneapolis was

$864.61, an actual difference in favour of Minneapolis of $238.07. But if the duty had not been paid the difference would have been $613.98. But even paying the duty there was a substantial advantage in shipping the car to Minneapolis at a rate of 6 cents per 100 pounds over the Canadian Northern from Carman.

Mr. BRADBURY. If these figures are accurate, and I presume the hon. gentleman thinks they are, does it not seem reasonable that the farmers would ship all their barley to the United States and pay the duty?

Mr. OLIVER. I think they are going to ship a very large proportion of it there once they get the freight rates. But the rates that applied on that car were rates on the Great Northern which has always had a through rate to Minneapolis. Points on the other two railway systems did not have through rates to Minneapolis until this arrangement was entered into which became effective on the 23rd of January. Since that rate became effective there is no doubt that very large shipments have been taking place, and that the congestion or grade blockade has been relieved to some extent by that means.

But what I want to draw your attention to, is the paragraph in the resolution which I have placed before the House which asks the government to make such arrangement, or to urge such arrangement, as will give the same rate on barley and flax to Minneapolis as to Fort William. On the barley that is now being shipped to Minneapolis the farmer pays two cents a bushel more than if it were shipped to Fort William, if it is from Manitoba, and 4½ cents a bushel more than if it is shipped from Saskatchewan. That makes a difference of $25 a car on barley from Manitoba, and $56 a car on barley from Saskatchewan. The barley crop is estimated at 35 millions of bushels the flax crop at 6 millions of bushels. I find from the returns from the Trade and Commerce Department that 2 million bushels of barley, and 2 million bushels of flax have been received at Fort William between September 1st and December 21st. If 2 million bushels of that grain came from Manitoba, and 2 million bushels from Saskatchewan, it means that the farmers have had to pay $130,000 more upon that barley and flax in order to get the advantage of the Minneapolis market. I want to impress upon the government there is no reason, there is no justice, in making that discrimination in these rates; that if they are going to give an outlet to the western farmer who grows barley and flax, if the railroads can afford to haul wheat at the same rate to Minneapolis and Duluth as to Fort William, they can afford to haul the barley and flax at the same rate, and the farmer should not be required to pay that 2 cents a bushel from Manitoba, and 4½ cents a bushel from Saskatchewan for the privilege of getting the benefit of the Minneapolis market after paying the duty as well.

I have given the House the informado in order to relieve the conditions of which we have complained. Now I want to draw attention to what they might have done in order to relieve those conditions and to demonstrate how very far short they have fallen of even measurably attempting to meet these requirements. I have pointed out that the panic condition which exists to-day in the west is the consequence of the blockade in the terminal elevators.

And the reason for the continuance of the blockade in the terminal elevators is that the railway company, or companies are not able to forward the grain fast enough to the ocean port to relieve that situation. The only remedy is to find a shorter outlet. The outlet in such a case is any place that will take the grain; and Minneapolis and Duluth are the places which are able to store the grain and are able to mill and market such of the grain as is fit for milling and marketing. As to the effort to relieve the grain blockade, let us consider a few figures. The length of haul from Winnipeg to St. Paul is 462 miles, as compared with a haul from Winnipeg to St. John of 2,178 miles—four and a half times the distance. From Moosejaw to St. Paul is 738 miles, and from Moosejaw to St. John 2,571 miles, or three and a half times as far. From Calgary to St. Paul is 1,166 miles, and from Calgary to St. John 2,979 miles, or two and a half times as far. By taking measures which will enable the grain marketed within a radius of Winnipeg to be sent to St. Paul instead of to St. John, the capacity of the rolling stock of the railway is practically increased four and a half fold. That is if they have been able to carry 10,000,000 bushels from Winnipeg to St. John, they would have been able to carry 50,000,000 bushels in the same time from Winnipeg to St. Paul. It is obvious that there was a means of preventing the blockade, a means of breaking the blockade, but the means were not taken in time to do the work. Let me point out that if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), had taken in time the measures which he proposes to take—I understand from the press—there would have been no blockade and the losses that have been suffered would not have been suffered. If the rates and conditions which, I understand, it is proposed to put into effect on March 7, had been put into effect on November 10, when a condition of blockade actually existed, not in expectation but in fact, the Canadian Pacific

railway wheat rate would have been 98 days longer; the Canadian Northern railway wheat rate 74 days longer, and the Canadian Pacific railway rate 74 days longer. On the average there would have been twice as long a time in which to deliver this grain and reduce the blockade. But although these special rates are allowed until April 30, again I submit to the committee that the month of April may be counted out so far as the transport of damaged grain is concerned with any result of saving its full value. If the period of transportation at the rates that came into effect on the date I have mentioned are taken with that month of April deducted, as it must be, the Canadian Pacific railway are giving the wheat rate for 44 effective days, the Canadian Northern railway for 61 effective days, and the Canadian Pacific railway on barley for 68 effective days. I claim on behalf of the people of the west that measures should have been taken to have these rates brought into effect at any rate as soon as the condition of blockade existed, and that had that action been taken the blockade, which had begun, would have been relieved and the country would have been many millions of dollars better off than it is going to be to-day.

To what purpose did my hon. friend take measures with the railway companies in this direction? Was it to relieve the situation for the farmer? If it was, then he certainly did not take measures as he should have done. Why did he restrict the operation of the rate on wheat and oats over the Canadian Pacific railway to the province of Saskatchewan? Why were the rates on barley and flax made higher than the corresponding rates on wheat and oats? Why were not these rates secured at an earlier date? Was it because he and the railway men came together and said: There is so much storage in Minneapolis and Duluth and we will reduce these rates low enough to enable us to haul the grain that will fill that storage, and if we do that the rest of the grain can wait our convenience to haul it out as it best suits us? For what other reason could it have been that my hon. friend secured the regulations with these restrictions? Does he say that it was because the Interstate Commerce Commission would not give permission sooner? All I can say is that all he had to do was to ask the Interstate Commerce Commission sooner and he would have got the permission that much sooner. There is no possibility of laying the blame anywhere except on the shoulders of my hon. friend and of the government of which he is a prominent member. I find a reference to the despatches in the press that the Interstate Commerce Commission did not put any bar of lapse of time in the way of notice of the going into effect to these rates. The following despatch appeared in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' of January 22:

Washington, D.C., January 21.—The United States laws require thirty days' notice, and the commission never grants permission to establish rates on less time except under extraordinary emergencies. The commission's invariable policy is never to grant permission to establish rates on grain because it is such a sensitive proposition, inasmuch as a slight disturbance of a rate line of adjustment at any given point throws the whole matter out of gear.

In these cases it was represented to the commission that grain at certain Canadian points was damp and spoiling. The rates of Canadian carriers have hitherto been made to Fort William and Port Arthur, but storage capacity at these places has been entirely exhausted, and was so inadequate that it was desired to establish these new rates to United States points only for storage, drying &c., while in transit in bond through the United States for export only.

Now, in face of that fact, I want to draw the attention of the House to the rate sheet issued by the Canadian Pacific railway on the 12th of January 1912, giving rates on carloads from stations in the western provinces. It became effective on the 16th day of February, 1912. I presume that this rate sheet had the approval of the commission before it was issued; if so, I ask what excuse was there for not giving effect to that rate before the 16th of February. In the case of barley and flaxseed, the rate issued on the 20th December became effective on the 23rd of January. In the case of the Canadian Northern railway, for some reason or other, there was not the same interval between the issue of the rate sheet and its coming into effect. The Inter-state Commerce Commission gave permission, and in nine days afterwards the rate became effective. I think it is demonstrated that the delay that has occurred in bringing these rates into effect is not due to the Inter-state Commerce Commission, it is due to the arrangement entered into between my hon. friend and the Canadian railway companies, and I want to insist that that arrangement was entered into for the benefit of the railway companies instead of the benefit of the farmers. If not, why these restrictions? Why not open the door, if it had to be opened, as soon as possible and as widely as possible? My hon. friend must have known that the conditions were as I have stated. He has under his control the machinery of the Grain Act, he has officers in touch with the grain situation throughout the west, there could not be a grain blockade in the western country without his having knowledge of it. I say, therefore, that when he has taken action at all he is condemned be-

cause he did not take action in time to be effective. To make it sure that the government had knowledge of these conditions, I read the report of E. D. Eddy, B.S.A., published by the Department of Agriculture under date of Ottawa, January 12. This report deals with the crop and climatic conditions throughout the west, it is a part of the public service for which this country pays, and the government not only had it in their hands, but it is their statement for which they are responsible. This report says:

The climatic conditions prevailing throughout the prairie provinces of Canada were very abnormal during the season of 1911. Seeding was largely done about the usual time, from the middle of April to the middle of May and under favourable conditions. During the latter part of May and June the conditions were favourable, with sufficient rain in most parts and reasonably warm weather. July was cloudy, showery and cool, growth being rapid and almost rank, but toward the end of the month rust appeared in some parts and there was little sign of ripening. During August unseasonably cold weather prevailed, preventing ripening, rust became prevalent in some districts, and frost occurred from August 22 to Aug 28 doing great damage. During September the weather was generally cold and wet with heavy damage resulting to the crops from frost and rust. Damaging frosts occurred in many districts on September 6, 8, 21 and 25. During the first part of October the weather was moderately dry and warm, but owing to rust and the abundant supply of moisture crops refused to ripen. The freeze up came on October 25, or three weeks earlier than usual. Much cutting still remained to be done, and as the stooks were wet from recent rains considerable injury resulted to even fairly well matured grain which was in stook. The latter part of October was cold and on November 1st the temperature dropped to 6 below zero. On November 4th something very unusual in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, after the freeze up, happened; the weather suddenly turned warm and rain fell all day. This was followed on November 8 with from 3 to 5 inches of snow and on November 10, 20 below zero was registered. The snow and extreme cold in November came when a large proportion of the threshing remained to be done. December was remarkably fair and mild and the threshing was continued, but the grain that was in stock is very tough and a large proportion of it unmarketable.

With these facts in hand, with the knowledge of the conditions that must have come to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I again ask what excuse has he to offer for failing to take the action that lay before him from the beginning of the season? When he did take action why did he not take effective action? I have asked a question, and I propose to give to the House the answer that appears to be correct. I think a large part of the answer may be found in a dispatch from Duluth, Minnesota, dated January 21, which appears in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' of January 22, 1912. It reads as follows:

The expected advantages to Duluth millers from the granting of a special low rate on grain from the Canadian Northwest to this city, have been dispelled by advices received here that a ruling had been made prohibiting the admitting of this grain unless the duty on it, plus the difference between the regular rate and the special rate, shall first be paid. The ruling is said to be the result of a protest by Canadian millers, who claimed that permission to mill grain here without additional costs could constitute discrimination against them.

I have a further light on that subject contained in an interview which appeared in the Montreal 'Gazette" of July 11 with Mr. F. W. Thompson, vice-president and managing director of the Ogilvie Flour Mills Company in which he said:

Even Canadian millers may experience considerable difficulty in getting sufficient high grade wheat to fully meet their requirements, and the question of an export duty on the high grade wheats, as a matter of protection to the home requirements and seed, may with every justification be seriously considered.

I find in the speech that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) delivered in this House on November 28, 1911, the following remarks:

Why should Canada not do the milling business that will go to the millers of Minneapolis?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman is transgressing the rule. It is not permissible to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall not make any further reference to it and I shall not quote any further from it. The rule was not in my mind or I would not have transgressed, I assure you, Mr. Speaker. Action should have been taken by the government according to the knowledge that was in their possession at the time.

The policy of the government, as they are pleased to say, looks to building up the industries and interests of this country of ours by a process of restriction. It is distinctly in giving effect to that policy that these millions of bushels of damaged wheat in the Northwest are in danger of absolute destruction and it is in pursuance of that policy that the people of the Northwest, the farmers and business men, have lost the millions of dollars that they have lost during the past season from the blockade conditions. There is no escape from the condition. The remedy my hon. friend proposes shall be taken on the 7th of March when, if the newspapers inform us correctly, the rates on barley and flax to Minneapolis and Duluth will be

reduced to the Fort William rates and the rates on wheat and oats will be the rates for grinding in bond and for home consumption as well as for export. But I say that if these conditions had been allowed to prevail at the beginning of the grain blockade on November 10 there would not have been that loss and damage to this country that have occurred. If my hon. friends see fit in pursuance of their policy of building up this country by a process of restriction to violate that policy, then it is only right that the country should be made aware of the consequences that are being suffered now by reason of that policy. It is too late, I am sorry to say, to save the situation now. My hon. friend has allowed it to go too far, but he shows that he has knowledge of how it could have been saved and he shows that even this process of restriction which he advocates so capably, and which is none the better for his capable advocacy, has broken down and he is compelled by the force of circumstances to abandon it, but he is abandoning it too late. The condition which has existed this past season and which, in the estimation of my hon. friend himself and his colleagues, has called for the abrogation of that policy of restriction at the last moment when it is too late, may be repeated in future seasons. Probably it will be measurably repeated in all near future seasons unless the country has suffered such a set-back by reason of the results of last season's operations that its expansion in production will be checked.

If, that expansion in production proceeds as rapidly in the future as it has in the past then it will be, if not as necessay, yet still necessary to find an outlet for our western grains by the shortest rail-haul in future seasons or the country will suffer damage—incalculable damage—such as it has suffered this season. My hon. friend and his colleagues are face to face now with a condition, not a theory. I hope I have been able to impress that point on their minds and that if they are instrumental in bringing into effect on the 7th March a reduction in grain rates from western points in Minneapolis and Duluth and placing them on the same level as to Fort William they will use the same endeavours to have these rates permanently continued for the benefit of the western producer and for the benefit of the developement of this whole country. I want to ask my hon. friend and those of his colleagues and supporters who believe in that policy of restriction in this country where the benefit to any interest comes out of the loss that is being suffered on the prairies to-day. I ask, is it the banker, is it the merchant, is it the manufacturer, is it the railway company—which of all these interests if benefiting by that loss? It is a loss to the farmer, it is true, but it is a loss to every other interest in this country. Right in the cities of Toronto and Montreal, the very chapel, the very church, the very cathedral of the doctrine of the restrictive policy, in these very centres, the effect of the losses that are being suffered to-day by reason of the restrictive policy of the government that is in power, is being felt. Those losses are being suffered in those cities as well as on the prairies of the west. Although we have great confidence in the future of our country, although our country has made great progress in the past and we believe will make good progress in the future I want to warn my hon. friend that it cannot stand a continuation of such shocks and losses as it has suffered this season at the hands of himself and his colleagues and still prosper and progress as we wish it to do.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I would like to know what effect the resolution of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) would have upon the trusts the mergers and the combines; I do not think he made that point clear.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend will explain to the House what relation his question bears to the subject I have been dealing with, I will try to answer him.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I thought that was a point the hon. gentleman left out.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver.) It is not my intention to detain the House at any length in speaking on this question. I certainly congratulate the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) for the exhaustive study he has made of this question, and I also wish to state that a great deal of the information he has gathered will no doubt be of great value to the members of the House and to the public. But, I do not agree entirely with him in the conclusions he has arrived at. In the first place, I think every member of the House will agree that it is a most regrettable thing that this grain blocade prevails to-day in the Northwest Territories. We are all exceedingly sorry that certain losses will occur, but I think it reasonable and fair that we should take into consideration all of the factors that have operated in the causing of this, what we may call, almost a national calamity. The hon. member (Mr. Oliver) has pointed out that there will be considerable monetary loss occurring as the result of the damage to the crops of the Northwest, but the chief object of his speech was to lay upon the shoulders of the present administration certain responsibility for the prevailing conditions.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is his whole object.

Mr. STEVENS. I wish to draw the attention of the House to some of the causes which have led to the existing conditions. The chief reasons for the conditions which obtain in the northwest at the present time are natural causes over which no human power has any control. In the first place as pointed out by the hon. member in the quotation he gave from the official bulletin of the Department of Agriculture, the season was a most extraordinary one, wet weather having come in the middle of the year. I think if the hon. gentleman had been as careful to quote the press reports up to about the first of August he would find the utmost optimism running through them, and the cry 'bumper crop' was on the lips of every one from ocean to ocean. We all rejoiced at the prospect of the large crop that the farmers of the west were going to have, but a little later in the season a most unusual thing occurred, when wet and cold weather set in, with the result that the grain did not ripen. That was a condition over which no government had control and against which it was impossible for any human agency to guard. It was consequently, late in the fall before harvesting was begun, and then when harvesting was actually in progress, the continued wet weather hampered further harvesting operations, and threshing. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the grain had been cut green, taking the chance of it drying in the stooks. No matter what your transportation facilities might have been, that grain which was cut partially green, would have been of a much inferior grade, and in all probability would have gone to the elevators in a semi-ripened condition. All these factors are entirely beyond the control of any government or of any human being. Another point I wish to draw attention to, is that, the congestion of grain in the northwest is a thing that will obtain every year, just so long as the farmers of the northwest follow the system of harvesting and marketing which they follow at the present time. A few weeks ago those of us who were not prairie farmers, were told we should mind our own business, and not make suggestions to the farmers of the Northwest, regarding granaries. But, I make bold to state that if the farmers of the Northwest were to provide suitable granaries for their grain, they would experience a great deal less trouble. I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite, who scoff at that idea now, that the time is coming when the farmers of the northwest will have to provide granaries for their grain, and they might just as well admit the fact now as later. How in the name of common sense can they expect that the huge harvest in the west in a good season, can be marketed within four or five weeks, and that is really what they are demanding. They cut their grain, thresh it right out of the stooks, and haul it immediately to the market, and expect to have cars enough to carry that grain to the seaboard within a few weeks. It would be far better for the farmers of the west, if they had granaries in which to store their grain, so that they could market it gradually.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does the hon. gentleman recall the fact that 150,000 of these farmers are still homesteaders who have gone in within the last four years. How could they be expected to have granaries, considering their financial circumstances?

Mr. STEVENS. What the hon. member says——

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). They are glad to get shacks.

Mr. STEVENS. The hon. member from Red Deer is heard from.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I know all about it.

Mr. STEVENS. As a matter of fact it is not the homesteader who has just gone on his land and cropped twenty-five or thirty acres that is to blame; it is the men with four hundred acres, one thousand acres, and two thousand acres who cause the congestion.

Mr. OLIVER. They are not the men who suffer.

Mr. STEVENS. The man who suffers is the homesteader who has just cropped his few acres of land. I say that it is the system that is followed by the old timers comparatively speaking of the Northwest that is responsible to a large extent for the suffering of the other settlers.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stevens), is familiar with the conditions in the west, and I want to ask him: if a farmer has a granary, the best that ever was built, and his grain is damp when he threshes it or has snow in it, and he stores it in that granary, and it remains until the warm weather sets in, what happens to that grain?

Mr. STEVENS. As a matter of fact the condition of the grain when it is threshed is a thing over which no transportation companies or no government can exercise any control whatever, and while it is a matter for regret that that man shall suffer because of that fact, we cannot blame the government, because his grain is wet when he threshes it.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman answer my question?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes; I will go a little further; I do not say that a man should put his grain in his granary and keep it

there until the hot weather comes. The hon. member (Mr. Oliver), is authority for the statement that if it is not moved by May, I think that is what he said.

Mr. OLIVER. I said if it is not in the drier by the 1st of April in an ordinarily early spring it is practically gone.

Mr. STEVENS. Take it at the first of April, and, therefore, the farmer is not called upon to store his grain until late in the summer. The point is this, that if the farmers had these granaries the bulk of this partially damaged grain, or grain that would be damaged if it is kept into the spring, could be moved during the winter months. The hon. member will agree with me that in the majority of seasons the farmer is better off to hold his good grain until May or June.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. STEVENS. Well, I think that is the case. I will tell you what a number of farmers in the northwest are doing at present, because some of them have told me this themselves.

They get the grain to the market as rapidly as they can, and then play the wheat market in Winnipeg for a rise in the price, and get a profit in that way. They sell their grain in the fall instead of holding it, and then buy wheat on margin in Winnipeg for a rising price. Any number of them do that, and it is a practice for which I have very little sympathy. On the other hand, if the farmer had his granary, so that he could hold his wheat and sell it whenever he liked, he could control the market and get a better price. But none of the farmers have granaries, and the result is that they are compelled to sell their grain at the price which the owners of the small elevators in the small centres choose to give them. If these elevators are full, the farmer has to keep his grain, and his only choice is to leave it in the fields or bring it to market and sell it at a figure which is arbitrarily fixed by a congested market.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria, Alberta). Does the hon. gentleman know that the cash price of wheat to-day in Minneapolis is four cents over the May price?

Mr. STEVENS. That may be. I am not disputing that fact at all.

Mr. OLIVER. Why would the farmer hold his wheat in that case?

Mr. STEVENS. It is optional. If a man has his wheat in his granary, he can sell it, or he can hold it and control the market. The reason the market is not steady is that at certain periods of the year it is flooded with grain while at other periods there is not sufficient supply. In any case, if the present system were changed so that the farmer had granaries in which his grain would be stored, the present conditions would be completely changed. I quite admit that this year is an extraordinary one. There is a large amount of grain which it is necessary to rush to the drying elevators; but that is accentuated by natural conditions over which no government could have any control. The hon. member for Edmonton tried to estimate the loss which was sustained in the northwest, saying that 50,000,000 bushels of grain were in the hands of the farmers, of which he admitted that only 30,000,000 bushels were partially damaged. It is well known that a large number of farmers are in the habit of holding their wheat until May, June or July of the following year, and sometimes it is held over for two years, but not very frequently.

Mr. TURRIFF. They must have granaries if they do that.

Mr. STEVENS. There are a few. The 50,000,000 mentioned by the hon. member for Edmonton represent about the average that is held, compared with the full crop this year. So that it is reasonable to say that his estimate of the loss is an exaggeration by at least two or three million dollars. There is no necessity under present conditions of exaggerating the loss that will occur this year, nor is it necessary to draw these pessimistic pictures which have been drawn here for the last couple of months of conditions in the northwest, with one sole object, namely, to cast reflections on the present administration. As a matter of fact, the present administration have done everything that is within human power to do to meet the conditions that obtain in the Northwest at the present time.

Mr. KNOWLES. Would it not help the farmers in the northwest to have access to the drying facilities in Minneapolis and Duluth, not to mention better prices, and could not the government have got that if they had wished?

Mr. STEVENS. As a matter of fact, the government have got it. I am perfectly sure that had the hon. member from Edmonton been on the treasury benches at the present time, he could not have done anything more to secure that relief than the present Minister of Trade and Commerce has done.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Reciprocity.

Mr. STEVENS. Reciprocity is dead. All that the hon. members of the opposition hoped to have received from reciprocity was access to the American market. If the American people wish to remove the duty from wheat, they can do so, we are not hindering them. All that we refused to do was to pay them a bonus

to remove that duty. When the hon. members trot out reciprocity as a relief to the farmers of the northwest in the the present condition, it is an absolute bugaboo.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. member has not answered my question. I ask: suppose reciprocity had been taken advantage of, and access to the American market had been secured for our farmers, does the hon. member not think that it would have afforded a very substantial measure of relief for them this season?

Mr. STEVENS. I do not, for this reason. Had reciprocity passed, it would simply have made a slight difference in the duty on wheat going into the United States.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). 25 cents a bushel.

Mr. STEVENS. If the American people want our wheat so badly as the hon. members intimate they do, they can remove the duty and get it; but they are not inclined to do that. As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman's question was fully answered on the 21st of September. The hon. member for Edmonton asks why action was not taken sooner in order to give certain relief which as he suggested could have been given by the Minister. In the same sentence almost he made the statement that the wheat was in the stook, and that it was impossible to harvest and thresh it up to a very recent period. As a matter of fact, throughout the whole northwest to-day every threshing machine, as far as I have been able to learn, is working overtime trying to thresh the grain that has been lying on the ground during the winter. The reason the grain has not been threshed is not because the farmers do not want it threshed, but because there are not the necessary threshing facilities to do it.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has presumed to quote me, and I wish to say that he has not quoted me correctly.

Mr. STEVENS. The hon. gentleman will admit that he read a circular as the authority of the government for its knowledge of the conditions, and it set out the exact conditions that I have stated.

During the balance of the season and through certain rains that came on in December, and through a subsequent thaw, and through snow, and so on, it has been impossible to get threshing done. Now I think I am perfectly correct in that statement, and so I affirm that I care not what the transportation facilities were, the same condition would have obtained, namely, that a large amount of the wheat would have been lying on the ground at the present time in exactly the condition in which it is, because every threshing machine has been doing its utmost and working to its full capacity to thresh that grain. Therefore, I want to point out to the hon. members opposite, that the condition which obtains in the northwest to-day in reference to the grain blockade, is to a large extent, or almost entirely, the result of natural conditions, over which no human being has any control, and to the system which obtains in parts of the northwest. Another point is this—I have not the exact figures here, I have not time to secure them, but I think probably the Minister of Trade and Commerce may have them, and will supply them later on—I think some 10,000 cars more were moved within a given time this year by the Canadian Pacific railway than were moved last year or in any other previous year, showing that the transportation companies have done a great deal more to move the grain this year than they ever did before, and that it is unreasonable to expect a transportation company to have sufficient cars lying idle on the prairies of the Northwest to handle all the wheat, out of the large crop of last year, within the short period of two weeks. Another thing that the transportation companies are faced with is this: A farmer will order a car for, we will say, the 20th of October, or some like date. When that date comes around Mr. Farmer is not prepared to load the car, and he puts his name down the list a month, with the result that while the car may have been assigned to him he is not using it, and it is necessary for the transportation company to switch that car off to some other farmer. This is a matter of common occurrence. I think it is only reasonable and fair that we should take into consideration all the facts of the case, and while I have no brief for any railway or transportation company, not for one moment, at the same time, I do believe that the blockade conditions are due more to natural causes than they are due to the negligence of the railroads in the northwest. I certainly think no case has been made out which would warrant hon. members of this House in condemning the administration in this matter, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce should rather be highly commended for his efforts to relieve the situation there, and not only that, but for the introduction of the Grain Bill, which is one of the most up-to-date pieces of legislation which has ever been introduced into this House. I believe that instead of trying to work up an imaginery case, based on inferences, and not facts, against the administration, it would be a great deal better if hon. gentlemen opposite had some concrete and reasonable suggestion to make which would assist the administration, rather than to hamper it.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat). Mr. Speaker, the matter now before the House I consider, as a western mem-

ber and also as a citizen of this Dominion, is one of the most vital questions that has so far been presented for our consideration during the present session, and I believe that every hon. gentleman will agree with me in that view. If western Canada suffers from a car shortage, or suffers in any other respect, so that the people there cannot get returns for their crops, then the rest of Canada must suffer as a result. I have heard gentlemen in this House make the statement that the welfare of eastern Canada depended upon the welfare of western Canada, and I believe most of us will concur in that observation. In considering this matter I want to discuss it as fairly as possible, but before entering upon some arguments in regard to the resolution now before the House, I would like to enlighten the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), although I am afraid any attempt to enlighten that hon. gentleman along the lines indicated in his speech would take up a great deal too much of our time. All that I can say to him is that I would be very glad to exchange my place of abode with him for a few months each year and give him the opportunity to become acquainted close at hand with the conditions in the prairie provinces. I believe that if he had been acquainted with those conditions he would not have made the remarks he did to-night in regard to this question. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to relieve the present government of any blame in connection with the situation in western Canada and he said there were exceptional conditions there, which we all knew of or heard of through the press and from reports that came down from the west. I admit we had to face exceptional conditions, but I urge the government should have immediately proceeded to deal with them in the most drastic manner possible, and should have put into effect what we are urging to-night in this resolution—that is have given the western farmer other trade outlets for his grain, the closest possible outlets, in order to relieve the congestion which has prevailed in the west during the past season. That was the duty of the government, and the members on this side are criticising them to-night, because of their inaction in this critical matter. They attempted to afford relief in regard to export grain, but they should have gone further at the same time and given the farmers in the west an opportunity of getting their grain into Minneapolis either for grinding in bond or for consumption in the United States. I can tell hon. gentlemen that there was a ready demand for the grain of western Canada in Minneapolis. I had a statement made to me by a gentleman from western Canada, who was in the elevator business, or at least is in touch with large interests there, that the representatives of one of the grain growers' associations of Saskatchewan went down to Minneapolis and ascertained that they could sell there to a commission house 100 cars each of every grade of grain up to No. 6, and also what is known as Feed Wheat. They could have sold that grain in the markets of Minneapolis. All they wanted was to get a better railroad rate and they could have obtained, even after paying the duty, a better price for their grain than could be got in Canada. I was informed of that condition by a man who is intimately acquainted with the elevator business in the province of Saskatchewan. I want to say that if we had had in western Canada a crop such as seemed probable in the early part of the season, we would have had the greatest crop that the west ever had. If we had had that crop and ideal conditions for harvesting, the railroads there simply could not have handled it any more than they are in a position to handle the crop that we actually had this year smaller and damaged though it was.

I also want to point out to my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) that when he states that the railroads have been keeping in touch with the advance of western Canada in regard to the supplying of cars, he is, in my opinion, entirely mistaken. I do not believe that the railroads have been keeping in touch with the growth of the country in that respect, and I think one of the reasons for the car shortage this year is that the railroads have not the motive power and have not the cars available to relieve the prevailing congestion. In my part of the province of Alberta—and I had occasion to draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the conditions there some time ago—they have now the first car shortage they ever experienced. I believe that particular part of western Canada is in better shape this year than any other part of the country, I believe that more of its crop is threshed and ready to be shipped than in any other district of the various provinces. Nevertheless they have a car shortage. I would like to point this out: I know a farmer in the vicinity of a village called Barons, near the city of Lethbridge, who was 294th on the list for a car at that station. He was 294th on the list in the early part of September of last year and up to the first of this month he had not been able to get a car. That is in the southern part of the province of Alberta. I also have the statement that a farmer in the vicinity of High River had only been able to get one car since December 31st. He wrote me to that effect in the beginning of this month, and he said there

were 144 cars at that time on the order book at the station of High River. Now these are simply two instances to show that the Canadian Pacific railway in that particular part of the country has not been able to keep up with the demand for cars. They have not been sufficiently acquainted with the crop conditions and the need of cars to supply the demand in that particular section of the west. The railways are not prepared to meet the emergency, and I say more that the railways are responsible, to a considerable extent, for the prevailing conditions. Now let me explain that statement. The railways in the west make the announcement very freely that they are going to build a certain branch line immediately. Two instances of that occurred in my own district. For instance the Canadian Northern company announced two or three years ago that it was going to rush the Goose Lake branch of its line. People flocked in there and homesteaded in that country. Others bought what land they could buy, they have been in there for two or three years, they have had to raise crops in order to live, and some of them have had to go 70 to 80 miles to sell and to ship their grain. These people would not have gone into that district if the railroad had not induced them to go in there by stating it was going to build that branch line immediately. A similar instance has occurred in the southern part of Alberta, in that part of the country south of the Crows Nest branch of the Canadian Pacific railway which is thickly settled.

The people have to go from fifty to sixty miles to sell their grain. These people went into the country because the Canadian Pacific railway promised to build the Weyburn branch, and they thought that that line was to be immediately put under construction. And now we find that construction is only to commence this year. The railways have encouraged the people to come into the country; they encouraged them to raise crops. Yet, when they do raise crops, they have to go fifty or sixty miles to a station, and when they get there they find that the Canadian Pacific railway cannot supply them with cars and that there is no elevator accommodation. Frequently these farmers have to go back with their grain that distance. It means practically a complete loss of the crop. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has had something to say about storage. He advises the farmers of western Canada to store their grain, and wait until they have a favourable opportunity to sell it. The hon. gentleman is totally out of touch with the conditions in western Canada. Those farmers who are in the best financial position provide storage facilities. But he must understand that the people who are going on homesteads in our west, are people, as a rule, with very little capital. They come to the west to make a home and a fortune for themselves. Most of them have been there but a few years, and the greater part of their money has been spent in building a home and barns, and in purchasing machinery at the high protection prices they have to pay. They must sell their crop as soon as they possibly can, in order to get the money to meet their payments. They cannot afford to store their grain and hold it until the Canadian Pacific railway or some other railway can supply them with cars or the elevator can afford them storage. They do not want to store their wheat, and cannot store it under present circumstances. Something was said by my hon. friend from Vancouver also with respect to reciprocity. He expressed the views that I expected he would, when he said that reciprocity was practically a bonus to the United States. Those of us who lived in western Canada, do not so regard it. We think that reciprocity would have met a situation such as that which has arisen. But we believe that the attitude the people of Canada took on that occasion was a bonus to eastern Canada, and not to the advantage of western Canada. And I believe that the manufacturers and interests of eastern Canada, in taking the action they did on September 21, did the thing which was most injurious to themselves. I found this feeling among our western farmers during the discussion of reciprocity. Reciprocity would be helpful to them and would not injure any of the interests of eastern Canada; but, in the face of that, the men who have been made rich by the development that has taken place and the business they have secured from the farmers of the west have opposed what was considered by the farmers of the west to be in their own interest. If there is any cleavage between east and west, it is not due to what the farmers did on the 21st of September, but to what the manufacturers of eastern Canada did on that day. I believe we have in eastern Canada people who will soon come to realize that it is in the interest of all Canada that the farmers should have the opportunity to sell their grain in the nearer market of the United States. What we want is the larger market and nearer market, and I believe that the people of the east will come to realize the benefit that that will afford to the whole country, as we have realized it already. We are simply demanding in this resolution that we should be given an opportunity to sell our grain in the United States markets, with a railroad rate which is better than that afforded us at the present time. We believe that the government had an opportunity to relieve the situation that has arisen from this blockade which

commenced six months ago and it sadly neglected to provide it.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce). Mr. Speaker, the rather long and exhaustive speech of my hon. friend of Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) had a good deal in it which was an attack upon Providence, but it ended up with an attack directed against the government and particularly against the Minister of Trade and Commerce on the ground that he had not performed the duty he might have performed. The one question that came to me over and over again while my hon. friend was speaking might be expressed in the old Latin words 'Cui Bono?' I could not but ask myself as he was speaking, what is the good of all this that he is saying? A man in the responsible position of my hon. friend, an old and tried statesman, one who has been a member of the government for years, is not generally supposed to occupy the time of a deliberative assembly unless he has something in view for the benefit of the public. The first half of his speech, taking up an hour or more, was devoted to detailing the hard usage which nature and Providence had dealt out to the western farmer during the last season. What remedy does my hon. friend propose? He cannot move a vote of want of confidence in nature and Providence. If he did it would not have much effect; he would not be able to turn nature and Providence out of office or change their action. He detailed with minute particularity the loss to the farmer in the west.

The first thing they lost was a slice of their expectations. For some reason or other they ploughed, they harrowed and sowed their seed, and came to the conclusion that if Providence was at all fair to them they ought to get 225 million bushels. It turned out they only got about 175 million bushels; there was a big slice off their expectations. Does my hon. friend blame the government for that? Worse still happened. Not sufficiently satisfied with cutting a slice off their expectations —not asking here whether their expectations were pitched too high or not—not satisfied with that, Providence continued to pour too much rain down, and give inlet to too little of the sun's rays. So the crop, instead of ripening as it should have, continued to grow rather than to ripen, refused to ripen, and the season was, we will say, a month late. Is my hon. friend going to move a vote of want of confidence in the government because the sun refused to shine with sufficient brilliancy, because the heavens refused to be economical of their stores, and were lavish during all that month? It is a thing for which nobody is to blame or can be blamed, and a thing which could not have been avoided, even if somebody had acted as somebody should have acted.

There was another point to be taken. Contrary to the wishes of the government, there occurred a row between the miners and the mine owners, and the miners refused to work without certain conditions, and the mine owners refused to come up to those conditions. Work stopped in the mines, and a thing which, in some respects, is just as bad as the loss of the harvest, threatened the people of the northwest. The very farmers and dwellers that my hon. friend is rightly concerned about, were threatened with a coal famine. My hon. friend knows that. Does he blame the government for that? The railways had to meet the situation; and, talk as you will about the railways, and rail against them as some people who are not over thoughtful, do, talk as you will and rave against them, the railways came to the aid of that situation in the northwest, and they took 600,000 tons and more of coal and spread it through all portions of the northwest, in order to provide against a possible famine and a possible freezing in consequence of a coal famine. That took a great deal of the available resources of the transport companies. They carried their cars, subject to delay, and with these heavy burdens of traffic, carried them to all parts of the northwest. When these were unloaded and were ready for transport out, the season was so far behind and the harvest was so unready for shipment, that there was not grain to be put into these cars to be taken back at that particular time. Does my hon. friend propose to move a vote of want of confidence in the government because of that occurrence and the consequent disruption of business?

Mr. OLIVER. In what direction was the coal hauled by these cars?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It was not hauled easterly. So I will allow my hon. friend to exercise his judgment to find in what direction it was hauled.

Mr. OLIVER. The coal was hauled westerly. In which direction was the grain hauled?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The largest part of the grain was hauled easterly.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will have to be more than amusing in order to satisfy the House that hauling coal westward prevented the hauling of grain eastward at the same time.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend has made his rejoinder to that after I had stated the facts of the case. If the grain was not ready to be hauled it could not be placed in the cars for hauling.

Mr. OLIVER. Then the hauling of coal west did not have any effect on the case.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend does not know much about the transport conditions, if he does not know of that shortage of coal in the west, and if he does not know that the hauling of that coal resulted in disorganization and confusion to the railway traffic. He will only have to talk to railroad managers to understand that, but I think he does understand it. There was then another thing that operated very hardly. The harvest was late in coming to maturity and afterwards was late in coming to the point where it could be transported. The season was, as my hon. friend admitted, at least a month or a month and a half shorter for haulage purposes. Thus you had a larger output of grain to be hauled, and you had the hauling season a month or a month and a half later than it usually began, and consequently the railway was deprived of that much of the time for the transport of the grain. Now take all these things into consideration, and going no further than the time of the freezing of the lakes and the stoppage of lake traffic, the disadvantage that the railroads were under from these reasons was a great disavantage. Every man who wishes to talk of the question in a businesslike way, and fairly, must take that into account. Now what did the railroads do? My hon. friend read a list of cases, in one of which a car, loaded at a certain time, was 64 days before it got to its point of consignment; another that was loaded at a certain other point, was 113 days before it got to the place to which it was consigned. So you could read dozens, scores, and hundreds of abnormal cases. My hon. friend gave little credit to the far larger number of cases in which assistance was rendered to the extent of the railroads' power. Take the total number of cars that are being hauled on the railroads in the northwest, and put against them the whole list you have read of these abnormally long delays that took place, and when you bring it down to a percentage, these abnormal delays were a very small proportion indeed in comparison with the whole number of cars that were hauled.

Now what have the railways done in the way of hauling? I think it is well for us to look into that for a moment. I have here a statement of the shipments of grain at Fort William and Port Arthur and the receipts. If you take two years and compare them, you will find this result: In four months ending on the 31st December and 3 weeks of the month of January bringing it down to the 21st day of January in the season of 1911-12, you have the total receipts of sixty-five and a half million bushels of wheat at Fort William and Port Arthur; of all grain you had a total of 82,243,230 bushels. You had shipments at Port Arthur of wheat in that time of fifty three and a half million bushels and of all grain of sixty-six and a half million bushels. If you compare that with what was carried in the preceding year, you will find that the percentage is very much larger in the short season of 1911-12 than in the longer season of 1910-11.

Mr. TURRIFF. Were there not three railways hauling that number of cars this year as against two railways in all previous years?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). There were three, but the third, although it took a certain quantity, took an inappreciable quantity as compared with the others.

Mr. TURRIFF. The Canadian Pacific railway was double tracked.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway did the bulk of the hauling and the Grand Trunk railway, while they did some, did not count very much in the total. What do you find? In 1910-11, for the five months ending January 31, 61,014 cars were hauled. In 1911-12, 96,829 cars were hauled. Take the first week ending February 7, 1911, and 356 cars were hauled; in the corresponding week of 1911-12, 3,021 cars were hauled. In the second week of February, 687 cars were hauled in 1910-11, and 3,131 in 1911-12. In the week ending the 21st February 1910-11, 999 cars were hauled, and in the week ending the 21st February, 1911-12, 3,888 cars were hauled. That is that 63,056 cars were hauled in the preceding year and 106,869 cars were hauled in the year that we are now passing through, about 70 per cent more than were hauled in the preceding year, and in a season which was at least six weeks shorter than the preceding season.

But, there is something more than that, and let us state it to be perfectly fair. It has been a long series of years since such a prolonged spell of absolutely strenuous weather prevailed in the west as prevailed through a portion of December and through the month of January of this year. Any one who knows the northwest and has seen railway traffic taken on there with the thermometer, 10, 15, 20 and 40 degrees below zero, knows that it is almost impossible to maintain traffic under those conditions. The best engine that you have and under the best management that you can get, under certain conditions of atmosphere there, has, perforce, to lie still. If she goes to work she blows herself to pieces, she so lames herself that she cannot do effective work. That must be taken into account as well and yet this six weeks of hard weather for which Providence must

be held responsible and for which my hon. friend should not blame the government, had an important effect upon the haulage of grain. Notwithstanding the shorter season, notwithstanding the trouble in reference to the coal famine, notwithstanding the late harvest, notwithstanding this extremely cold weather we have the result that I have just read that the railway companies took out 106,000 cars, where, in a previous season, without these disabilities, they only hauled 63,000 cars. Blame the railway as much as you reasonably can but do put the other side at least when you are making up the whole account and let us see what lies to the credit of the transportation companies as well as the disadvantages under which they labour.

My hon. friend went on to say that not only were there late crops and a diminution in the expected crops, but that there was also a degradation in quality, and he makes an elaborate calculation as to how much the farmers of the northwest have lost by a depreciation of price owing to the poorer quality of the grain. The government is surely not responsible for the poorer quality of the grain. He counts that $20,000,000 have been lost by the farmers of the northwest for that reason alone. That is surely not a count that he can make up against the government or the administration. Then he goes on to calculate the shortage at $15,000,000, making $35,000,000, then he goes on to make a loss of $10,000,000 on account of depreciation by blockade and $6,000,000 on account of what may be the total loss, making altogether $51,000,000—an enormous loss if the calculation is correct, but not one cent of which loss can be attributed to the fault of any government or any administration, as it seems to me.

My hon. friend went on to draw this gloomy picture. What boots it to have drawn such a gloomy picture as this? It seems to be almost like a man who had suffered from wounds by accidents and who was laid up in the hospital; he gets out of it, gets back to his home, and is able to move fairly comfortably. Some kind friend knocks at the front door and when he goes to the front door the friend hauls him out, tears apart every one of his wounds, takes every plaster off the healing bruises, drags him out into the light of day, and shows him to his neighbours with his wounds uncovered and freshly opened, but he applies to them no balm, he pours no oil into them. What kind of a mind must a man have who expects to help his neighbour by that kind of treatment? So I thought and when my hon. friend was speaking I asked again the question: What good is coming out of all this? What man is to be helped by opening his wounds afresh? Does it give him greater hope, instil into him a greater spirit of optimism, put into him courage and vigour? I do not think it does. Does it help Canada as a whole to have that dull, dark picture brought again to view, not once, or twice but for the tenth or eleventh time? Surely we want as bright an atmosphere and as hopeful an outlook as possible. What in the world would become of us as a community if when a man got sick all sorts of physical troubles were portrayed to him. Would it help that man or the community or the country in which he lived? So my hon. friend was not doing any good to the farmer of the northwest and he was not doing any good to the reputation of Canada. He was not doing anything to help Canada's future prospects in the eyes of the world by portraying these dark pictures of how Providence maltreated and illused the farmer in the northwest.

But, he says, this present government do not seem to have alleviated the situation. What about himself and his own government? Had not he the Northwest Territories in his hand? Was not every man in the northwest his particular charge? He knew them, their paths, their trails, their incomings and their outgoings. He was the strong member of a strong government.

For fifteen years that government and for eight or nine years he, as a member of that government, had the northwest at heart, slept with it at night and walked with it by day; the country they had decried in preceding years they took to their bosom and made their pet child of it for fifteen years, and yet left it in this kind of incapacity which we are told of to-day. And the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) comes down like the wolf on the fold on a poor Minister of Trade and Commerce who has been here only four months, and he wants to know why I have not made everything right within that time. Well, my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) travelled through that northwest at a period very slightly anterior to the time when we came into power, did he not? He was travelling in the northwest for the benefit of the farmers of the northwest; of course he was. Did he not know that there were troubles; did he not know that Providence was not smiling, that the heavens were pouring out too much moisture, and that the sun was not doing its proper business for the farmer. He saw all these conditions about him, and what steps did he take? Coming down to one simple thing, that which would have done more to have alleviated this trouble and to have broken this blockade than anything else, would have been another line of railway out of the congested district down into that eastern portion of Canada. Why was it not built and ready? In 1903

my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) and his government undertook to build another outlet from the northwest. There was no other reason presented by them for that huge scheme of the Grand Trunk Pacific. It was to be another outlet for the west where the grain was piling up breast high, and there was but one single track to bring it out. Well, Canada put all her courage and all her energy into getting that other outlet; Canada put all her credit at the back of it, and you over there used it right royally, too. Canada put her good millions in your hands; what did you do with the money? You talked about making another outlet for the grain of the northwest, but you went down diligently and spent thirty million dollars of it between Quebec and Moncton where you did not expect to get a bushel of grain out from the northwest; you sunk a lot of it in the Quebec bridge, and you piled it up west of Quebec, but you diligently kept from building that portion of the road from Winnipeg to Cochrane, which, if you had built, would have given you an outlet. Canada was not to blame because she did not put money in your fists; you had all of it you should have had, and a mighty sight more. There was no lack of money and credit, and you gentlemen and my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), as one of you, were recreant to the bargain by which you got authority to build that road in that very essential part which should have been first built but which you neglected to build.

And the things you ought not to have done you diligently went on to do in a lavish manner. And so, ever since August of last year there has not been another pair of shining rails from the congested wheat district out to the east, and the reason is that these gentlemen opposite did not do their duty in their fifteen years of power. And now they come and they have—what shall I say—they come and they have the assurance to throw all this blame upon the present administration. Well, if this present administration stays in power not fifteen years but five years and does not do more to alleviate the conditions in the northwest than you did in your fifteen years of office,———

An hon. MEMBER. Turn us out.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Yes, turn us out. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) after drawing that dark picture on the canvas, after having presented the wounds of his friends and patrons in the west, dragged them out and made them bleed anew, and then he comes to his point. And what is his point? It is: you should have less restriction and more reciprocity. What is the use of fighting over the events of last September in the attempt to find a remedy for what lies before us at the present time or in the near future. What ever gentlemen may think as to reciprocity being good or bad, the country never had as fair a chance at any subject as it had on the 21st day of last September. These gentlemen opposite brought forward their scheme the fruition of fifteen years of cogitation and incubation, and they exhibited it to this country and praised it up for at least nine or ten months. Then they went to the country with all their power and eloquence and force and they again exhibited that nostrum for the healing of Canada as ably as any Liberal party has ever presented its case in this country. And the people, without excitement, and after studying and weighing the question for eight, ten, or eleven months, came to vote and give their answer. Why may we not just as well for present purposes accept that answer in good faith and instead of bringing it out in this way, put our minds to some practical thought as to what can be done under the present circumstances? Do not let us cry for the moon when there is a piece of good cheese near at hand to satisfy our appetite. Now, Sir, this government is not going to cry for the moon, it is going to set itself to work to remedy as quickly as possible these grievances and evils such as they are in the northwest. Will hon. gentlemen opposite help us to do that or will they continue the somewhat dark practice they have lately entered upon; will they continue to harp back upon the differences between the east and the west; draw a gloomy picture of the travails and trials of the west, and in that way fan a feeling of discontent. Will they help us by some hopeful impulse and hopeful energy to portray the bright side of the question and will they set themselves with us to a helpful and hopeful attempt to solve the difficulties of the northwest? That is not to be accomplished by preaching cleavage between manufacturers and farmers; it is not to be accomplished by playing on the feelings of antagonism between capitalists and labouring men; it is to be accomplished only by a calm and frank and hearty acceptance of the situation, saying to us and with us: 'Here is the country's position; we will not make this a disunited Canada; we will further you in your efforts to make it a united Canada.'

The farmers of the west and the men engaged in the industries of the east are not aliens to each other, neither are they enemies tearing out each other's hearts. As the one prospers, the other prospers; the interests of both are intertwined; and we do better, all of us, to show the identity of interest between the two than to dwell upon imaginary differences. Does anyone pretend to tell me that a great railway company goes into that northwest and de-

liberately tries to block its development? Why, a man would be a fool who scared away or killed the trout in the stream before he let the fly fall upon the water; and the railway organization, if it lives at all and has profits, has to live out of the prosperity of the people through whose district it runs. It would be a fool not to do its best to develop that country, and in the large I believe the railway companies have done their best to develop it. I am not in favour of railway monopoly or railway control, and I believe the farmer, the storekeeper, the man of leisure, the man in the college or the school, every man, has a right to be protected by the central government against arbitrary or wrongful exactions by any man or any set of men. So I believe the railroads ought to be carefully supervised and controlled, and we are doing that. There never was so much supervision and control exercised over the transportation interests of this country as there is this very day, and there never was better accord between the transportation interests and the great interests of the shippers and producers than there is to-day. Not to say that they are all agreed on all points; but they are agreed on more points than they have been up to the present time, and our object should be to bring them to agree on still more points of confidence and helpfulness one towards the other. I am not a farmer, but I have a right to my opinion. I was born on a farm, I grew up on a farm, I have had interests connected with farming ever since I was a boy, and I have full sympathy with the farming community. But I say that our brothers and kindred in the northwest would do well to pay attention to the methods of cultivation and farming in the east. I have no sympathy with the miner in the shape of an agriculturist, who goes into the great northwest and takes hold of 2,000 or 10,000 acres of the bank that God has filled with rich vital energy, and makes it his sole purpose to mine every ounce of that out that he can by machinery and all the agencies that he can add to his power. I would like to see that man cut up into about 20 different men on the same amount of land; for I believe that ten farmers with 160 or 320 acres, and farming it well, will do much better than a smaller number of men who are mining out the energy and vitality of the country. The small farmer in the northwest has a good deal of ground for complaint against that class of farmer. His lot is made harder because that class of farmer exists there. A question was put to my hon. friend: suppose the eastern farmer has coarse grain, and it is injured by frost to a certain extent, he does not much feel the loss of that—why? Because he feeds it; he has something to feed it to, and he makes more by feeding it and selling the product than he would if he had sold the grain even if it had been good. And when we hear about these places in the west with their frozen grain, we ask, why do they not feed it, and the answer comes, they have nothing to feed it to. Should we not remedy that condition of affairs as soon as possible? And shall we remedy it in any other way than by constant teaching, constant advocacy and constant impulse along the right line? In this matter the Northwest must help itself, or it never can be best helped, by changing graudually but surely its method of farming, and introducing mixed farming—not putting all the eggs into one basket. Instead of going to outside countries to bring in all their food except grains from time to time, they have an inestimable opportunity there for the production of all that class of articles. That is one part of this problem of coarse grain. Then, I think we cannot put the question too strongly to the farmers of the west that they must look to the storing of their own grain to a certain extent. My hon. friend's argument seemed to have weight when he said, what is the use of having a granary and putting damp grain into it? But all the grain of the northwest is not damp grain. There is plenty of grain there which was not and is not damp, and which maybe would have paid the farmer still better if he had had a granary into which to put it and keep it. It would certainly make him the master to some extent. When he goes now with his grain and wants to sell it to the elevator man, and it has to be transported to Fort William and to stay there until the navigation season opens, he knows that he is paying storage for all those months, and he is paying a good slice more than the storage because of the lessened price that he gets from the man who buys it who has that storage possibility and contingency in view. A granary owned by that man at home, in which he would store that grain, would to my mind have two effects: it would make him a master of the situation to this extent, that if the street buyer did not give him what he thought he ought to have, he could put his grain into the storage granary and keep it.

He would be paying the cost of his granary, but if he had not the granary, and had sold his grain at the lower price, and with a discount on it for the storage for 4, 5 or 6 months, he would lose more in the second transaction, whereas he would gain if he had taken the first method of handling his grain. Now, I am not here to teach the farmers, but that seems to me to be sensible. I think it is sensible, and I think the older farmers in the west are proceeding along that line, and the sooner more of them do that, the sooner this

problem will be solved. What else will help to solve that? It seems to me that it will be helped by extra storage outside of individual granaries, and farmers. That is what we should bend our energies to, and to that the government is devoting its energies.

Mr. OLIVER. Is the minister under t' impression that the farmers of the north west do not have granaries on their farms

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am under this impression, which I think is the true one: That the system pursued by the farmers in the west, is very different from the system pursued by the farmers in the east. The first thing an eastern farmer looks out for, is to get some place to stor his products until he makes a sale of them. Almost the last thing the ordinary settler in the west looks at, is to get some storage capacity for that which he raises. Now, that is my impression. Am I right?

Mr. OLIVER. No, you are absolutely wrong. If my hon. friend wishes to be correct, let me say to him that the first thing the farmer does in the northwest when h has wheat, is to provide some storage on his place for it. But the question is not the storage of the grain on his farm, it is a question of storage of the grain at the railway station. That is where the grain is piled on the streets.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). My hon. friend tries to persuade this House that a man who has a granary which can store his grain and keep it from the weather will, instead of storing it in that granary, draw it out and pile it up in a lean-to somewhere. Well now, that is less of a compliment to the western farmer than I would like to pay him. I do not believe the western farmer deserves a left handed compliment like that.

Mr. OLIVER. I am anxious to inform the hon. gentleman, and if he will not ac cept the information, I cannot help it.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is always well when information is handed out to you in that way, to exercise a little caution before you accept the information as being correct, and I am bound with what sense I am gifted, to discriminate in the kind of information that I am going to take in to digest, and I cannot take that kind of information. Now I do not want to keep this House any longer. There is one point that I have yet to mention. Here was the question that my hon. friend put to me: Why did you not compel the railways to make effective and so get into operation these reduced traffic rates to the south part of Canada before you did? Why didn't you move earlier? Well my hon. friend will recollect that his government kept in office so long beyond what they should have, that they prevented us from getting where we could find out the facts of the case until it became later than it otherwise would have been. My hon. friends did not vacate there until, I think it was the 6th, 7th or 8th. of October.

Mr. LENNOX. They hated to leave.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Now to get an effective rate on the arrangement with the United States through the Interstate Commerce Commission by the 10th of November, as my hon. friend said we should have, we would have had to make a movement several days before the 10th of October. Did my hon. friend who knew the conditions make that movement? When our railways deal with the railways to the south to arrange a rate and have it made effective, they have to deal with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the rule of the Interstate Commerce Commission is that it will not grant an effective rate without thirty days' notice being given and that they adhered to. The Canadian Pacific railway on December 28, took up this matter with the United States connections, agreed upon a schedule of rates, and made application to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to make it effective within three days. The Interstate Commerce Commission refused to make it effective within three days. That was not my fault nor the fault of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The second application was made, and an urgent appeal went with it, and the permission was given to put rates into effect on short notice but to be confined to export through the United States and not for the market of the United States. That much was gained and it was gained as speedily as under the rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it could be obtained. The other permissions were in the same way followed up and got just as soon as, with the time limit which was obligatory, they could have been got. The Interstate Commerce Commission, declined to allow the new rates and make them effective on short notice for consumption within the United States. They said: 'This thirty days' notice is for the purpose of a caution and warning, we do not think we can, within shorter notice than the legally authorized rules, do this thing, which will bring articles from Canada into competition with our own supply on this side of the line. Our people ought to have warning, and they ought to have what the law gives them, a thirty days' notice.

Mr. OLIVER. Did the Interstate Commerce Commission insist on a thirty days' notice on the application for rates for export only?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). No. I have just stated that they refused at first

when the proposition was made to them to put it into effect on three days' notice. Afterwards another request was made and an urgent appeal went with it. Then they gave permission to put the rates into effect but for export only.

Mr. OLIVER. How long after the second application was the consumption permission given?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think the permission, if my information here is right for export rates, went into effect on either the 20th or 23rd of January. My hon. friend has stated what was done with reference to the Canadian Northern railway, and, so far as I gathered he has stated the circumstances correctly. Afterwards, and in gradual order, as the notice was conformed with and the Interstate Commerce Commission gave their permission these rates came into effect, and on the 7th of March all of them will be effective not only for export but for domestic purposes, for consumption within the United States. So far as fair despatch, and urgency impelling to fair despatch, goes our railway companies, and I myself—not as an autocrat of those companies for I am not, neither is the government—with a sympathetic endeavour to hasten things as rapidly as possible, made every effort that could be made and these rates have gone into effect just as soon as they could have gone into effect. Unless, indeed, my hon. friend, knowing the circumstances very well before he went out, had started the ball rolling before he went out of office and so had antedated the action that took place afterwards. I am willing to take the responsibility that fairly falls to me, and the government is willing to take all the responsibility that fairly falls to it. In this matter, I think the government and I are not to blame. By the way, my hon. friend, I think, read some of the quotations for wheat, going to show that prices in the United States were much higher than in Canada. I have a telegram here which advises me that May wheat in Minneapolis is at present only four cents higher than May wheat in Winnipeg.

Now, although I have not fully covered all the ground, I think I have made a fair reply to my hon. friend. I come now for a moment, to ask what my hon. friend wants by his motion. I should think, by the speech which was made by the hon. member from Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) that the motion had more point to it than it seems to have. What is the first clause?

That the House has heard with satisfaction from the Minister of Trade and Commerce that as a result of a conference held by hon. member and at his request with representatives of the three railway systems operating in western Canada, these railways have lowered their rate, making the rate to Duluth and to Minneapolis the same as to Fort William and Port Arthur.

Is there any reason in this why a motion of want of confidence in the government should be moved? 'Heard with satisfaction'—the hon. gentleman and his friends are satisfied, and say they are satisfied. Then, what is all this bother about so far as this is concerned? And the second clause is this:—

And that as a further result of the conference mentioned, application has been made to the interstate commission of the United States for leave to file grain rates from the northwest down to Minneapolis and Duluth, and so ease the pressure in the congested districts by taking the grain away by more western routes down towards the south.

My hon. friend is pleased with this. Why then, a vote of want of confidence in the government so far as this is concerned with which he is so much pleased? Again:

The House is informed by the public press that the reduced rates as mentioned have been granted by the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern railways on wheat and oats for export only.

So far, so good. He is pleased that this has gone——

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). The hon. gentleman is not pleased that from 250 to 400 cars a day are leaving taking grain out of congested districts and carrying it down to storage? And not being pleased, he moves a vote of want of confidence in the government, because that is being done. And again:

As the reduction of rates so announced can only affect the situation to a limited degree, the House would urge upon the government the advisability of securing further consideration of the matter by the railway companies with a view to having the reduced rates apply to wheat and oats for grinding in bond and for consumption in the United States as well as for export.

The government has done it. The reduced rate goes into effect on March 7th, as soon as the time limit runs out. Is my hon. friend displeased with that? Is he moving a vote of want of confidence in the government because we, before he moved his resolution, took action in the matter? Why, this has been done; it is now in the way of fulfilment. It does seem to me that my hon. friend is somewhat belated. The bugaboo died, and it is a corpse he is exhibiting. The living bugaboo departed this life two or three weeks ago. In the name of common sense and philanthropy, I want to know why a motion of want of confidence is moved on any of these four counts. He has got it all, he gives thanks for it all, and yet he gets up and moves

a motion of want of confidence because he has got what he wanted. And here is the last clause:—

The House would further urge that such means as may be practicable be taken by the government to have the through rates on barley and flax to Duluth and Minneapolis which became effective on January 23 reduced to the Fort William rate.

If my information is correct, the Fort William rate will rule upon this also after March 7.

Then, what is it that my hon. friend wants? I do not think there is any use of my belaboring this stiffened corpse-like bugaboo any longer. I would invite my hon. friend to withdraw it from the public gaze. Though it was a child of his own and dear to his heart, why the indecent spectacle of having the corpse dragged around?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, if anything could justify the motion of want of confidence it would be the frivolous manner in which—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). —my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) approaches a condition of real suffering in western Canada and the hilarity with which his frivolous remarks are hailed by the gentlemen behind him. I shall endeavour before I sit down, to show that we are dealing with a larger problem than the government, I think, have any proper conception of. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) asks about the speech of my hon. friend from Edmonton. 'Cui bono', Well, the answer seems to me to be on the surface. If he means that this debate cannot do much good in regard to the present condition of affairs, one may agree with him. But there will be other seasons, So the problem is much larger than my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has yet seen it to be; and if, out of this debate the government can be guided to some better conception of the problem with which they are dealing, and if suffering be saved in future seasons, Canada will have reason to be grateful to the people who have raised this debate and have taken part in it in a serious way, however little she may think of those who consider the present economic conditions of western Canada a matter for levity, hilarity and fooling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer) My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) went on from his Latin query to give an excellent example of what I will venture, with due deference, to call confused thinking. In making the wealth of a nation there are two elements: One is production and the other is the disposal of the produce. As my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) pointed out Providence and nature had a great deal to do with production but the government has to do with the disposal of the produce. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) was dealing with the disposal of the produce; and by a turn of sophistry of which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce used to be a master—we have not had so much of it from him while he has been on the government benches—he proceeds to distract the attention of his easily misled followers from the question of disposal for which he is responsible to the question of production, and he says to my hon. friend from Edmonton: Do you blame the government because Providence and nature have not been as kind to you as you had hoped?.

It is my hon. friend himself who blamed Providence, and yet he tried to shift the attack from the government for their failure to dispose of the produce, to Providence and nature, forsooth, for some breakdown in their methods. Well, that is marvellous sophistry, and I hope my hon. friend, before he goes to sleep, will be proud of it. Now if his economical thinking was a little halting, I must say his surgery is bad in the extreme. He turned to the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and he says: What is the use of taking the dressings off the wound? Well, I think I may speak to him on this subject; I will not say I may give him lessons even in thinking, but certainly I have a right to talk to him as a surgeon, and I must tell him that the proper way to treat a wound is not to keep the dressings on it until it stinks and the patient dies. That is the kind of medical metaphor with which my hon. friend pleases his friends. I am tempted to try a little Latin myself. There is an old Latin proverb which says: Parvum parva placent—little things please little minds. Then, of course, when my hon. friend was in the vein of bad logic he could not get off the use of the tu quoque. He says that my hon. friend has slept with the west. Wonderful discovery. He says, you have walked with the west. A very original idea. But he says, what did you do to relieve the evils? We provided a remedy, which you misled the country to turn down. Then my hon. friend goes on to say, what reformatory steps ought to be taken? And he gets back to his old calling of an instructor of the farmers. He says, you have got to improve your methods of cultivation. If we improve our methods of cultivation what will be one of the first results? Increased crops, more grain to dispose of. So my hon. friend's method of treating a grain blockade is to double the amount of grain he has got to handle. He has got more to handle now than he can take care of, and his recom-

mendation to the western farmers is, improve your methods of cultivation, double your crop, and then you will get rid of your grain. Then of course mixed farming came in. Well, now the difficulty with my hon. friend, as with some others who have spoken here is that they really do not know the west. There are places in Saskatchewan where you cannot water your stock within seven miles of your farm buildings. In addition to that, when men go into the west they go for the purpose of tilling large quantities of land, and taking advantage of that very wheat production which my hon. friend is condemning here, which is the secret of Canada's prosperity to-day, the secret of the growth of the cities of which you are so proud. Then my hon. friend went on to give other directions to the farmers. He says they have got to store their grain. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) gave the same advice. Well, now I speak with some knowledge on this question, and I want to tell my hon. friends in all good faith that I have been living ten years among those people, I have been endeavouring to make my livelihood upon the western lands, and I want to assure them that when men go into that western country they have to make a careful reckoning of cents and dollars before they undertake any expenditure whatever. I do not know the owner of a homestead who would not be anxious to improve his buildings, improve his dwelling house, I do not know one in my own neighbourhood. But I know that a large number of them have a great anxiety to keep out of debt. They want to get along in the world. I intend to preach this doctrine to eastern Canadians, because a large number of eastern Canadians are only removed two generations from the time when their own forefathers were going through the same trials and difficulties that the western pioneers are going through to-day. To tell a man who has got to his last dollar that he must build barns is rather an unfeeling way to approach this problem. I make that personal appeal with an intimate knowledge of the conditions. But I want to go a step further. My hon. friend says, store the grain. How far will that carry you? We do not raise grain to store it, but we raise grain to sell it. We raise it to get it to its final repository, which is the stomach of a human being, either in this country or some other country. If you store your grain, and go on and break up your soil and produce more for next year, does my hon. friend not see that he simply moves his problem six months back, and that the next year things will be worse than they are now? The farmer cannot build a granary in every field. I think that is a fair way of looking at it.

But there is an additional reason under this head, why I think this is an absolutely insufficient and paltry remedy to offer to the farmer. The farmer has to sell his grain in the fall, because, apart from the mere matter of a living, he needs the money to pay his way. What is the use of telling a farmer who is being worried by the representative of a firm of implement dealers in Toronto for a high price for his implements, and who has interest to pay on that price to store his grain? The implement agent does not say that; he says: here is your note, can you settle it? Between the implement dealer who says: here is my note, can you settle it? and my friend who says: store your grain, the farmer is in a pretty tight position. I am the farmer, I feel that difficulty. I hope that my hon. friend, when he talks about barns and storehouses—and he reminds me of the foolish man in the Scripture when he does it—will deal with this point, and that he will tell me how the farmers of western Canada are going to get out of this difficulty.

I do not know that there was a great deal in the speech of the hon. gentleman further than what I have already dealt with, but I am far from having said all I want to say on this problem, because when I rose I promised to endeavour to show to the government that it was a bigger problem than they have any comprehension of. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said: What is the use of fighting the battles of last September again? He re-echoed a remark in the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), and it had been re-echoed already by the hon. member for Vancouver from the maiden speech of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White), in this House. I do not want to fight any battle of this life over again except in so far as I can learn lessons from it for the future battles of this life. I take it that it is the duty of the government, who are responsible for dealing with the affairs of the country, to solve this problem. We are all alike in being anxious to do the best we can for Canada. I would like to say to my hon. friends that they might happen to have on this reciprocity question a change of heart and a change of mind. I know that none of us can teach the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce anything about the great principles of politics. He knows, if any man knows in this House, that, as Mr. Asquith said the other day, there is no finality in politics. It is excusable in the hon. member for Vancouver, it is excusable in an inexperienced member like the Minister of Finance, to say that reciprocity is dead. That is the kind of political opinion we expect from such inexperienced quarters, but I know that, like Mr. Asquith, the

Minister of Trade and Commerce will say that there is no finality in politics. We know that home rule was killed twenty-five years ago by the defection of a certain number of the followers of a great leader, but the same slaughterers are having all they can do to hold down the corpse to-day. I have seen these corpses before being dragged about, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce put it, and I have seen them rise up and overwhelm the slayers. Is there anybody who would say that home rule is dead to-day? Yet, it was killed twenty-five years ago. I should not wonder if my hon. friend resuscitates this very corpse, and I believe he is brave enough to do it, yet if he sees that it is the best thing for Canada and for the world. I am going to try and show him that there may be more in it than he thinks.

We will leave these corpses and party questions on one side if you like, but let me take up the question of the economic condition of western Canada. I want to endorse what my hon. friend from Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) said that this is not a party question. It is not a western question; it is a Canadian question. From the national point of view I believe that there was an honest note of regret in the last election. We have heard many explanations of it, but, after all, what was the cause of the victory in the last election? We have been establishing Canadian clubs, we are growing, we are a young nation, youth is naturally sensitive and touchy, and an appeal was made to the national sentiment, which was victorious. But, when you have established the consciousness of nationhood you have not settled your problem. When you have established a young man's consciousness upon his having grown to manhood, you have not settled this problem. Those of us who have reached middle age know that he is just about tackling the problems of life. You have to settle the question of Canadian nationhood, you have to assume a nation's responsibility and discharge a nation's duties. That is what you proclaim yourself a nation for. Amongst the primary duties of a nation is that of solving the very problem against which we are fighting in western Canada to-day. The problem is there after all. The sentiment has passed for us. I have thought all good, I believe all good, but the economic problem remains. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has disclosed a consciousness of that fact, and while the economic problem remains, who can proclaim that reciprocity is dead? That is a prophecy—and I have given the grounds in a few words for my disbelief in that prophecy. John Morley said that the only thing that you can do with a prophet is to disbelieve him. But, you cannot disbelieve that the wheat is rotting on the prairie and that the people are suffering. If you are responsible for the government of the country, you are responsible for the welfare of these people, and yet you have not finally met that problem. What is the problem? The problem is the disposal of the produce of our magnificent western country. As my hon. friend from Lethbridge so well pointed out, it is not a western problem but it is a Canadian problem. The moment the west suffers the east suffers in sympathy and the prosperity and wealth of the whole of Canada decline. The position is a worse one, politically, for my hon. friends opposite, because we had a plan for the disposal of this produce. That plan has been turned down in the meantime, and our function under the constitution of this country is to say to the government: What are your plans? You defeated our plan, it is defeated pro tem. Now, what are your plans? This is a serious question for the government politically, because the responsibility at once comes to their door. The material is being produced, the people are there and they are coming, we are told, this spring still in greater numbers to find homes, till the soil and produce more. What are your plans for the disposal of what they produce? That is the serious problem that the government have to consider from a political standpoint. But, from a national standpoint—and I shall always wish to view such public questions in that way—the question is still more serious because, if you continue to advertise Canada as a splendid field for immigration in the United Kingdom and people come in as a result of the advertising carried on by the railway companies and by the government, you are, if you continue to do that and do not solve the problem of the disposal of the material that these people produce, engaged in a pitiless campaign, and you are in a fair way to make Canada the laughing stock of the world. I pointed out, in speaking on the immigration estimates, the other evening, to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, that in a recent debate we had an admission from the Minister of Trade and Commerce, which after all was a serious admission, and one which was scarcely calculated to produce the tone of frivolity in which he mainly spoke to-night. What was his admission? He said: I am bound to admit that for the moment production has outrun transportation in western Canada. That is your problem. Men are on the farms, they are producing the material and for the moment it cannot be hauled out of the country. That is the admission of the hon. member (Mr. Foster); that is the problem that has to be solved. And, when I called attention to that prob-

lem, the Minister of the Interior answering presumably for the government upon the point, said he was not so pessimistic as I was, but, I am a confirmed optimist as a matter of fact. And he went on to say: We are having two lines of transcontinental railway built and we are also building the Hudson Bay railway. And that was his solution of the problem. He had some wonderful peregrinations in connection with the Hudson Bay route; he talked about some part of the waters up there being navigable for twelve months in the year, and of going to cross some portion of the bay and connecting with another railway; I really had not sufficient knowledge of geography to follow the hon. gentleman's movements. But I want to ask this, and I ask it in all seriousness from my right hon. friend and his colleagues in the government, is that all the answer they have to make for the solution of this difficulty. I need not point out that as an immediate solution it is a perfectly farcical answer, because it is no answer at all. The Hudson Bay railway after all may be an interesting speculation; it may be an interesting road for grain some time in the future, but for the immediate relief of the conditions in western Canada today it is no answer whatever. Any way, is it an ultimate answer? What about the ultimate relief, and what about the ultimate development of Canada in that way? That resolves itself into this question: When you have your two lines of Transcontinental built and your Hudson Bay railway built then you say we will be better able to transport the grain of western Canada. Where would you go? To the seaboard of course, and when you get it to the seaboard where will you send it? Well, during the last campaign these gentlemen opposite having declared they would have no truck or traffic with Yankees, of course the answer from them comes: We will deal with the old country. Well, I am not talking for this season; I am talking for the future of the country of which I have the honour to be a citizen. We are going to send it to the old country, they tell us. Well, Mr. Speaker, the old country is well known to be a country with an excellent appetite; they eat four and sometimes five times a day, but they don't get up in the night to eat. Their appetite is good, but it is not infinite, and we happen to be able to reduce to figures what the result will be. We have got our transportation running now, in the imagination of the Minister of the Interior, we will say; we have got our grain to the seaboard and we have Britain as the object to which we are sending it. After all, we can reduce to figures the exact amount of wheat that Britain can take in any given year, and as a matter of simple arithmetic Britain takes less than two hundred million bushels of wheat from the whole world in twelve months. She takes it from twelve different countries of the world. It is impossible by any fiscal arrangement (even if you could make such a fiscal arrangement with Britain), it is impossible by any fiscal arrangement whatsoever for Canada to capture that wheat market; quite impossible. It is particularly impossible at this moment when the apostle of protection in Britain, Mr. Bonar Law, has just delivered a long speech on the Address, and never once mentioned tariff reform. It is impossible with both parties in Britain practically united upon a free trade basis. But it is economically impossible that Canada should ever capture the whole of that market and for this reason: that when Britain sends a load of Sheffield hardware to the Argentine she is not going to send, out of sympathy, that ship right up to the Hudson bay to get a load of Canadian wheat; no, she will load with Argentine wheat, and so Britain will be found to take a certain amount of wheat from some of these other dozen countries for many a long year to come. But, if we did capture the whole market, what we could supply to Britain is what she could take of wheat and that is two hundred million bushels annually. Now, I think my hon. friend sees the problem he is up against. Is this the Canada that this government is seeking to build, a Canada which will have a surplus of two hundred million bushels of wheat and that only. If these gentlemen are the big Canadians of whom we hear, surely they are the smallest Canadians, economically considered that one can have any conception of. Why, it is estimated that in a very few years, if you have immigration coming in and if you have development going on, and if you have cultivation going on at the rate which it has been going on for some years past we shall have to dispose of a billion bushels of wheat more than we need in Canada. There is not a Canadian on the other side of the House who dare contradict that prophecy, because if he did contradict it he would place himself inevitably in opposition to the confirmed optimism of this grand young country. Now, when you get your billion bushels of wheat to dispose of, Britain's capacity is only two hundred million bushels and the problem I have been bringing home to my frivolous old friend is: what are you going to do with the other eight hundred million bushels. I listened with interest to his impassioned appeal for union between the East and West. I think he will do me the credit that I have never uttered a word in his hearing in this House which did not resound with the same sentiment. There is not a particle of dust in the British Em-

pire that I would sever, politically speaking, from another particle of dust in the British Empire. I believe that the British Empire is the greatest engine that the world has seen up to now for the propagation in this world of the principles of freedom and justice, and I would not lift my little finger to break or hurt that empire in any way or to sever the sections of the integral portions of that empire. But when we are talked to in that way as to the necessity of maintaining a proper connection between the East and the West I want to say in conclusion that the only way you will maintain it is in the way my hon. friend indicated: by tackling manfully these problems, and if my hon. friends opposite are to be allowed to imagine all they like about building a few railroads I ask them to extend their imagination to the production of some hundreds of millions of more bushels of wheat than Britain can possibly take, and then I ask them where they are going to turn for a market. Consistency has been described as the last infirmity of noble minds—let me concede to my hon. friends all the nobleness of mind they like but I say to them: for goodness sake don't hang on to the last infirmity.

Look into the history of your own party and see if there is not yet time to turn in the one direction in which you can turn for a ready and larger market for your products. We can only solve the problem of east and west by the sincere spirit of the closing words of my hon. friend. Now, I want to put this to my hon. friends in the east: if they were western farmers, would their attachment to the east be increased by your saying to them: produce your wheat, it is a beautiful thing to grow wheat, sell it if you can after we have built the Hudson Bay railway and have made a way out for it through the icebergs to a limited market; but do not sell it to the Yankees; they eat wheat and will pay a good price for it, but they should not eat Canadian wheat; do not sell it to them. If you were a farmer in the west would you be bound by ties of affection to the people of eastern Canada if they said: we are going to put all the obstacles possible in the way of your selling your produce, and at the same time we are going to take the last cent out of you by preventing you from buying where you like? I do not think anything can shake the loyalty of the west, and I want to say that there is no section of the people of the west who are more loyal than our recent American immigrants. I want to pay that testimony to them. Nine out of ten of them say: we prefer the laws of this country to the laws of the United States, and to that extent they are loyal; but their loyalty will not be strengthened by the kind of treatment I have described. You cannot show your affection for a man by hanging around his neck with one arm and rifling his pocket with the other. It is not a square deal to tell us, You must be restricted where you sell and equally restricted where you buy. This question will have to be carefully looked into. I really think from the careful way in which my hon. friend is following me that he is taking this thing seriously, and I have good hopes that he will look into this question thoroughly. Let him throw consistency to the winds, as all the great statesmen have done. Sir Robert Peel went into power in 1841 pledged to maintain protection, and in 1846 repealed the corn laws; and the people of Huddersfield erected to his memory a monument which I walk around every time I visit that town and read the inscription on it. Let the hon. gentleman throw consistency to the winds and deal squarely with this problem, and then you will see a prosperous Canada, a Canada that will be the marvel of the world because I think that with a proper economic system and good government it is destined to be the greatest nation on earth.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has treated the House to a dissertation the major portion of which consisted of platitudes uttered with a loud voice and in a bumptious manner that rejoiced hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who mistook noise for argument. The hon. gentleman, during the course of his somewhat discursive speech, the best portion of which consisted of quotations from John Morley on Gladstone, took occasion to read to this House a lesson on parliamentary ethics. The hon. gentleman seemed to find fault with a harmless and innocent remark that was made on this side of the House while he was speaking. The words used were, 'go easy,' surely harmless, innocent words, that one would think would not call forth the diatribe that we heard from the hon. member. The hon. member told us about the mother of parliaments. It strikes me, judging from the usual condition of the hon. member for Red Deer, that he is much better acquainted with the purlieus of Whitechapel and Seven Dials than he is with Westminster.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Everybody knows that Whitechapel is a district where you will find the lowest class that inhabits the city of London, and I think it is an injurious remark for any hon. gentleman to suggest that another hon. member of this House is fitted to be an inhabitant of those purlieus.

Mr. SPEAKER. The remark was scarcely within the amenities of the debates of parliament, and I would ask the hon. member (Mr. Fowler) to withdraw it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr Speaker, just a moment——.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, chair.

Mr. FOWLER. You will permit me to say that many very good people, actuated by the very best motives, go into the purlieus of Whitechapel.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is only making the offence worse attempting to justify the remark. I think it would be more appropriate to withdraw it.

Mr. FOWLER. In deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, if I have made use of any remark which is unparliamentary, which if it were not for your ruling I would not consider so, I will of course come within the parity rule and withdraw the remark. But at the same time, I have a right to say this, that the personal remarks made by the hon. member for Red Deer were quite as injurious, as far as I was concerned, as anything I said about him. The hon. gentleman has told us that he himself is a farmer; and, Sir, if any argument were needed to back up the statement made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that a considerable part of the difficulty in the country was due to bad farming, the statement made by the hon. member for Red Deer that he is a farmer would amply supply that argument. It is a remarkable thing that men who have been failures in every other sphere of life, hearing of those fertile lands in the west have gone there hoping to achieve success, and that is one of the ills that this country is suffering from at the present time. I will not say that there are not other ills. I will not say that the transportation facilities are yet sufficient to carry out the products of the country. But it does seem to me that what the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce pointed out is absolutely true, that the fault cannot lie with the government, who have not had either time or opportunity to take this matter into proper consideration and provide the necessary remedy.

But, Sir, the fault does lie at the door of hon. gentlemen opposite, and mainly and principally at the door of the ex-Minister of the Interior, the man who moved this resolution. Because. Sir, charged as he was to look after the interests of the people of the west he took no steps whatever to provide the necessary remedy for evil which he never saw impending but which was rapidly approaching. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in dealing with this matter can only hark back to the old threadbare subject of reciprocity, a subject which was threshed out in this country from end to end, and which the people of Canada voted against with such almost surprising unanimity on the 21st of September last. The hon gentleman is not original at all. He never makes a speech in this House in which he does not discuss the question of reciprocity. That seems to be the only thing on which he can talk with any lucidity at all, that is the very thing which is troubling him most. The hon. gentleman also says: You cannot expect Britain to take your grain no matter what means of transportation you may supply, no matter how you may increase the facilities for carrying that grain to the markets of the world. Then what country is going to take it? 'Oh, the United States'. Mr. Speaker, the lack of knowledge the hon. gentleman has with regard to farming, the lack of knowledge that he has with regard to parliamentary ethics is to be regretted. The same hon. gentleman quoted my allusion to Whitechapel and was so lacking in proper respect to members of this House as to refer to the Minister of Trade and Commerce as 'My frivolous old friend'. The hon gentleman holds himself at all times as conforming to the proper parliamentary attitude as observed in the Mother of parliaments, where they almost fought across the benches on one occasion a few months ago. We have not yet come to that in this House, although with the example of the hon. member for Red Deer before us I do not know to what length we may ultimately go. Well, Sir, he has told us that the great remedy. the sovereign panacea, the cure-all for the ills from which the people of western Canada are suffering to-day, is to send their grain away to the United States which to-day exports more wheat than we in Canada raise altogether. That is the sort of remedy this great and wonderful statesman from—I will not say Whitechapel because you Mr. Speaker, have said that I should not use the term—but this great and wonderful statesman this modern miracle worker in statesmanship is able to supply to the people of western Canada. It seems to me that nothing could be more absurd, robbed as I say of its noise and its quotations from Gladstone, than the speech we have listened to to-night from the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. OLIVER. I have the right to close the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, this is not a substantive motion.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Oliver):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béland,	Maclean (Halifax),
Boivin,	MacNutt,
Bourassa,	McCraney,
Brown,	McCoig,
Buchanan,	McCrea,
Bureau,	McMillan,
Cardin,	Marcile (Bagot),
Carvell,	Martin (Regina),
Cash,	Michaud,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Molloy,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Nesbitt,
Clark (Red Deer),	Neely,
Cruise,	Oliver,
Delisle,	Pacaud,
Demers,	Papineau,
Ethier,	Proulx,
Fortier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Seguin,
Gauvreau,	Sinclair,
Guthrie,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Kyte,	Tobin,
Lachance,	Turgeon,
Lanctot,	Turiff,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Verville,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Warnock,
Law,	White (Victoria, Alta.) and
Loggie,	Wilson (Laval).—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alguire,	Lamarche,
Ames,	Lancaster,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lavallée,
Arthurs,	Lennox,
Ball,	Lesperance,
Barnard,	Lewis,
Barrette,	McCurdy,
Beattie,	McKay
Bellemare,	Marshall,
Best,	Middlebro,
Blain,	Munson,
Blondin,	Nantel,
Borden,	Paquet,
Boulay,	Paul,
Bowman,	Perley,
Brabazon,	Porter,
Bradbury,	Rainville,
Broder,	Reid (Grenville),
Burnham,	Robidoux,
Burrell,	Roche,
Clark (Bruce),	Rogers,
Clarke (Wellington),	Schaffner,
Clements,	Sevigny,
Cochrane,	Sexsmith,
Cockshutt,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Coderre,	Shepherd,
Crocket,	Staples,
Crothers,	Steele,
Davidson,	Stevens,
Donnelly,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Edwards,	Sutherland,
Elliott,	Taylor,
Elson,	Thornton,
Foster (Kings, N.S.).	Tremaine,
Foster (Toronto, N.),	Walker,
Fripp,	Wallace,
Gauthier (Gaspe),	Webster,
Goodeve,	Weichel,
Guilbault,	White (Renfrew),
Hartt,	Wilson (Wentworth) and
Kemp,	Wright.—84.
Kidd,	
Lalor,	

Mr. SPEAKER.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.

Messieurs

Hughes (Victoria),	German,
White (Leeds),	Emmerson,
Hazen,	Murphy,
Pelletier,	Lemieux,
Stanfield,	Pardee,
Macdonell,	Devlin,
Thompson (Yukon),	Carroll,
Sharpe (Ontario),	Ross,
Davidson,	Chisholm (Inverness),
Wilcox,	Clarke (Essex),
Stewart (Lunenburg),	McKenzie,
Jameson,	Douglas,
Boyce,	Richards,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Cromwell,	Lovell,
Henderson,	Knowles,
Thoburn,	Robb,
Mondou,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Achim,	Bickerdike,
Fowler,	Pugsley,
Smyth,	Boyer,
Bristol,	Charlton,
Baker,	Kay,
Rhodes.	Macdonald.

Amendment negatived.

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

Progress reported.

Mr. BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BORDEN. Bills first, probably beginning with the Grain Bill; afterwards the Tariff Bill and any other Bills standing on the order paper; and then Supply, taking up the estimates of the Department of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a. m. Thursday.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1911-1912.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2° 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass.; Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider' Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., Northwest Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp. Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ACHIM, Mr. H., *Labelle.*

C.N.R. and Carillon & Grenville Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 970 (i).

La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord (B. 45) 1°*, 970 (i).

AIKINS, Mr. J. A. M., *Brandon.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 94 (i).

Civil Service Increases since 1900 (M. for ret.*) 561 (i).

Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices, &c. (remarks) 855 (i).

Denny, James, Relief (B. 112) 1°*, 3630 (ii).

Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2186, 2318, 2773, 3795 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Copy of Cor. *re* Construction, &c. (M. for papers) 1213, 1264 (i).

Hudson Bay Ports, Surveys, &c. *re* Navigation (Ques.) 3943 (ii).

——— (M. for reps.*) 3756 (ii).

Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2124 (ii).

Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6029 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4313 (iii); in Com. 4605; on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) 4663 (iii).

Methodist Church (B. 133) 1°*, 4975 (iii).

Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2722; in Com., 2949 (ii).

AIKINS, Mr. J. A. M.—*Con.*

Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6429 (iv).

Wadge, Thomas Patent Relief (B. 16) 1°*, 643 (i); in Com., 2859, 2983 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Canada-Australia Trade (M. for papers*) 582 (i).

Continental Can. Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5207 (iii).

Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3225 (ii).

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 940 (i).

Montreal Central Terminal Co.'s. (B. 49) 1°*, 970 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Retention of (Ques.) 2062 (ii).

N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3130 (ii).

Private Bills, Suspension of Rules (remarks) 5902 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., 6th Rep.: M. to conc., 6062 (iv).

Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6550 (iv).

Rambaut, Thos. D., Patent Relief (B. 84) 1°*, 970, 1862 (i); in Com., 2855, 2985, 3280, 3479 (ii).

——— Patent Relief B. 84, on Order for Com., 3332 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept., (Gazette) 1491 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2643; in Com., 2930, 2945, 3021 (ii).
Trade Relations between W. Indies, Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 1981 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5909 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. A., *North York.*
Aurora Public Building, Papers, Reports, &c. (M. for copies*) 561 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) 1319 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*
Cable Rates, Res. (M.) to withdraw, 3448 (ii).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing, &c., on M. (Mr. Edwards) to Com. of Sup., 5725 (i).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Power for Govt. Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).
Newspaper Postage, Opinion of P.M.G. *re* Regulations (Ques.) 2291 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2348, 2352 (ii).
Parcel Post, Rural Mail Delivery, &c.: on M. for Sup., 4082 (iii).
——— Reply to Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) 4109 (iii).
Postal Regulations, Commission *re* Investigation (prop. res.) 2251 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 2376 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2°, 3352 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals, Welland (surveys) 5790 (iv).

ARTHURS, Mr. J., *Parry Sound.*
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3432 (ii).
Powassan Postmaster, Change *re* (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Gazette (Gazette) 1486 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2934 (ii).

BAKER, Mr. G. H., *Brome.*
Central Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 44) 1°*, 970 (i).
Customs Smuggling Case by M. P., Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Ques.) 2072 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3949 (ii).

BAKER, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Trust and Loan Co. of Canada (B. 108) 1°*, 3449 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
Dom. Guarantee Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 795 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com. (amt.) 6576 (iv).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 970 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1635 (i).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3070 (ii).
Ottawa and Lake McGregor Ry. incorp. (B. 192) 1° m., 6495 (iv).
Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6550 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. (B. 114) 1°*, 3828 (ii); in Com., 5202 (iii).
Union Bank of Canada (B. 57) 1°*, 970 (i).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B. C.*
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2471 (ii).
Labour Conditions, Emplymt. of Orientals in B.C. (remarks) 177 (i).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co. (B. 73) 1°*, 1410 (i).

BARRETTE, Mr. J. A., *Berthier.*
Berthier-en-Haut Post Office, Purchase, Repairs, &c. (M. for papers*) 1409 (i).
Keewatin Separate Schools, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3149 (ii), 4240 (iii).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration of (Ques.) 974 (i).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*
Battlefields Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 817 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6262 (iv).
London Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1665 (i).
Petroleum, Crude, and Refined, Quantity imported yearly since 1902 (Ques.) 730 (i).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 121) 1°*, 4457 (iii); in Com., 5198 (iii).
Speaker, Dep., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to appoint, 523 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (promotions) 6280 (iv).
Immigration (regulations) 3913 (ii).
Wells, Edna Relief (B. 102) 1°*, 3049 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Wills, Annie Greek Relief (B. 173) 1°*, 5680 (iv).

BELAND, Hon. H., *Beauce.*
Asbestos Importations, Total Value, &c. (M. for ret.) 1590, 1817 (i).
Boucher, Mr. O. F., Pet. *re* Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 975 (i).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6306 (iv).
Cattle Quarantine at Beauceville, Res. from Chamber of Commerce, 4984 (iii).
Civil Service (mail clerks) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 4784 (iii).
Dalaire, L. P., Dismissal of (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Duchaine, Pierre, Dismissal of (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6057 (iv).
Farly, Mrs., Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2579 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Assiniboine River Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6061 (iv).
Henry, Norbert, Contract *re* Mails between Scott Junction and Station (Ques.) 975 (i). *See* 'Scott.'
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3727 (ii).
Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3339 (ii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5408 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5959 (iv).
Lacombe, J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastian P. O., Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 974 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Levis Dry Dock, Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 3°, 4925 (amt.) 4934; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 108) 4972 (iii).
——— on Voting *re* M. for 3°, 4984 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction *re* (Ques.) 4260 (iii).
——— (M. for reps., &c.*) 4263 (iii). *See* 'Lewis.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6305 (iv).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
Scott Junction Mail Contract, Cancellation *re* (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6477; (census) 6462; (International Institute) 6479 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490 (iv).

BELAND, Hon. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agencies) 3915 (ii).
Inland Revenue (explosives apparatus) 6604 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6597 (iv).
Labour Dept. (conciliation boards) 1511 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5478 (iii).
Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6486 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5342 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6289; (salaries, &c.) 6618 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Tracadie Lazeretto) 1530 (i).
Thibodeau, George, Resignation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).

BELLEMARE, Mr. A., *Maskinongé.*
Budget, The, 5146 (iii).
Election Expenses in Maskinongé, Settlement of (Ques.) 4776 (iii).
Dismissals by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Par. in 'Le Devoir' (read) 2452, 2664 (ii).
Medical Director General, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel Ice Breaker (Ques.) 5680 (iv).
Statue erected on Federal Land in Quebec City by Prov. Govt. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. R. B., *Calgary.*
Address, The, in answer to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 14 (v).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5286 (iii).
Alberta Interurban Ry. Co. (B. 33) 1°*, 969 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5264 (iii).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2432 (ii).
Premier Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2522 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 127 (i).
Alberta Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5904 (iv).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on Order for Com., 5903 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2846 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Ducharme, Mr., Apptmt. as Commissioner (remarks) *re* Attacks on, 2830 (ii).
Elevators, Control by Govt., ref. to in debate on Address, 137 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2404, 3529, 3781 (ii).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ques.) 539 (i).
Grain Shipments from Ports in Canada, Quantity, Grades, &c. (Ques.) 536 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3963 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, ref. to in debate on Address, 132 (i).
Magdalen Island News Service (remarks) 4162 (iii).
Navigable Waters Pollution (B. 107) 1°*, 3449 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Minutes of Meetings, Amounts expended, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1588 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Ice Breaking and Dredging (personal explanation) 3331 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2° 3352; in Com., 3360 (ii).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Conservation on Commission (Chicago canal) 6582 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4720 (iii).
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2826 (ii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5366 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Midland) 1855 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2977 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6421 (iv).

BEST, Mr. J. A., *Dufferin.*
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6094 (iv).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 22 (Mr. Jameson) in Com., 2011 (ii).
Personal Explanation, Remarks *re* Agricultural Com. Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 2155 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5770 (iv).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
British Preference, Increase of (Ques.) 553 (i).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Abolition of (Ques.) 557 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1082 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 6202 (iv).
Educational Bills, Ques. of Order, *re* Jurisdiction of Dom. Govt., 3873 (ii).
See 'Queens.'
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6457 (iv).
Highlands Bridge, Contract *re* Construction (remarks) 1197 (i); 5790 (iv).
Immigrant Inspection before sailing for Canada (remarks) 618 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs. on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2091 (ii).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. (B. 2) 1°*, 12; 2° and in Com., 939 (i).
Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 643 (i).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port (Ques.) 554 (i).
N.T. Ry., Branch Lines to Montreal, Construction of (Ques.) 554 (i).
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2664 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3874 (ii), 4750 (iii).
Queen's University Bill, Ref. to Min. of Jus. (remarks) 3730 (ii).
See 'Educational.'
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6469; (live stock industry) 6469 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (Rockfield bridge) 5790 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1082 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3918 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1479 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachine) 1952 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*
British American Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 155) in Com., 5946 (iv).
Cigarettes, Quantity manufactured and imported in each Prov. for 1905, &c. (Ques.) 556 (i).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6099 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5882 (iv).
Davidson, David George, Relief (B. 175) 1°*, 5831 (iv).
Dominion-Gresham Casualty Co. Amalgamation (B. 176) 1°*, 5831 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).
Freight Rates, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
Grain Amt. Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2537, 2775, 3167 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Freight Rates, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3979 (ii).
Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6006 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4498 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1878 (i), 3375, 3411 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5836 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, on M. to adopt 3rd Rep., 6335 (iv).
Race Track Meets: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.
Railway Committee, 13th Rep. (presented) 5999 (iv).
Rural Mail: *See* 'Civil Service,' 'Parcel Post.'
Rural Telephone System, Placing in Post Offices (Prop. res.) 2247 (ii).
—— (M.) to stand, 2460 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co's. (B. 172) 1°*, 5680 (iv).
Seely, Keitha Relief (B. 174) 1°*, 5831 (iv).
Sterling Life Assurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 72) 1°* , 1410 (i); in Com., 2448 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2895, 3011, 3542 (ii).

BOIVIN, Mr. G. H., *Shefford.*
Address, The, 497 (i).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
Fenian Raid Vets. Land Grant, &c. (Ques.) 3334 (ii).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6642 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4969 (iii).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. to Legalize (Ques.) 575 (i).
SUPPLY—
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6642 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5830 (iv).

BOIVIN, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Van Antwerp, C.B., Employment by Inland Rev. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L. (Prime Minister), (*Halifax*).
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 50 (i).
—— Precedence *re* (M.) 9 (i).
—— (M.) to Present, 519 (i).
—— Reply from H.R.H. (presented) 932 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5285 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5563 (iv).
Agricultural 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) *re* 2375 (ii).
Archives (B. 66) (prop. res.) 1282; 1°*, 1283; 2° m., 1440 (i); in Com., 1494 (i).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment for (M.) 3343 (ii).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 1362 (i).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
Banking Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1820 (i).
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c., (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
B.C. International Boundary Line, Par. from Washington (remarks) 2755 (ii).
B.C. Provincial Boundary, Agreement *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 972 (i).
B.C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs. (Ans.) 573 (i).
Boundary Waters Treaty, Apptmt. of Commissioners, on Inquiry (Mr. Pugsley) for Ret., 2589 (ii).
See 'Waterways Commission.'
Business of the House, Morning Sittings (M.) 4980 (iii).
Cabinet, Constitution of (remarks) in debate on Address, 56 (i).
—— Quebec Ministers of the Cabinet, Choice of Min. of Public Works (Ans.) 545 (i).
—— Stmt. by Hon. Mr. Monk (Ans.) 526 (i).
Cable Rates to G. B., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 3238 (ii).
Cable Rates Reduction, Papers laid on Table, 931 (i).
Cable Rates with G.B., Res. on Order Paper, Withdrawal of (remarks) 3448 (ii).
See 'Postal.'
Canadian Missionaries in China, Relief *re* Dangers (remarks) 230; (stmnt.) 268 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co. Subsidy (M.) for Com. on Res., 5841 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 187, Res. prop., 5690; in Com. on Res., 6082; on M. for 2°, 6331; in Com., 6341; 3° m., 6495 (iv).
Canadian Offices in London, Cor. *re* Accommodation, on M. (Mr. Bradbury) for Papers, 1400 (i).
Car Shortage *re* Grain Shipments (remarks) 803 (i).
Census Enumerators, Delays in Payment (remarks) 1971, 2156 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment (remarks) 703, 927 (i).
Civil Service Act, (additional commissioners) Amt. (B. 104) Res. prop., 2862; in Com. on Res., 3143; 2° m., 3347; in Com., 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. (B. 60) Prop. Res., 1019; in Com. on Res. 1032; 2° and in Com., 1434 (i); in Com., 3343; on M. for Com., 3540 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., Ques. of Order, 4577 (iii).
Civil Service Association, Representations to Govt. (Ans.) 3335 (ii).
Civil Service, Competitive Examination, Extension *re* (Ans.) 533 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 1582 (i).
Civil Service Reform and Outside Service (Ans.) 727 (i).
Coffin, Mr. Henry, Reinstatement as Sessional Messenger (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
Commisioners of Investigation appointed by Govt., Number &c., (remarks) re Question, 5680 (iv).
See 'Dismissals,' 'Marine.'
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 10 (i).
——— List (presented) 703 (i).
——— (M.) to present Rep., 794 (i).
——— (M.) to add Names, 1019 (i), 2217 (ii).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4396 (iii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5551; on M. for 3°, 5892; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2848 (ii).
See 'Hansard.'
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 888 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service, Apptmt. of Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3248 (ii).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
——— Ruling of Dep. Speaker on Objection (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3255 (ii).
——— *See* 'Marine,' 'Civil Service,' 'Commissioners.'
Dismissals from Ottawa Dept., on Inquiry for Ret., 3834 (ii).
——— House of Commons Dismissals, on Inquiry (Mr. C. A. Wilson) for Ret., 6807 (iv).
See 'Sessional, &c.'
——— Post Office Dismissals, since Oct 1911, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 1395 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1175 (i).
Dismissals: *See* 'Inquiries, B. 19.'
Distribution Office, Salaries (M.) to send Mess. to Senate *re* concurrence in Rep., 6660 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) amt. B. 8 (Mr. Burnham) on M. for 2°, 1018 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Limitations as to Tenders (remarks) 1820 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act, on Prop Res. (Mr. Perley) 5560 (iv).
Dynamite and Explosives, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 724 (i).
Elevators, Ownership and Operation by Govt. (remarks) 2854 (ii).
External Affairs Dept. Amt. (B. 58) 1° m., 971; 2° m., 1434 (i).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Reimbursement for Losses (Ans.) 528, 714 (i), 3333 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 3148 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Investigation, Aptmt. of Sir William Meredith (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Fast Atlantic SS. Service (remarks) 5696 (iv).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6514 (iv).
Fife, Duke of, Decease (remarks) 2154 (ii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction *re* Provinces (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Fish Reduction Works at Arichat, Tel. from Prime Minister (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 5706, 6067 (iv).
French Translator, Apptmt. of Mr. C. E. Duckett (M.) 1969 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 1971, 3060 (ii).
Good Roads Bill: *See* 'Highways.'
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Elevators,' 'Public ownership.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2535 (ii); on Order for 3°, 4153 (iii).
Grain Shipments: *See* 'Car Shortage.'

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6749, 6766 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 712; on M. for 2°, 796 (i).
G. T. P. Ry., Assiniboine Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6060 (iv).
——— Subsidy Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. White) 2297 (ii).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Form of Question, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (ii).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Co.'s Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1460 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay in Distribution (remarks) 269 (i).
Health Dept., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 3639, 3643; in Com., 3668, 3948 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6398 (iv).
Hindoo Immigration: *See* 'Sikhs'.
Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 165.'
House of Commons, Employees, Salaries Increases (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Speaker, 6660 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., 751 (i).
Immigration in Ont., Promise of Premier *re* Assistance (Ans.) 546 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c.: *See* 'Sen. & H. of C.', &c.
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 2°, 1024; in Com., 1285, 1425 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Acquisition by Govt. (Ans.) 566 (i).
——— Legislation *re* Acquisition (Ans.) 569 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1000 (i).
I.C.R. and Brotherhood Unions, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 793 (i).
I.C.R. Management Board, Abolition of (Ans.) 570 (i).
——— Ticket Collectors, Apptmt. of (remarks) 6787 (iv).
Internal Economy Commission (presented) 11 (i).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5408 (iii).
Keewatin Separate Schools, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4241 (iii).
——— *See* 'Man. Boundaries Bill.'
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3535 (ii).
Legislation, Joint Com. (M.) 2217 (ii).
L'Evenement Publishing Co., Minister acting as Director (Ans.) 1813 (i).
Library Committee (M.) 795 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Library of Parliament, Rep. (presented) 11 (i).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6023 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1790 (i).
Manitoba Boundary Extension (B. 115) (M.) for Com. on Res., 3538; in Com. on Res., 3835; 1° m., 3898 (ii); 2° m., 4263, 4483; agreed to (Y. 114; N. 76) 4494; in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 4649; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4705; on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com.; in Com. (amts.) 4836 (iii); 3° m., 4838 (ii).
Man. Boundaries, Conference *re* Separate Schools (Ans.) 715 (i).
——— Discussion of School Question (Ans.) 534 (i).
See 'Separate Schools.'
——— Eastern Extension (Ans.) 3936-7 (ii).
——— Eastern and Western Line, &c. (Ans.) 971 (i).
——— Financial Terms, &c. (Ans.) 558, 716 (i).
——— on Inquiry for, 1820 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 3834 (ii).
——— Manitoba Questions, (remarks) *re* answers, 581 (i).
——— Memorial, Stmnt. *re* Finances, &c. (remarks) 3631 (ii).
——— Papers *re* (remarks) 3448 (ii).
——— Settlement *re*, Cor. with Man. and Ont. &c., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) 777 (i).
Man. Boundaries: *See* 'Ont. Boundaries.'
Marcil, Mr. Tancrede, Application *re* Govt. Position (Ans.) 2069 (ii).
Marine Hospital Ships, Establishment of *re* Fishermen (remarks) 6787 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1624; (M.) to adjn. debate, 1629; Agreed to (Y. 87; N. 61) 1706 (i).
Marriage Act Amt., Decision of Privy Council (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. to legalize (Ans.) 575 (i).
Marriage Law, Pet. *re* Dom. Legislation (Ans.) 529 (i).
——— Ref. to Supreme Court (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Marriage Question *re* Catholic Hierarchy, (Ans.) 574 (i).
See 'Ne Temere.'
Miner, Bill, Escape &c. (remarks) 939 (i).
Monday Sittings, Precedence of Govt. Business (M.) 2376 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Res. from Corn Exchange Protesting *re* Removal (Ans.) 2070 (ii).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Montreal, Patronage Committee, Recommendations *re* (Ans.) 1866 (i).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port (Ans.) 554 (i).
Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* (Mr. Carvell) as Public Service Commissioner, on M. for Sup., 6541 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
—— Objection *re* Candidate at Elections (Ans.) 6336 (iv).
Morning Sessions: *See* 'Business of the House.'
Mounted Police, Increase in Pay (remarks) 4743 (iii).
—— Report (presented) 971 (i).
Naval Bill, Discussion *re* (Ans.) 4240 (iii).
Naval Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 58 (v).
—— Interview with Hon. Geo. H. Perley, &c. (remarks) 1576 (i).
Naval Policy, Promise *re* Rereferendum (Ans.) 526 (i).
—— Repudiation by Nationalists (Ans.) 714 (i).
—— Speeches in Election Campaign, &c. (Ans.) 552 (i).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1869 (i); 3141, 3393, 3437 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Commission of Investigation *re* Construction (remarks) 2061 (ii).
See 'Gutelius.'
N. T. Ry. Station at Quebec City (remarks) 6786 (iv).
National Waterways Treaty, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3833 (ii).
Naturalization, Legislation *re* Uniformity, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor., 767, 771 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Power of Parlt. (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 798 (i).
—— Questions asked of late Govt., Concurrence by present Govt. (Ans.) 719 (i).
—— Stmnt. of member for Peterborough (Ans.) 731 (i).
See 'Marriage.'
Newspaper Articles *re* Dismissals, Ruling *re* Reading, 3058 (ii).
Notes: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, *pro forma*, 9 (i).
Old Age Pensions (M.) for Special Com., 2217 (ii).
Ontario Boundaries Extension (B. 152); (M.) for Com. on Res., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5270; 1°*, 5271 (iii); 2° m., 6155; in Com. 3°*, 6188 (iv).
See 'Manitoba Boundaries.'

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Ottawa City Federal District, Referendum *re* (Ans.) 1356 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Pets, &c., 979 (i).
Panama Canal, Tolls, &c. (remarks) 2447 (ii).
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 1396 (i).
Parliament, Limit of Session, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 557 (i).
—— Redistribution Bills, &c., Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Taylor, 545, 715 (i).
Peace Memorial Monument, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 2590 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5969 (iv).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 4460 (iii); (explanation) 4550 (iii).
Petroleum, Crude and Refined, Quantity imported yearly since 1902 (Ans.) 730 (i).
Picotte, Mederic, Dismissal from H. of C. (Ans.) 2066 (ii).
Postal Regulations, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2285 (ii).
—— on M. to take in Mondays (remarks) 2376 (ii).
See 'Cable.'
Preferential Trade within the Empire (remarks) in debate on Address, 55 (i).
Prime Minister's Visit to Archbishop of Quebec (Ans.) 534 (i).
P. E. I., Better Terms, on M. for Sup., 5173 (iii).
P. E. I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6143 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland Govt. Car Ferry Service, Tel. sent to A. A. McLean (Ans.) 1578, 1581 (i).
Printing of Parliament, Com. (M.) 795 (i).
Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 6578 (iv).
—— Extension of Time (M.) 930 (i).
—— Refund of Fees (M.) 930 (i).
Private Secretaries: *See* 'Civil Service B. 60.'
Provincial Boundaries, Res. from Sask. Legislature *re* Transfer of Resources (Ans.) 2578 (ii).
Provl. Boundaries: *See* 'B.C.', 'Man.' 'Ont.' 'P.E.I.', 'Ungava,' 'Que.'
Public Accounts Com. (Diamond Light, Co.) on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5833 (iv).
Provincial Control of Western Natural Resources, Promises *re* (Ans.) 553 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Public Ownership of Govt. Utilities, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 657, 1916 (i).
Quebec Boundaries Extension (B. 151)—(M.) for Com. on Res., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5268 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 6160; 3° m., 6188, 6338 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Reconstruction, Plans, Tenders, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Papers, 1402 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) 4757; on Order for Com., 4237 (iii).
Questions not answered (M.) *re*, 6732 (iv).
Race Tracks: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 165.'
Ry. Act (tariffs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1016; on M. to resume adjnd. debate, 1821 (i).
—— (remarks) 2499, 2531 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2501 (ii).
Ry. Bridges, N.B., Subsidies (prop. res.) 5691 (iv).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Railway Committee, 13th Rep., on M. (Mr. Blain) 5999 (iv).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4122 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies (B. 183) (prop. res.) 5681; in Com. on Res., 6060; 1°*, 6061 (iv).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1916 (i).
Reciprocity, ref. to in Debate on Address, 51 (i).
Red River Pollution, on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
Renfrew, S., Vacancy, Issue of Writ (remarks) 1576 (i), 1971, 2059, 2377 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse., 2225 (ii).
Restaurant Committee (M.) for Com., 710 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 2377 (ii).
Revised Statutes, French Translation B. 65 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1439 (i).
Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonald) 3450 (ii).
St. Eustache Election Meetings, Stmnts. of Quebec Ministers (Ans.) 553 (i).
St. John Harbour Improvements, Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities (Ans.) 567 (i).
St. John Valley Ry., Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. Bridges Subsidy (B. 188) 3° m., 6496 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges.'
St. Lawrence River Water Power, Res. from Board of Trade, Montreal (Ans.) 2457 (ii).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*
Saturday's Sittings (M.) 6186 (iv).
—— (stmnt.) 5831 (iv).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) B. 75, in Com. on Res., 1498 (i).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills (remarks) 6493, 6577 (iv).
Senate Vacancies (remarks) 5162 (iii).
Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. of Acadian in N.B. (Ans.) 541 (i).
Senate Vacancies in N.S. (remarks) 1576 (i).
—— Pet. *re* French Apptmt. (remarks) 2755 (ii).
Separate Schools, Man. and Keewatin, Demand from Members (Ans.) 4247 (iii).
See 'Man. Boundaries.'
Sessional Employees, Number dismissed (Ans.) 569 (i), 2064 (ii).
Sikhs, in B.C., Decision *re* bringing in their Wives (Ans.) 2457 (ii).
Solicitor General, Appmt. of (Ans.) 546, 1816 (i).
—— Payments to Min. of Jus., &c. (Ans.) 725 (i).
—— Vacancy (remarks) 1577 (i), 5162 (iii).
Speaker, Election of (M.) 2; Reply to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 5 (i).
Speaker, Deputy (M.) 519, 523 (i).
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Papers, 2462 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Archives (salaries) 6462 (iv).
Canals—Welland (surveys) 5789 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Archives (dep. minister) 6460 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 1035 (i).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Privy Council (salaries) 6460 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (private secretary) conc., 6779 (iv).
Fisheries (International Fishery Commission) conc., 6778 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (stenographers, &c.) 6461; Senate (sessional indemnity) 6460 (iv).
Militia (automobiles) 5520 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 6485; (claim of Mrs. Wiley) 6489; (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6486; (honorarias *re* Pelagic Sealing) 5810; (La Société Nationale Gymnastique) 5811; (Olympic games) 6486; (retiring allowance to Staff Sergeant Codd) 5811 (iv).
Mounted Police (pay, subsistence, &c.) 5175 (iii); (pensions) 6485 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5342 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings (Chatham, conc., 6804 (iv); Ottawa (examining warehouse) 1950; Ottawa (H. of C., addition) 1951 (i).

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (French River) conc., 6777 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 5597; (rolling stock) 6461 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (Annuities Act) 701 (i).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 5828 (iv).

Supreme Court of Canada, Division of (Ans.) 547 (i).

Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2160; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2615; in Com., 2942, 2866, 3024, 3564, (ii) 4081; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 3°, 4146 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6667 (iv).

Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of &c. (Ans.) 529 (i).

Taylor, Hon. Geo., Promise *re* Senate (Ans.) 545 (i).

See 'Parlt.'

Temiscouata Election Expenses, Delay *re* Payments to Dep. Ret. Officer (remarks) 1708 (i).

Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) (prop. res.) 5681; in Com., 6405 (iv).

——— Subsidy; in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iv).

Thompson, Dr., Dismissal, &c., (remarks) 6784 (iv).

Trade Commissioner to the Empire, Apptmt. *re* (Ans.) 5951 (iv).

Transportation Question: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'

Under Secretaries of State, Apptmt. of (remarks) 3059 (ii).

Ungava Annexation, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2060 (ii).

Ungava Territory, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).

See 'Man.,' &c.

Universal Eyesight Insurance incorp. B., 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5941 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6180 (iv).

Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., &c., 983 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6692 (iv).

——— Ratification of Apptmt. by late Govt. (Ans.) 533 (i).

See 'Boundary Waters.'

Wednesday Sittings, Govt. Business (M) *re* Precedence, 1969 (ii).

Winnipeg Military Property Sale: *See* 'Fort Osborne.'

BORDEN, Rt. Hon. R. L.—*Con.*

Yukon Judges Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5405 (iii).

BOULAY, Mr. H., *Rimouski.*

Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs (Ques.) 3151 (ii).

Bourque, Geoffrey, Accident on I.C.R., Inquiry *re* (M. for reps.*) 2459 (ii).

Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c., (Ques.) 1358 (i).

Courchesne, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Revenue (Ques.) 1864 (i).

Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5807 (iv).

Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).

Dismissals in Rimouski County (remarks) 1276 (i).

Dupont, Rene, Dismissal as Immigration Agent (Ques.) 1864 (i).

I.C.R., Board of Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5655 (iv).

——— Fences, Number of Rods, &c., Campbellton Division, (Ques.) 6748 (iv).

Laurier, C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette, Mich. (Ques.) 2454 (ii).

Laurier, R., Immigration Agent at Detroit (Ques.) 2454 (ii).

Lavoie, Mr. Absolon, Inquiry *re* Death on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).

Lemieux, Mr., Appointments to Govt. Service, List (read) in Com. of Sup., 6297 (iv).

Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4916 (iii).

Matapedia Water Works Co., Claims against I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).

Roy, Wm., Complaint of H. Boulay *re* I.C.R. (Ques.) 934 (i).

——— (M. for papers, &c.,) 1391 (i).

St. Laurent, Xavier, Claims for Loss of Horse killed on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).

Sayabec Post Office, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6297 (iv).

Sorel Workshops Investigations, Payments *re* (Ques.) 1205 (i).

SUPPLY—

Justice, Administration of (Montreal Circuit court) 6597 (iv).

Militia (properties) 5539 (iii).

Post Office (mail service) 6297 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Sudbury) 1953 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (highway crossing) 5601; (locomotives) 5655 (iv).

Sussex Street Property, Purchase by Govt., Total Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1359 (i).

BOULAY, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Temiskaming Lake Dam Construction, &c. (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).
Tourigny, Judge, Charges *re*, Govt. Action (Ques.) 3147 (ii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*
Algoma Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 969 (i).
Canadian Missionaries in China, Refusal of British Gunboat for Protection, Rep. *re* (remarks) 1198 (i).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Staples) in Com., 5201 (iii).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5199 (iii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Dismissal &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
Dismissals from Govt. Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 970 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Sudbury Post Office, Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Brown, Wm., Postmaster at Point Fortune, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4779 (iii).
Carillon Canal Hydraulic Power, Name of Lessee (Ques.) 2293 (ii).
Cuillerier, Mr. Jos., Soulanges Canal, Electrician, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4457 (iii); 6183 (iv).
Dismissal of Conservative Postmaster *re* Political Partisanship (Ques.) 2295 (ii).
Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 4976 (iii).
Isidore Chevrier, Charges *re*, &c. (Ques.) 4039 (iii).
Lalonde, Damien, Rep. *re* Assault, &c. (Ques.) 4255 (iii).
Legault, Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal of (Ques.) 5950 (iv).
Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 6183 (iv).
Methot, Denis, Apptmt. on Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 4255 (iii).
Montpetit, Dr. E., Pet. sent to P.M.G. *re* Dismissal of William Brown (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Mount Oscar Postmaster, Dismissal of I. Chevrier (Ques.) 4780 (iii).

BOYER, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Postmasters, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).
Rigaud Postmaster, Applications *re* (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
Robert, Wm., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contracts, Expiration of (Ques.) 5951 (iv).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail, &c. (Ques.) 5260 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Charges *re* Damien Lalonde (Ques.) 4249 (iii).
——— Claims of Denis Martin for Damages (Ques.) 2292 (ii).
——— Employees, Names, &c. (Ques.) 4250 (iii).
——— Patronage, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Excise (tobacco stamps) 5827 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5484 (iii).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6632 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5828 (iv).
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4249 (iii).
——— Date of Wm. Robert's Contract (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
Valois, J. B., Dismissal from Vaudreuil Post Office (Ques.) 3537 (ii).

BRABAZON, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*
Quinze River and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 970 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*
British American Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 155) 1°*, 5400 (iii).
Canadian Offices in London, Cor. *re* Accommodation, &c. (M. for copies) 1396 (i).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2026 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6456 (iv).
Flags, Use of (B. 74) 1° m., 1410 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3990 (ii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3680 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4353; in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4677 (iii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1069 (i).
Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6494 (iv).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1939 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Railway Question: *See* 'Grain Shipments.'
Reciprocity Treaty with U.S., Cor. with British Ambassador (M. for copies*) 1817 (i).
——— Cor. between Can. Govt. and U.S. (M. for copies*) 1817 (i).
Red River Pollution, on M. for Sup., 5166 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Justice—Penitentiaries (bonus) 6600 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1479 (i).
Militia, Ques. of Order, 5538 (iii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5991 (iv).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Budget, The, 5083 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6255, 6456 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3169 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3979 (ii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3672 (ii)
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can. (remarks) 2426 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6196 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4286 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3385 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 6464 (iv).

BROUILLARD, Mr. O., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
I. C. Ry., Change in Pay Day (Ques.) 3310 (ii).
Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3339 (ii).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Budget, The, 5103 (iii).
Chateauguay Co., Inundated Lands, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 6660 (iv).
Customs Smuggling Case, Ques. of Priv., 2216 (ii).
Tomatoes, Prices in U.S. (remarks) in debate on Budget, 5103 (iv).

BUCHANAN, Mr. W. A., *Medicine Hat.*
Address, The, 403 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1862 (i).
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5557 (iv).
C. P. Ry. Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers (Ques.) 5262 (iii).

BUCHANAN, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Car Shortage in the West (remarks) 1709 (i).
——— Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1714 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1507 (i).
Coal Strike in the West, Stmnt. of Min. of Int. *re* Settlement (Ques.) 571 (i).
Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal (Ques.) 552 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3498 (ii), 4077 (iii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4004 (ii).
See 'Car,' &c.
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 729 (i).
——— Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2210 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 728 (i).
Police Point Reserve Transfer (M. for papers*) 5557 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (industrial disputes investigation act) 1498 (i).
Public Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 2212 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2886 (ii).
United Gold Fields of B. C. (B. 93) 1°*, 2217 (ii).

BUREAU, Hon. J., *Three Rivers, St. Maurice.*
Asbestos Manufactures (remarks) *re* M. for Ret., 1591 (i).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Political.'
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Dismissal for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6053 (iv).
Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal, Charges *re* (Ques.) 1210 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) on Amt. (Mr. Proulx) to M. for 3°, 6064 (iv).
Lemieux Family, appointed by late Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Miner, Bill, Rumoured Presence in Ottawa (remarks) 939 (i).
Political Literature, Distribution *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6517 (iv).
Post Office Dismissals, General Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6305 (iv).

BUREAU, Hon. J.—*Con.*
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1210 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Charges of Management (dom. notes) 1033; Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1077; Customs (salaries) 1040; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1040, 1061; Marine Dept. (salaries) 1056; Militia (salaries) 1038; Post Office (salaries) 1067 (i).
Mines (French reports) 6490; (ore deposits) 6490 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 6285 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto warehouse) 1963 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6449 (iv).
Three Rivers, Inland Revenue Charges against Collector C. D. Hebert (Ques.) 1209 (i).

BURNHAM, Mr. J. H., *West Peterborough.*
Address, The, 318 (i).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Budget, The, 5101 (iii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (deposit) Amt. (B. 8) 1°m., 337; 2°m., 1017 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 4068 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3704 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1636 (i).
Marriage Law, Par. in Toronto 'Star' (Ques.) 3941 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Owners of Paintings, &c. (Ques.) 6337 (iv).
——— Purchase of Paintings, &c. (Ques.) 6184 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1875 (i), 3379 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Repair Shops, Erection at Quebec and Winnipeg (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Old Age Pensions (prop. res.) 1362 (i).
——— (remarks) 1829 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6133 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3877 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2506 (ii).
Railway Transportation Question, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1906 (i).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3488 (ii).

BURNHAM, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Combines Act) 1518 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5502 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2658 (ii).

BURRELL, Hon. M. (*Minister of Agriculture*) *Yale-Cariboo.*
Agricultural Aid and Encouragement (B. 100) 1° m., 2849 (ii); 2° m., and in Com., 5277 (iii); 3° m., 5561 (iv).
Animals destroyed at North Ham, Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6475 (iv).
Apples and Fruit Growing in N.S. (remarks) 1721 (i).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Cattle Embargo by G.B., Abolition of (Ans.) 558 (i).
Cattle Quarantine, Res of Chamber of Commerce, Beauceville (remarks) 4985 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Delay *re* Payments to (remarks) 935, 1021, 1199 (i), 3835 (ii), 4460 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Payments to (Ans.) 2244, 3335 (ii).
Census Enumerators at Regina, Instructions, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Stmnt., 564 (i).
Census Enumerators, Percentage retained of Salaries (Ans.) 934 (i).
Census, Population of Canada, Quebec Cities, &c. (Ans.) 3336 (ii).
Census Report (presented) 4037 (iii).
Census Returns for Saskatchewan, on Inquiry for Ret., 4983 (iii).
——— Completion of (Ans.) 5261 (iii).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5206 (iii).
Conservation Commission, Water Powers Report (presented) 407 (i).
Copyright Bill, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 557, 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 936 (i).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing Cheese (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5744 (iv).
Horses destroyed at Weyburn, Rep., &c. (remarks) 6790 (iv).
Horses imported from U.S., Destruction for Glanders (remarks) 5694, 5940 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6220, 6322 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6219 (iv).

BURRELL, Hon. M.—*Con.*
Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of (Ans.) 4549 (iii).
Live Stock Record Association incorp. (B. 167) 1° m., 5553; 2° m., 6021; in Com., 6023 (iv).
Nursery Stock, Purchase for Experimental Farm, N.S. (Ans.) 3333 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 148 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5986 (iv).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).
Population of Canada and Quebec Cities (Ans.) 731 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5899; in Com., 6219, 6320 (iv).
Regina Census Return (remarks) upon Inquiry for (Mr. Knowles) 1574 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Experimental Farm, Buildings *re* (Ans.) 578 (i).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6469 (iv); (census, &c.) 619 (i), 6462; (experimental farms, branch stations) 6477; (experimental farms, farm bulletins) 6465; (experimental farms, tobacco growing) 6478; (live stock industry) 6469; (Seed Control Act) 6469 (iv).
Agriculture—Miscellaneous (Destructive Insect and Pest Act) 6479; (Dom. Exhibition) 6479; (fumigating stations) 6479; (International Institute) 6478; (Toronto exhibition) 6480; Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 6465 (iv).
Archives (salaries) 6461 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1041 (i); (promotions) 6485 (iv).
Veitch Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 933 (i).
Wheeler, Seager, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at New York (Ans.) 542 (i).

CARDIN, Mr. P. J. A., *Richelieu.*
Dauphinais, Mr. J. O., Dismissals, &c. (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
Dupre, Dr. H., Dismissals from St. Robert Post Office (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 3753 (ii).
Govt. Dredges, Contracting *re* Boarding Employees (Ques.) 5953 (iv).
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments (Ques.) 5952 (iv).
Investigations *re* Political Partisanships, Cost of (Ques.) 5950 (iv).
Lalonde, Alfred, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4779 (iii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3753 (ii).
Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3753 (ii).

CARDIN, Mr. P. J. A.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Govt. Dredges, Emplymt. of &c. (Ques.) 4256 (iii).
St. Martin, Madame, Dismissal from St. Louis de Bonsecours (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
Sainte Rochs Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
——— (Ques.) 4248 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Sorel and Ste. Victoria Mail Contracts, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (M. for papers*) 4782 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6643 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5828 (iv).

CARRICK, Mr. J. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Grain Act, Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2182, 2383 (ii).

CARROLL, Mr. W. F., *South Cape Breton.*
Civil Service Association, Representations to Govt. &c. (Ques.) 3334 (ii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c. (Ques.) 804 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2092 (ii).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1444 (i).
Lightkeepers in N. S., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Cup., 5234 (iii).
Lobster Twine Customs Duties (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1072 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1649 (i).
Naval Service, Tenders *re* Shipbuilding &c. (Ques.) 558 (i).
New Waterford Mail Service, Change *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294, 6630 (iv).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5226 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1829 (i).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 1509; (Gazette) 1475 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Marine (hospitals) 5238 (iii).
Militia (armouries) 5544 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5377 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5219; (wreck subsidies) 5231 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6294; Outside Service (salaries) 6630 (iv).

CARROLL, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Burke's Head) 2045; (Cape Breton) 2052; (Cow Bay) 2055 (ii).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5831 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2872 (ii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 82 (i).
Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 2449 (ii).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5285 (iii).
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6247 (iv).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 1813 (i).
Bath Postmistress, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Bohan, John W., Dismissal from Customs at Bath (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
Boots and Shoes, Imports and Prices, into Canada for 1908-9-10 (M. for ret.) 1267 (i).
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3338 (i).
Canadian Agencies in Europe, Names of Appointees (Ques.) 5261 (iii), 5557 (iv).
Canals Staff, Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt, *re* Investigation by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 1414 (i).
Chubb, George, Customs Officer N.B., Dismissal &c. (Ques.) 4459 (iii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4564 (iii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6089 (iv).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4395; in Com., 5483 (iii).
Criminal Code (lumber) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5550 (iv).
Diamond Light and Heating Co., Examination *re* Public Accounts, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 5832 (iv).
See 'Public Accounts.'
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 899 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1074, 1166 (i).
See 'Marine.'
Dredges and Boiler Inspection (Ques.) 5953 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5554 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6252, 6256 (iv).
See 'Volunteer.'
Franco-Canadian Relations (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5759 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N.T.Ry. Commission, British Subject, &c. (Ques.) 4038 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3966 (ii).
Immigration Agent, Mr. Sevigny, Apptmt., Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 1588 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2429 (ii).
I.C.Ry. Supt., Application of Member of H. of C. (Ques.) 4040 (iii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5409 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5959; in Com., 6010 (iv).
L'Evenement Publishing Co., Minister acting as Director (Ques.) 1813 (i).
McLean, W. S., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang (Ques.) 4780 (iii).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4324; in Com., 4521; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 4653 (iii).
Man. Boundaries Bill, Voting (Mr. Mondou) on 2°, Ques. of, 4397 (iii).
Marcil, Mr. Tancrede, Application *re* Govt. Position (Ques.) 2069 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt., Decision of Privy Council (Ques.) 2855 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Officials, Apptmt. of, Promotions, &c. (Ques.) 3944 (ii).
Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* as Public Service Commissioner, on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Mundle, D. I., Dismissal as sub-collector at Richibucto, N.B. (Ques.) 4780 (iii).
Municipal Elections and Civil Servants (Ques.) 1813 (i).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3409 (ii).
See 'Gutelius.'
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6235 (iv).
Patronage Committee, Montreal, Recommendation *re* (Ques.) 1866 (i).
Post Office Dismissals, General Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, on M. to adopt 3rd Rep., 6333 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep. on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. 5832 (iv).
See 'Diamond Light.'

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Public Service Commission, Charges *re* A. B. Morine, on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).
Quebec Ministers of the Cabinet, Apptmt. Min. of Public Works (Ques.) 545 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2522 (ii).
Railway Bridges in N.B. Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6211, 6380 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6211 (iv).
Railway Ties, Contract with Dame Boulay (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Regiments of Foreign Born Citizens, Organization of (Ques.) 534 (i).
Renfrew, S., Election, on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse., 2237 (ii).
Robinson, Fred. P., Apptmt. as Preventive Officer, N.B. (Ques.) 4241 (iii).
Rural Mail: *See* 'C. S. Bill 79.'
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Agreement *re* (Ques.) 3049 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. Bridges Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6496 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges B. 188.'
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3946 (ii).
Sayabec Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
——— Dismissal, Apptmt. *re* &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).
Sevigny, Mr. J. E., Apptmt. in Immigration Office, &c. (Ques.) 1205, 1814 (i).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 6462 (iv).
Canals (statistical officers) 5801 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1074; Railways (salaries) 1064 (i).
Excise (customs duties) 5827; (salaries) 5812; (travelling expenses) 5826 (iv).
Legislation—Senate (indemnities) 6460 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5454; (allowances) 5447; (associations and bands) 5529; (armouries) 5541; (automobiles) 5493; (clothing) 5521; (customs dues) 5522; (headquarters staff) 5536; (salaries) 5546; (schools of instruction) 5546 (iii).
Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot Inquiry) 6487 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5309 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6282; Outside Service (salaries) 6621 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (London, England), 6655 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John dry dock) 3300 (ii); Ont. (French River) 6658 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Board of Management) 4137; (Campbellton) 4162; (construction) 4134; (working expenses) 4163 (iii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (staff salaries) 5801 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Weight and Measures (inspection electric lights) 5828 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2710; in Com., 3025 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6404 (iv).
Trade Agents: *See* 'Canadian.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6177, 6450 (iv).
See 'Fenian.'
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2984, 2986, 3280, 3479 (ii).
——— reported from Com., 3280 (ii).
White, James, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3338 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5997 (iv).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmt. of Excise Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Yule, Mr., Collector of Customs at Aurora, Dismissal of (Ques.) 5950 (iv).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2399, 3190 (ii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 4808; Amt. neg. (Y. 44; N. 86) 4833 (iii).
Man. and North Western Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 92) 1°*, 2217 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2160 (ii).

CHABOT, Mr. J. L., *Ottawa.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 129) 1°*, 4835 (iii); in Com., 5904, 5942 (iv).
Ottawa and Ungava Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1069 (i).

CHARLTON, Mr. W. A., *Norfolk.*
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Works (M. for rep.*) 3755 (ii).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6163 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6312 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W., *Inverness.*
Carmichael, Dr. A. G., Supt. of Fish Hatchery, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5276 (iii).
Inverness Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1535 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*
Kennedy, Allan, Govt. Telegraph Repairer, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
McFarlane, J. D., Postmaster at Southwest Margaree, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
McIsaac, Colin, Preventive Officer at Port Hood, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 5956 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
McLean, Donald E., Dismissal, &c. (M. for papers*) 4980 (iii).
McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2017 (ii).
McPhee, James, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Orangedale to Cheticamp Ry. Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Port Hawkesbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i), 2016 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5236 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4735 (iii).
Militia—(armouries) 5545 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (life saving awards) 5228 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Inverness) 2056; (Melford) 2056 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (generally) 2822 (ii).
Railways (surveys, &c.) 4226 (iii).
Weights and Measure (electric light inspection) 5828 (iv).
Telephone Wires strung on Telegraph Poles, permission of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).

CHISHOLM, WM., *Antigonish.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5295 (iii).
Antigonish County Public Works, Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2438 (ii).
Antigonish to County Harbour, Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 6227 (iv).
Antigonish Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2022 (ii).
Decoste, Capt. Peter, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.) 1268 (i).
——— (Ques.) 548 (i).
——— Defective Answer to Question (remarks) 803 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
Dismissals *re* Inland Rev. Dept., Policy of Min. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*
——— Apptmt. of Commissioners *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3250 (ii).
——— Recommendation by sitting member (remarks) 1278 (i).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5274 (iii).
Girroir, John, Resignation from I. C. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4185 (iii).
Great Northern Mining and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1460 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3715 (ii).
McAdam, Alex. R., Fishery Officer at Antigonish, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3343 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4630 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 783 (i).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Public Works for N. S., Appropriations *re* Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2796 (ii).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6171 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6224 (iv).
Senate Vacancies in N. S. (remarks) 1576 (i).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6227 (iv).
Steam Trawling, &c., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Papers, 2466 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6470, 6477; (bulletins) 6465 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Pictou and Cheticamp) 4736 (iii).
Militia (automobiles) 5496, 5519 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 1952 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Bayfield) 2041; (Blue Rocks Island) 2041; (Cribbin's Point) 2046; (Gillis Point) 2056 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton shops) 5604 (iv); (Sylvan Valley) 4226; (Truro) 4231 (iii).

CLARE, Mr. Geo. A., *South Waterloo.*
Berlin P.O. Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).

CLARK, Mr. H., *North Bruce.*
Fisheries Jurisdiction *re* Provinces (Ques.) 3339 (ii).

CLARK, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adj. debate, 1632 (i).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Bisley Competition (remarks) 3748 (ii).
Public Works, Appropriations in Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2804 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1487 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2996 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6406 (iv).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 210 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 5085 (iii).
Christmas, Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 927 (i).
Civil Service Act B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5265 (iii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1187 (i), 2039 (ii).
Grain Act, Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3475, 3818 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4023 (ii).
See 'Ry. Rates.'
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3654 (ii).
Horncastle, Isabella Helen, Relief (B. 147) 1°*, 5257 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Cor., 1227 (i).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 599 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1681 (i).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1874 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1380 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5839 (iv).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1932 (i).
Stewart, Ethel May, Relief (B. 120) 1°*, 4237 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Marine Dept. (salaries) 1053 (i).

CLARK, Mr. M.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3316 (ii).
Labour Dept. (combines, &c.) 1522 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5481 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2915, 3030, 3593 (ii); on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 3°, 4148 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6676 (iv).
——— Mace on Table (remarks) 3619 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6415 (iv).
Tower Clock, Repairs to (remarks) 1575 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*
Brian, Mr., Dismissal from Customs Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Canadian Missionaries in China, Relief *re* Dangers (remarks) 229 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Dumontier, Joseph, Apptmt. as Inland Rev. Inspector at Quebec, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 3340 (ii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 643 (i).
Farmers' Bank Investigation (remarks) *re* Report, 2853 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1311 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1657 (i).
Marriage Law, Pet. *re* Dom. Legislation (Ques.) 528 (i).
Newspaper Postage *re* Dom. Elections Campaign (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Post Office, Change of Names (remarks) 3751 (ii).
Renfrew, S., Election, Issue of Writ (remarks) 2059 (ii).
——— (M.) to adjn. Hse., 2218 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery Extension (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Statutes of Previous Session, Delay *re* Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1077 (i).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1474 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Pelee Island) 642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals) 1326 (i).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 693 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. W. A., *North Wellington.*
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6756 (iv).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S., *Comox-Atlin.*
Budget, The, 5144 (iii).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 2217 (ii).
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, Capt. Newcombe's Rep. (M. for copy) 2467 (ii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 2217 (ii).
Prince Rupert Dry Dock, Subsidy, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1811 (i).
Public Works Expenditure for last ten years in Different Provinces (Ques.) 2064 (ii).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for last ten years (Ques.) 1811 (i).

COCHRANE, Hon. F. (*Minister of Railways*) *Nipissing.*
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6315 (iv).
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6246, 6305 (iv).
Albert Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (amt.) in Com., 6395 (iv).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5897, 6216, 6312 (iv).
Antigonish to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 6227 (iv).
American Freight passing through Welland Canal (Ans.) 3536 (ii).
Archibald, Mr. P. S., Employmt. by Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 933 (i).
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I. C. Ry. Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3051 (ii).
Bourque, Mr. Jeffrey, Claims *re* Damages on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2244 (ii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6318 (iv).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6323 (iv).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Can. Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 189) 1°*, 6083; in Com., 6372 (iv).
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 187) in Com. on Res., 6081; 1°*, 6082; 2° m., 6331; in Com., 6339; 3° m., 6371 (iv).
Can. Northern Ry., Bridge at Morris, Man., Objections *re* (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Can. Northern Quebec Ry., Maintenance of Road on L'Ile Bourdon (Ans.) 5262 (iii).
C.P.Ry. (Toulon) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Canals, Capital Expenditure, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1811 (i).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Canal Staffs, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Canal Traffic, Total Tonnage of Freight, &c. (Ans.) 3051 (ii).
Cap. de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2014 (ii).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Carillon Canal Hydraulic Power Lease, Name of Lessee (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
Car Shortage, *re* Transportation of Hay Crop (remarks) 2754 (ii).
Cement supplied to Ry. Dept., Tenders, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (iii).
Chateauguay Inundated Lands, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 6661 (iv).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Accommodation, Pets. from Boards of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4192 (iii).
Clarkboro, Sask., C.N.R. Right of Way, Title *re* (Ans.) 934 (i).
Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ans.) 2242 (ii).
Cuillerrier, Mr. J., Soulanges Canal Electrician, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 6183 (iv).
—— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
Cresine, Geo., Quarter Master on SS. *Scotia*, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
Dismissals, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4187 (iii).
See 'Canals,' 'I.C.R.', &c.
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Position on N.T. Ry. (Ans.) 2246 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6221 (iv).
Falconer, R. S., Dismissal of as Inspector, &c., on I.C.R. (Ans.) 544 (i).
—— Emplymt. as Contractor *re* Public Works (Ans.) 5261 (iii).
Fraser, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4189 (iii).
Fraserville Wharf, Cor. *re* Construction (Ans.) 3534 (ii).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Freight Rates in the West, Complaints *re* (remarks) 666 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3217 (ii).
Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2242 (ii).
Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 4976 (iii).
Goods Roads Bill: *See* 'Highways.'
Goulet, Apptmt. as Inspector of Stations, N.T.Ry. (Ans.) 3935 (ii).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2320 (ii).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Grain Congestion in the West, Transportation, &c. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Oliver) to Com. of Sup., 6205 (iv).
See 'Freight Rates,' &c.
Grand Lake and Belle River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6307 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Co. (Brandon) Subsidy, in Com., 6324 (iv).
——— Nanaimo and Esquimalt Branch Line Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
G.T.P. Workshops at Quebec, Site for Building (Ans.) 3050 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry.: *See* 'N.T.Ry.'
Great Northern Mining and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal (Ans.) 6183 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N.T. Ry. Commission, British Subject (Ans.) 4038 (iii).
See 'N.T.Ry.'
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1459 (i).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 5895, 6212 (iv).
Hampton Spur Line, Construction *re* (Ans.) 572 (i).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).
Hay Crop and Car Shortage: *See* 'Car,' &c.
Highlands Bridge, Construction *re* (remarks) 1198 (i).
Highways Improvement (B. 77) 1°m., 1571 (i); 2°m., 3633, 3666, 3667, 3946 (ii); 3°m., 4140 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6397 (iv).
Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 3537 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1263 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c., 745 (i).
I.C. Ry., Board of Management, Abolition of, on Stmnt. (Mr. Emmerson) to Com. of Sup., 5586 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Extension, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 994 (i).
——— Coal Supply, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 2457 (ii).
——— Condon, D. Murray, Transfer of Passenger Agent (Ans.) 3337 (ii).
——— Control by Ry. Commission, Res. *re* (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
——— Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5807 (iv).
——— Dartmouth to Denis Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 543 (i).
——— Employees Retirement Fund, Refund to dismissed men (Ans.) 2450 (ii), 5934 (iv).
COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
I.C. Ry., Estende to Baddeck Branch Line, Tender *re* (Ans.) 576 (i).
——— Estmere to Baddeck Branch Line, Tenders, &c. (Mr. McKenzie) on M. for papers, 2498 (ii).
——— Fences, Number of Rods on Campbellton Div. (Ans.) 6748 (iv).
——— Fraser, John, Dismissal as Inspector at Stellarton (Ans.) 3935 (ii).
——— Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation (Ans.) 6749 (iv).
——— Guysborough Branch, Construction *re* (Ans.) 571 (i).
——— Hillsborough Branch, Rails loaned, &c. (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
——— Hagerty, S. W., Lismissal from Inspectorship of Ry. Station at Mulgrave (Ans.) 4976 (iii) .
——— Holiday and Sunday Pay, &c. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
——— Inspector, Application from Member of H. of C. (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
——— I.C.R. and G.T.Ry. Arbitration, Delays *re* Settlement (Ans.) 3940 (ii).
——— Matapedia Branch, Inspection *re* Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4196 (iii).
——— Moncton Office, Tenders *re* Heating, Stmnt. *re* (Ans.) 6744 (iv).
——— Moncton Shops, Heating Tenders, on Inquiry for Papers, 5762 (iv).
——— Moncton Shops, Transfer to Fraserville (Ans.) 544 (i).
——— 'Ocean Limited,' Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars (Ans.) 2241 (ii).
——— Pay Day, Change *re* (Ans.) 3340 (ii).
——— Pullman Car Porters, Promotion, &c. (Ans.) 1413 (i).
——— Ry. Ties at Sayabec, Name of Contractor, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
——— Rivière du Loup, Workshops at, Removal to Fraserville (Ans.) 570 (i).
——— Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere Fence Poles, Charges *re* Removal, &c. (Ans.) 2586 (ii).
——— Snow Blockade, Delays *re* Trains (remarks) 1409 (i).
——— Station at Truro, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1413 (i).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6309 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6322 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6219 (iv).
Lachine Bridge: *See* 'Highlands.'
Lac Seul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Lalonde, Damien, Rep. *re* Assault (Ans.) 4256 (iii).
Lauzon, Désire, Emplymt. by Govt., References as to character (Ans.) 3538 (ii).
Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 6183 (iv).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Methot, Denis, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 4255 (iii).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 713; 2° m., 797 (i).
N. T. Ry. Act (Commission) Amt. (B. 76) 1° m., 1571; in Com., 1866 (i); 3126, 3364 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Cost and Progress, in Com. on Bill, 3127 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Branch Lines to Montreal, Construction of (Ans.) 554 (i).
N. T. Ry. Commission, Apptmt. of Mr. Leonard, Duties assigned &c., (Ans.) 533 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. E. Taschereau (Ans.) 2245 (ii).
——— Payments to Taschereau, Cannon & Co. (Ans.) 2245 (ii).
——— Commission, Report *re* (remarks) 2157 (ii).
——— Commissioners, Notification of Dismissal (remarks) 1196, 1199 (i).
——— Damages in Dorchester County, Amounts paid (Ans.) 6184 (iv).
——— Estimated Cost, Stmnt. *re* (Ans.) 3127 (ii), 6733 (iv).
——— Investigation, Apptmt., Salary, &c., of Messrs. Gutelius and Lynch Staunton (Ans.) 4242 (iii).
See 'Gutelius.'
——— Moncton to Levis, Portion uncompleted (Ans.) 932 (i).
——— Pets. *re* Subsidy to Montreal Branch Line (Ans.) 573 (i).
——— Quebec-Moncton Section, Completion *re* Operation by Govt. (Ans.) 723 (i).
——— Repair Shops, Erection at Quebec and Winnipeg (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
——— St. Damien Station, Change of Plans (Ans.) 3533 (ii).
——— Station at Quebec, Contract *re* Building, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Cor., &c., 759 (i).
N. T. Ry. (Montreal Branch), Subsidy, in Com. 5896, 6215 (iv).

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Lease &c., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 933 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Meeting *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6230 (iv).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6235 (iv).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 6127 (iv).
Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of (Ans.) 578 (i).
Pariseau, Mr. S. B., Employee of Ry. Dept. and Cedar Rapids Co., (Ans.) 973 (i).
P. E. I. Car Ferry, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1206 (i).
P. E. I., O'Leary to West Point Ry. Branch Line, Construction *re* (Ans.) 721 (i).
P. E. I., Winter Communication with Mainland, Ry. Service (remarks) 3832 (ii).
Public Works on Rys., Suspension *re*, Names and Locations (Ans.) 531 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Erection of Shops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6214 (iv).
Ry. Bridges in N.B. Subsidy (B. 188) 1°*, 6083; in Com., 6374; 3° m., 6394 (iv).
Ry. Construction in the West, Shortage of Steel Rails (remarks) 6543 (iv).
Railway Question: *See* 'Freight Rates.' 'Grain Congestion.'
Railway Subsidies (B. 183) in Com. on Res., 5894, 6080; in Com., 6211, 6304; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6395; 3°m., 6395; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) to M. for 3°, 6396 (iv).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Roy, Wm., Complaint of Mr. Boulay *re* I.C.R. (Ans.) 934 (i).
Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895, 5896 (iv).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 6127 (iv).
St. Jean-Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction (Ans.) 571 (i).
St. John, N.B., Ry. Crossing at Haymarket Square, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 1406 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. and Bridges, Subsidy, in Com., 6211 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges B. 188.'

COCHRANE, Hon. F.—*Con.*
St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction (remarks) 4461 (iii).
——— Agreement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4233 (iii).
——— Subsidy, Agreement *re* (Ans.) 3050 (ii).
——— Subsidy, Contract to Grand Falls (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
——— Contract *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. Carvell) for papers, 3946 (ii).
Sauve, L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ans.) 575 (i).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 6546 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6912 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claims of Denis Martin for Damages (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
——— Employees, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4250 (iii).
Soulanges Canal Patronage, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).
Souris Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iv).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6224 (iv).
Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Ry., Appropriation *re* (Ans.) 2290 (ii).
——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 543 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Cornwall (lower lock) 5797 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (lock improvements) 6611 (Rockfield bridge) 5790 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 5797 (iv).
Canals—Murray (high spots) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (Bank St. bridge) 5791 (iv).
Canals—St. Peters (improvements) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste Marie (locks) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (guard pier) 5798; protection works) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 5799; (Newmarket) 5792 (iv).
Canals—Welland (construction) 6607; Port Colborne elevator) 5796; (surveys) 5786 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Railways (private secretary) 5808 (iv); (salaries) 1064 (i).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5762, 6605 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 4136; (board of management) 4136; (branch lines) 4135 (iii), 5618, 5621 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 4137 (iii); (Campbellton) 4162; (Chatham diversion) 4137; (coal contracts) 5611 (iv); (construction) 4131; (construction, working expenses) 4162 (iii); (equipment account) 5677 (iv); (extensions, &c.) 674 (i); (facilities) 5809 (iv); (gratuity to Cuthbertson children) 5678; (Halifax docks) 5596 (iv); (Hampton) 675 (i), 4225 (iii); (highway crossings) 4226 (iii); 5595 (iv); (locomotives) 5609 (iv); (Moncton office) 5653, 6604; (heating at Moncton) 5611; (Moncton shops) 5604; (North Sydney diversion) 5610; (Riviere du Loup) 5654; (rolling stock) 5653; (Sydney diversion) 5658 (iv); (Truro) 4231 (iii); (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6604 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (board of commissioners) 5800 (iv); (litigation) 5801; (remuneration to G. T. P. Director) 5801; (staff salaries) 5801 (iv).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5765 (iv).
Railways—P. E. I. (car ferry) 5663; (facilities) 5661; (Harmony-Elmira branch) 5659 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario and G. T. R. Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6769 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy (B. 186) 1°*, 6082; in Com., 6402 (iv).
T. & N. O. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6080 (iv).
Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898, 6217 (iv).
Transportation Question: *See* 'Freight Rates,' 'Grain Congestion.'
Trent Canal Water Powers, Claims of Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Vale Railroad, Operation by I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5615 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898, 6218 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).
Welland Canal Freight: *See* "American Freight.'
Welland Canal Water Power, Diversion, &c. (Ans.) 6748 (iv).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*
Budget, The, 5118 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Stmnt. of Member for Edmonton *re* Prices in East and West, on M. for Sup., 807 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Canada, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 2429 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1897 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3034 (ii); on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 3°, 4150 (iii).

CODERRE, Mr. L., *Hochelaga.*
British Colonial Fire Insurance Co. (B. 10) 1°*, 643 (i).

CODERRE, Mr. L.—*Con.*
Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 970 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4875 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Resignation of Messrs. Geoffrion and Ballantyne (remarks) 6553 (iv).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 794 (i).
Montreal Transcontinental Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 128) 1°*, 4835 (iii).
Security Life Insurance Co. of Canada (B. 27) 1°*, 794 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station F) 1352 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Hamilton Harbour B. 32 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 2449 (ii).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2109 (ii).

CROMWELL, Mr. F. R., *Compton.*
British Empire, Dom. Trust Co.'s Change of Name (B. 46) 1°*, 970; 2° m., 1201 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6263 (iv).

CROTHERS, Hon. T. W. (*Minister of Labour*) *East Elgin.*
American Shoe Machinery Co., Discontinuance of Proceeding *re* (Ans.) 572 (i).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4104 (iii).
Cement Merger, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1518 (i).
Coal Combine in B. C., Investigation *re* (Ans.) 4240 (iii).
Coal Strike in Alberta, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1503 (i).
Coal Strike in Fernie, B. C., Information *re* (Ans.) 568 (i).
Coal Miners Strike in the West, Settlement of (Ans.) 568 (i).
—— Stmnt. of Min. of Int. *re* Settlement (Ans.) 571.
Conciliation Board, Apptmt. of, *re* International Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6259 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6563 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of by late Govt., Rep. of Judge Barron, &c. (Ans.) 2581 (ii); 6563 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1468 (i).

CROTHERS, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*
Hale, Thomas, Dismissal as *Labour Gazette* Cor., Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 4459 (iii).
House of Commons Waiters: *See* 'Waiters.'
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1419 (i).
I.C. Ry. Provident Fund (remarks) 5933 (iv).
Labour Conditions in B.C. (remarks) 178 (i).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Apptmts. in Richelieu County (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Names of Apptmts. (Ans.) 1865 (i).
—— Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 1411 (i).
—— Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1442 (i).
Living, Cost of, Special Rep. (presented) 6332 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4339 (iii).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement of by Labour Dept. (Ans.) 572 (i).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1886 (i).
SUPPLY.
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1500 (i); (contingencies) 6615 (iv); (*Gazette*) 1468; (industrial disputes act) 1500 (i); 6615 (iv); (industrial training commission) 1527; (inspection *re* dangerous machinery) 1525 (i); (private secretary) 6615 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5625 (iv).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5782 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2912 (ii).
Technical Education Commission's Rep. (Ans.) 1202 (i).
United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Appeal (Ans.) 6783 (iv).
—— Investigation, Application to Min. of Justice *re* (Ans.) 3148 (ii).
—— Proceedings *re* (Ans.) 2455 (ii).
Waiters, Minimum Wages paid to, in Cities (Ans.) 3049 (ii).

CRUISE, Mr. R., *Dauphin.*
Chard, J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re* (Ques.) 2458 (ii).
Dauphin Custom House (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. 2571, 3189, 3510 (ii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 4788, Neg. (Y. 47; N. 89) 4793 (iii).
Justice, Depy. Min., Salary, Extra Payments, &c. (Ques.) 2458 (ii).
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limitation *re* Catch (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4684 (iii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A., *North Simcoe.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5944 (iv).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2411 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 970 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 819, 836 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship, Lists dismissed by Lib. Party (read) in Com. of Sup., 1096 (i).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Cor., 1391 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6055 (iv).
E. F. Piper, Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1201 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6255 (iv).
Flaxseed, Stmnt. *re* Shipment of (Mr. Turriff) 661 (i).
Freight Rates, &c., on Public Ownership (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 664 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2170; in Com., 2182, 2324 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 130) 1°*, 4835 (iii); on Order for Com., 5947; in Com., 6563, 6762 (iv).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, 6563, 6762 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., 733 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6004 (iv).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6046 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1728 (i).
N.T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3417 (ii).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
Naturalization, Legislation *re* Uniformity, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor., 773 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1385 (i).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 970 (i); in Com., 2413 (ii).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6134 (iv).
Printing Com., 1st Rep. (M.) to conc., 3330 (ii).
——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 6578 (iv).
Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 6578 (iv).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Public Works, Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2808 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to M. for Sup., 5443 (iii).
Railway Fares, Reduction to Students (remarks) 6277 (iv).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 664, 1923 (i).
Rideau Hall Improvements Amount expended from 1896 to Nov., 1911, (Ques.) 876 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6483 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Outside Ports (salaries) 1096 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3317 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 1511 (ii); (Gazette) 1481 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John) 630 (i); Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2827 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (branch lines) 5651; P. E. I. (car ferry) 5665 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2880, 3569 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 3616 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry., and G. T. Ry. Co.'s (B. 145) 1°*, 5257 (iii); on Order for Com., 5947; in Com., 6769 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6422 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2854; on 3°, 3280 (ii).

DAVIDSON, Mr. A. L., *Annapolis.*
Decoste, Capt., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3259 (ii).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c. (Ques.) 3754 (ii).
Faulkner, R. S., Emplymt. by Public Works as Contractor (Ques.) 5261 (iii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3998 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3722 (ii).
I.C.R. and G.T. Ry. Arbitration, Delays in Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 3939 (ii).
I.C. Ry. Branch Lines, Accommodation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
Lowe, Robt. S., Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3754 (ii).
Public Works, Appropriations for N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2810 (ii).
Seamen, St., Annapolis Co., Post Office, Date of Opening (Ques.) 3754 (ii).

DAVIDSON, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5645 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3276 (ii).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ques.) 2242 (ii).
Matte, J. Arthur, Postmaster at Montauban, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Neuville and C.N.Ry. Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of (Ques.) 2067 (ii).
Notre Dame des Anges Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 554 (i).
Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, Quebec City (Ques.) 2071 (ii).
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 2068 (ii).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John, Iberville.*
American Goods shipped into Canada, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 3533 (ii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com. 5852 (iv).
Census Employees, Payments to (Ques.) 3335 (ii).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5808 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors (Ques.) 551 (i).
Garceau, Resignation as Commissioner (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4962 (iii).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6640 (iv).
St. Jean and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction (Ques.) 551, 571 (i).
SUPPLY—
Excise (revenue officers) 5824; (tobacco stamps) 5826 (iv).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6640 (iv).
Tuberculosis in St. Jean and Iberville, Govt. Information *re* (Ques.) 3533 (ii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Address, The, 348 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5855 (iv).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices, &c. (remarks) 859 (i).
Combines in Trade, Restraint *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
Dismissals from Public Works, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 3058 (ii).
Dismissals in Hull, Official Inquiry (remarks) 550 (i); 4140 (iii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
——— on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 954 (i).
Dom. Notes and Stamps Printing Contract, (remarks) 5845 (iv).
French River (remarks) *re* Vote, 6729 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 3060 (ii).
——— Rep. in Ottawa Citizen *re* P.M.G. Speech, 1970 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Route and French River (remarks) 6785 (iv).
Grand Lake and Belle River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6307 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3959 (ii).
Inquiries Act. Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1316 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6010 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4907 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1617 (i).
Naval Question, Speech of Hon. Mr. Monk at Hull (Ques.) 551 (i).
Naval Service, O.C. *re* Instructions, Circulars issued, &c. (Ques.) 2065 (ii).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Contracts *re* provisioning (Ques.) 2859 (ii).
——— Sale of (Ques.) 2859 (ii).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (remarks) 1587 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4766 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6307 (iv).
St. Peter of Wakefield, Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
South Renfrew Elections, Speech of Minister of Customs (remarks) 1573 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Finance (contingencies) 1069; Naval Dept. (salaries) 1063 (i); Post Office (H. B. Verret) 6278 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1474 (i).
Miscellaneous Printing Bureau (plant) 6613 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 6286 (iv).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Louisville) conc., 6800 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6420 (iv).
Wright County Public Works Employees, Dismissal of (Ques.) 550 (i).

DOHERTY, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice) *Montreal, St. Ann.*
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of (remarks) 1575 (i).
Companies Incorporation, ref. to Supreme Court, Withdrawal of (Ans.) 529 (i).
Criminal Code (log stealing) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) on M. for 2°, 944; 1821 (i); in Com., 2532 (ii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. (B. 165) 1°m., 5550; in Com., 5862; 3°m., 5892, 5960; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Deputy Minister of Justice, Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 3150 (ii).
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt. (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (additional judge) Amt. (B. 168) 1°m., 5553; in Com., 5893 (iv).
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4239 (iii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto, Transfer (B. 182) in Com. on Res., and 1°*, 5957; in Com., 6181 (iv).
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin (Ans.) 4261 (iii).
Inquiries Act, (Dismissals) Amt. (B. 19) 1°m., 710; 2°m., 1021; in Com., 1283; 1414 (i).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. (B. 156) in Com. on Res., 5407; 1°*, 5415 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5958; in Com., 6000; 3°m., 6062; on Amt. (Mr. Proulx) 6063 (iv).
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Extra Judges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Justice, Dep. Min., Salary, Extra Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2458, 3150 (ii).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 939 (i).
Letellier, Judge Blaise, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
McRae, Mr. F. D., Pets. *re* Clemency (Ans.) 713 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4845 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1642 (i).
Marriage Question, Ref. to Privy Council, Provl. Representations (Ans.) 3755 (ii).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application *re* Leave (Ans.) 5954 (iv).
Montreal Circuit Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judges (remarks) 3907 (ii).
——— (Ans.) 545 (i); 2855 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Resignations of Messrs. Geoffrion and Ballantyne (remarks) 6552 (iv).

DOHERTY, Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Montreal Judiciary, Pets. *re* Increase of Judges (Ans.) 545 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'
Ottawa County Superior Court Judge, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Deptl. Report (presented) 970 (i).
Penitentiary Employees Salaries, Increases *re* (Ans.) 1205 (i).
Prisons and Reformatories Act Amt. (B. 166) 1°m., 5552; in Com., 5892-3 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4751 (iii).
Revised Statutes of Can., French Translation Correction (B. 65) 1° m., 1197; in Com., 1438 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. (B. 75) prop. Res., 1414; in Com. on Res., 1497; in Com., 1714 (i).
Sorel Workshops, Investigations *re* Payment of Accounts (Ans.) 1205 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1035, 1039 (i); (promotions) 6584 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6597; (N. W. Territories) 6560 (iv).
Justice, Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6487; (litigation) 6561; (pecuniary claims) 6579 (iv).
Justice—Penitentiaries (bonus) 6600; (Dorchester) 6561; (McAllister, Mr., moving expenses) 6597; (St. Vincent de Paul) 6586 (iv).
Miscellaneous (St. John Ambulance Association) 6583; (tuberculosis association) 6579 (iv).
Tourigny, Judge, Charges *re*, Govtl. Action (Ans.) 3147 (ii).
Yukon Territory Judges Act (reduction) Amt. (B. 123) M. for Com. on Res., 3630 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4555-6; 1°*, 4563; 2°*, in Com., 5567 (iii).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*
Camrose Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3512 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Thomson) to M. for 3°, 4795 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Strathcona) 2213 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage dues) Amt., 1° m., 229 (i).
——— (M. for com.) on prop. Res., 1817 (i).
Cement Duties compared with U.S. (remarks) on Tariff Commission Bill, 2727 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6103 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmts. between Dissolution of Parlt. and Sept. 31st (M. for stmnt.*) 562 (i).
Dairying Industry in Can., Grievances *re* weighing at Montreal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5711 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1084, 1179 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6266 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3706 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1704 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6482 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1084 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Cuba) 4722; (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Halifax and Nfld.) 4727 (iii).
Militia (automobiles) 5498 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5385 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2720; in Com., 2973, 2997, 3550 (ii).
Williamsville Post Office, Kingston, Ques. of Priv., 6271 (iv).

ELLIOTT, Mr. Geo. A., *North Middlesex.*
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3686 (ii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *East Middlesex.*
Immigration Office in London, Ont. (Ques.) 2451 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Boxes in Ont., &c. (Ques.) 6782 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Address, The, 413 (i).
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6246, 6304 (iv).
Albert Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6395 (iv).
Ash, Mr. Earl, Claims *re* Damages for Fire on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 2246 (ii).
Bank Notes Printing: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* in Com. of Sup., 5299 (iii).
Beaumont Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2365 (ii).
Census Enumerators, Delay in Payments (remarks) 1971 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 928 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4565 (iii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6101 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Courtenay Bay Harbour Works, Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii), 6187 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5864 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) 892 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1076 (i).
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Dismissals from Westmoreland County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, &c., Limitation as to Tenders (remarks) 1820 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Monk) in Com. on Res., 6048 (iv).
Election Expenses in Albert, Delay in Payment (remarks) 2156 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6222 (iv).
Estimates, Discussion on Conc. (remarks) 6805 (iv).
Fisheries Protection, Sawdust Pollution (remarks) 937 (i).
Flags, Use of B. 74 (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for 1°, 1410 (i).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 6078 (iv).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Public.'
G.T.P. Ry., Esquimalt and Nanaimo Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
Great Northern Mining & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2110 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1298, 1418 (i).
I.C. Ry., Board of Management, Abolition of, on M. for Sup., 5571 (iv).
——— Ques. 569 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Legislation *re* Acquisition (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— Branch Lines (prop. res.) 985, 1011 (i).
I.C.Ry., Instructions *re* Holiday and Sunday Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1583 (i).
——— Moncton Office, Tenders *re* Heating (Ques.) 6743 (iv).
——— Passes to Employees, Newspaper Reporters, &c., Instructions from Ottawa (remarks) 2328 (ii).
——— Provident Fund, Payments to Dismissed officials (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5930 (iv).
——— Ticket Collectors, Apptmt. of (remarks) 6787 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C. Ry., Transfer of D. Murray Condon, Passenger Agent (Ques.) 3337 (ii).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6014 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6024 (iv).
Man. Boundaries B. 115, in Com., 4609 (iii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 871 (i).
Moncton Heating Tenders, Inquiry for Papers, 5762 (iv).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1870, 1878 (i), 3130, 3372 (ii).
N.T. Ry. Commission, Apptmt. of Mr. R. W. Leonard (M. for cor., &c.*) 2246 (ii).
——— Resignation of (remarks) 1199 (i).
N.T. Ry. (Montreal Branch) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5897 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Meeting at Newmarket, Representations (remarks) 3057 (ii).
Northern N.B. and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com., 6229, 6231 (iv).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6234 (iv).
Ocean Limited Express Operation (remarks, in Supply on conc., 6774 (iv).
——— Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars (Ques.) 2241 (ii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1837 (i).
Ottawa Plaza, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re* (Ques.) 876 (i).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2351 (ii).
Patent Relief Bills, on M. for 2°, (remarks) 1202 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Govt. Car Ferry, Tel. *re* (Ques.) 1580 (i).
——— Car Ferry System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5220 (iii).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Car Ferry System (M. for copies*) 2072 (ii).
Public Ownership of Govt. Utilities, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 655 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickel) in Com., 4755 (iii).
Race Tracks: *See* 'Criminal Code.'
Railway Bills, Amendments by the Senate (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6544 (iv).
——— Explanation *re* (remarks) 6493 (iv).
Railway Com., G. T. Ry., Apptmt. of Subcommittee, Liberals omitted (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5897; in Com., 6211; 6304; on M. for 3° (amt.) 6395 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2986 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 426 (i).
Reid, Mr. Watson E., Dismissal as Inspector of Hillsboro Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Roy, Wm., Inquiry *re* Charges, on M. (Mr. Boulay) for Papers, 1393 (i).
St. John and Courtenay Bay Contract, Signing, &c. (remarks) 4743 (iii); 6187 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry., Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii).
Senate Amts. to Ry. Bills, 6493, 6544 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 1498 (i).
Senate Vacancies (remarks) 5162 (iii).
Shediac Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2373 (ii).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5913 (iv).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (construction) 6609 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 1076 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6772; Justice (promotions) 6586; Public Works (private secretary) conc., 6779 (iv).
Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1157 (i).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3314 (ii).
Justice—Penitentaries (bonus) 6600; (Dorchester) 6561; (McAllister, Mr., moving expenses) 6596 iv).
Justice—Miscellaneous (litigation) 6561 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1476; 1492 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4719 (iii).
Militia (armouries) 5541 (iii).
Miscellaneous (St. John Ambulance Ass'n.) 6583 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5220; (life saving awards) 5228 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Hillsboro) 1528 (i); (Shediac) conc., 6793 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Sackville) conc., 6805 (iv); (St. John dry dock) 3296 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) conc., 6778 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5764, 6606 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) conc., 6774; (gratuity to Cuthbertson children) 5678; (highway crossings) 5595; (locomotives) 5607; (Moncton, heating) 5610; (Moncton office) 5653; (provident fund) 5677; (refrigerator cars) 5603; (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6605 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5672 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 694 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2862, 2887 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5907 (iv).
Wadge Thomas Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2984 (ii).
Winnipeg Govt. Property Sale: *See* 'Fort Osborne.'

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Address, The, 295 (i).
Brazeau, Emiler, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal (Ques.) 6337 (iv).
Canadian Navy, Repudiation by Nationalists &c. (Ques.) 714 (i).
——— Speeches *re* Election Campaign, &c. (Ques.) 552 (i).
Debates, Official, Correction *re* Vote of member for St. James, Montreal, *re* Man. Bill, 4983 (iii).
Doherty, Mr., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 725 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay *re* Distribution (remarks) 268 (i).
Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
House of Commons Messengers, Dismissals, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 562 (i).
Judges of Superior Court, Superannuation, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
Lauzon, Desire, Emplymt. by Govt., References *re* Character, &c. (Ques.) 3538 (ii).
Mail Carrier, Como to Oka, Compensation *re* Death (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4422; on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4937 (iii).
Marriage Question *re* Catholic Hierarchy, &c. (Ques.) 573 (i).
Military Conference, Invitations *re*, Canon Dauth, &c. (Ques.) 552 (i).
Point Aux Anglais, Drainage Works, &c. (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
Provost, Raoul, Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries (Ques.) 2453 (ii).
Solicitor General and Min. of Justice, &c. (Ques.) 725 (i).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6282 (iv).

FORTIER, Mr. E., *Lotbinière.*
Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of (Ques.) 4549 (iii).
Lotbinière County Postmasters, Dismissals, Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 972 (i).
Postmasters in Lotbinière, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

FORTIER, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Ste. Croix Wharf Construction (M. for papers*) 5557 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6294; Outside Service (salaries) 6645 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Three Rivers) 2443 (ii).

FOSTER, Mr. A. De Witt, *Kings, N.S.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 201 (i).
Dismissals, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5804 (iv).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2098 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour, Grounding of *Niobe* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E. (*Minister of Trade and Commerce*) *North Toronto.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 72 (i).
Annuities Branch Lecturers, Charges *re* J. B. Leger (Ans.) 1413 (i).
——— Payment to Agents (Ans.) 974 (i).
——— Dismissal of Agents, &c. (Ans.) 727 (i).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates, 1913 (i).
———on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Ret., 1819 (i).
Arichat and Canso SS. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).
Bras d'Or Lakes SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iv).
British West Indies and British Guinea, on Inquiry (Mr. Murphy) for Ret., 1820 (i).
See 'Trade Relations.'
Canada-France Steamship Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5262 (iii).
Canadian Agents, Apptmt. of, in Europe (Ans.) 5261 (iii).
Canada and G. B. Mail Service, Renewal of Contract *re* (Ans.) 547 (i).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies' 'G. B. and Can.'
Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation (Ans.) 1582 (i).
Car Shortage in the West, Govtl. Action *re*, on M. for Sup., 1716 (i).
Christmas Holidays, Adjournment *re* (remarks) 702 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5267 (iii).
Commercial Agent in France, Apptmt. as Successor to Mr. A. Poindron (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Customs Weighing of Goods, Decree of French Govt. (Ans.) 721 (i).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 897 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Dom. Notes Printing, Ques. of Order, 1843 (i).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) adjournment, 5937 (iv).
Franco-Canadian Trade Relation, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 5755 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys.: *See* 'Grain Shipments.'
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Telegraph.'
Grain Act Amt. (B. 32) prop. Res., 870; in Com. on Res., 871 (i); 2° m., 2161; in Com., 2179, 2302, 2382, 2535, 2755, 3156, 3451, 3513, 3757 (ii); 4042; on Order being called for 3°, (M.) for Com., 4153; in Com., 4154; (amt.) 4787; M. for 3°, 4788; on Amt. (Mr. L. Thomson) to M. for 3°, 4796 (iii).
—— M. to take up Govt. Orders, 869 (i).
—— Notice of Amendment, 3630 (ii).
See 'Man. Grain B. 96.'
Grain Act, Farmers' Interests, &c. (remarks) 4744 (iii).
Grain Bill, Notice for Discussion (remarks) 1575 (i).
Grain Carriage to Duluth, Stmnt. *re* Washington Despatch, 2577 (ii).
Grain Congestion in the West, on Inquiry (Mr. Oliver) 6187 (iv).
—— Number of Cars despatched (stmnt.) 5954 (iv).
—— Par. in Toronto Globe (remarks) 5929 (iv).
Grain Shipments from Canadian Ports, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 536 (i).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 541 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, &c. (remarks) on Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3976, 4009 (ii).
G.B. and Canada Mail Service, Letter of Quebec Board of Trade (remarks) 1844 (i).
Harvey & Salisbury Ry., on Inquiry for Ret., 1843 (i).
Highlands Bridge Construction, Ques. of Order, 1197 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c. 747 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Canada, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2426 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1313 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (feed) Amt. (B. 78) in Com. on Res., 1839 (i); in Com., 6189, 6678 (iv).
Japan, Trade Relations with, Stmnt. by Japanese Consul at Vancouver (Ans.) 560 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Marconi Service (remarks) 4161 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, Establishment of Dom. Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
Mail Subsidies, Mar. Provs. and Porto Rico (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
See 'Supply.'
Man. Boundaries Extension, Answer to Question (remarks) 3755 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 96) 1°m., 2405 3°m., 2575 (ii).
See 'Grain Act.'
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1868 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1375, 1834 (i).
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) on Senate Amts., 5679 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to M. for Sup., 5443-4 (iii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com. (amt.) 4759 (iii).
Ry. Act. Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 944 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1923 (i).
See 'Grain Shipments,' &c.
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5902 (iv).
Reciprocity, ref. to in Debate on Address, 76 (v).
Rooms alloted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re* (remarks) 670 (i).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1036, 1039; Marine Dept. (salaries) 1047 (i).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation Act) 1503 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c.) 4714; (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4734; (Canada and Australia) 4714; (Can. and Cuba) 4721; (Can. and G.B.) 4715 (iii); (Can. and Mexico) 5934 (iv); (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Can. and S. Africa) 4726; (Halifax, Newfoundland and England) 4727; (Halifax and W. Indies) 4740; (Magdalen Islands) 4730 (iii); (North Sydney &c.) 680 (i); (Pictou and Cheticamp) 4736; (Quebec and Gaspe) 4739 (iii); (St. John and Halifax) 678 (i), 4740 (iii); (St. John and W. Indies) 640 (i); (Sydney and Wycocomagh) 4741 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Trade and Commerce (annuities) 688; (bounties Act) 687 (i); (iron and steel bounties) 5934 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2962 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6671, 6821 (iv).
Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Govt. Ownership (remarks) 2007 (ii).
Trade Agents: *See* 'Can. Agents.'
Trade and Commerce Deptl. Report (presented) 971 (i); 2591, 3630 (ii); 6780 (iv).
Trade Relations between W. Indies, Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 1995 (ii).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).

FOWLER, Mr. Geo. W., *Kings and Albert.*
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6248 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Lalor) to conc., 2842 (ii).
Dismissals of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 961 (i).
—— Irrelevancy of Debate, 952 (i).
Freight Rates, &c., Public Ownership, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 666 (i).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4032 (ii).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Contract *re* Rails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4166 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3663 (ii).
I.C.R. Hillsborough Branch Rails Loaned, &c. (Ques.) 4978 (iii).
James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6310 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6329 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1781 (i).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3864 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 784 (i).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1892 (i).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6234 (iv).
Pink Rock Wharf, N.B. Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4257 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6234, 6310 (iv).

FOWLER, Mr. Geo. W.—*Con.*
Steele, Col., Apptmt. to Headquarters Staff (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6485 (iv).
Militia (ordnance) 6653 (iv).
Post Office—Outside Office (salaries) 6621 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (St. John) 627 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of management) 5676; P.E.I. (car ferry) 5665 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2937 (ii).

FRIPP, Mr. A. E., *Ottawa.*
Address, The, 409 (i).
Continental Can Co. Patent Relief (B. 119) 1°*, 4236; 2°m., 4395; in Com., 5204 (iii); 5483, 5903 (iv).
Eddy, Ezra B., Change of Name (B. 117) 1°*, 4139; 2°m., 4238 (iii).
Edmond F. Piper Patent Relief (B. 53) 1°*, 970; 2°m., 1201 (i).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 161) in Com., 6127 (iv).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 794 (i).

GAUTHIER, Mr. L. J., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Address, The, 475 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4912 (iii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Dairying Industry, Complaints *re* Weighing Cheese (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5726 (iv).
Delisle, L. Treffle, of Trois Pistoles, Dismissals, &c. (M. for cor.*) 4781 (iii).
Dionne, Thos., Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iv).
Fraserville Bridge Works, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou (Ques.) 549 (i).
Fraserville Wharf, Cor. *re* Construction (Ques.) 3534 (ii).
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3150 (ii).
Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of Mr. Irving (Ques.) 4259 (iii).
I.C.R. Riviere du Loup Workshops, Removal to Fraserville (Ques.) 570 (i).
—— Ticket Collectors, Apptmt. of (remarks) 6786 (iv).
Michaud, Mr. J., Postmaster at St. Moise Station, Dismissal (Ques.) 1864 (i).
Morice, Theophile, Dismissal from I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Morin, Mr. Theo., Reinstatement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).
Naval Cadets, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 6786 (iv).
Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).
Postmasters in Temiscouata County, Dismissal, Charges &c. (Ques.) 548 (i).
SUPPLY—
Excise (inspectors) 5815 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Riviere du Loup) 5654 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3616 (ii).
Temiscouata Election Expenses, Delays *re* Payment to Dep. Ret. Officer (remarks) 1707 (i).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Address, The, 346 (i).
Buck, Mr. A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal of (remarks) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6355 (iv).
Civil Service (commissioners) Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3145 (ii).
Crystal Beach Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Remarks (Mr. German) 5960 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2183 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6570 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3664; in Com., 3670 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1427 (i).
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Extra Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Man. Boundaries B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 1°, 3906 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3115 (ii).
Peace Memorial Monument in Queen's Park, Toronto, Action of Govt. *re* (remarks) 2590 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5970 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, on M. to adopt 3rd Rep., 6334 (iv).
Spirella Co. of Canada Patent Relief (B. 71) 1°*, 1410 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (construction) 6607 (iv).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Immigration (regulations *re*) 3911 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6607 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2972, 3549 (ii).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5990 (iv).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing Cheese (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5731 (iv).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6213 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6213 (iv).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 1°*, 4976 (iii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 970 (i).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6361 (iv).
Dismissals from Public Office from 1896 to 1911 (M. for ret.) 1280 (i).
Duffy, Edith Harriet, Relief (B. 163) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6223 (iv).
Foresters, Ancient Order Subsidiary (B. 157) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3678 (ii).
Jenkins, Wm. Alexander Hunt, Relief (B. 162) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Lumber Combine in B. C., Challenge of Mr. A. E. Watts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2299 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1731 (i).
Moose, Loyal Order Grand Lodge incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 161) 1°*, 5549 (iii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5984 (iv).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6139 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6223 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2702; in Com., 2934 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3959 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., *South Renfrew.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5278 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5897, 6216, 6312, 6317 (iv).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6319 (iv).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6223 (iv).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) *re* adjournment, 5938 (iv).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6307 (iv).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 144 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 5165 (iii).
—— B. 189 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6372 (iv).
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 6331; in Com., 6343; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6495 (iv).
C.P. Ry. (Toulon) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5886 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6269 (iv).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 6070 (iv).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6224 (iv).
Govt. House Property, Toronto, Transfer B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5958 (iv).
G.T.P. Rv., Assiniboine River Bridge, in Com. on Res., 6061 (iv).
G.T.P. (Brandon) Subsidy, in Com., 6324 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6759 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Line Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5629 (iv).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6213 (iv).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on Senate Amts., 6398 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6310 (iv).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6011 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5900, 6220, 6322, 6327 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6220 (iv).
C

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Lac Seul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Live Stock Record Association incorp. B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 1°, 5553; in Com., 6025 (iv).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Moose, Loyal Order incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6126 (iv).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N.T. Ry., Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6732 (iv). *See* 'Supply—Railways.'
Northern N.B. and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6230 (iv).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6242 (iv).
Ontario Boundaries Extension B. 152 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 6155 (iv); in Com., 6157 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 6127 (iv).
Peace River and Ry. Best Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5973 (iv).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract (stmnt.) *re* English Criticisms, on M. for Sup., 5415 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Erection of Shops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5896, 6214 (iv).
Queen's College B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) on Senate Amts., 6770 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5896, 6211, 6307; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) to M. for 3°, 6396 (iv).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 172 (Mr. Lalor) in Com., 6127 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. and Bridges Subsidy, &c., in Com., 6211 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6472; (census and statistics) 6462; Experimental Farms (tobacco growing) 6478; (International Institute) 6479; (Toronto exhibition) 6480; (Year Book) 6465 (iv).
Archives (salaries) 6461 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (lower lock) 5797 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 5797 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Canals—Lachine (Rockfield bridge) 5790 (iv).
Canals—Murray (high spots) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (locks) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (guard pier) 5798; (protection works) 5791 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (Bank St. bridge) 5791; (dredging plant) 5798 (iv).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 5799; (Newmarket) 5792 (iv).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 5796; (surveys) 5786 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; (promotions) conc., 6771; Railways (private secretary) 5808 (iv).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6579 (iv).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 5256; (inspectors, &c.) 5254 (iii); (International Fisheries Commission) conc., 6779 (iv).
Inland Revenue (peat industry) 6491 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 5237 (iii).
Militia (associations and bands) 5529 (iii); (associations) 6653 (iv).
Mines Branch (ore deposits) 6602 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Royal Mint) 6584; (St. John Ambulance Ass'n) 6584; (tuberculosis association) 6579 (iv).
Post Office—Outside Service (inspectors) 6646 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (London, Eng.) 6655 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (French river) conc., 6778 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5762 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of management) 5598; (branch lines) 5632; (facilities) 5809; (Halifax docks) 5596; (highway crossings) 5595; (Moncton office) 6604; (North Sydney diversion) 5610; (rolling stock) 5653, 5610, 6461; (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6604 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Board of Commissioners) 5800; (G.T.P. remuneration to director) 5801; (litigation expenses) 5800-1 (iv).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction) 5765 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5662; (Harmony-Elmira branch) 5660 (iv).
Tidal Service (surveying steamers) 5400 (iii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry. and G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6769 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6442 (iv).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6217 (iv).
Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898, 6217 (iv).
Trent Canal Water Power, Claims of Prov. of Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5909 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5898 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 2°, 5968 (iv).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5997 (iv).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5568 (iv).
GUILBAULT, Mr. J. P. O., *Joliette.*
Canadian Northern, Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 970 (i).
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 970 (i).
Coffin, Mr. Henry, Emplymt. as Sessional Messenger (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3702 (ii).
Joliette County, Returning Officer, Payments *re* (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4416 (iii).
GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 62 (i).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2014 (ii).
Carpet Weavers Union *re* J. C. Murray, Prosecution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1510 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4569 (iii).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order 3213 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contracts, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., 754 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1422 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3895; on M. for 1°, 3905 (ii); on M. for 2° (remarks) 4415; in Com., 4537; (amt.) 4541 (iii).
N.T.Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1882 (i).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5970; on M. for 3°, 6188; 3°, 6338 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2986 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (concilliation board) 1510 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 2601 (amt.) 6 m. h., 2614; neg. (Y. 52; N. 104) 2751; in Com., 2867, 2939, 3015 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J., *South Lanark.*
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5891 (iv).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 909 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 796 (i).
Magdalen Island Marconi News Service (remarks) 4161 (iii).
Ry. Act (tariffs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1016 (i).

HARTT, Mr. T. A., *Charlotte.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6526 (iv).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *St. John City and County.*
'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew (remarks) 408 (i).
—— Purchase of by Govt. (stmnt.) 489 (i).
Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Master and Mates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii).
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 162 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. Loggie) to adjn. debate, 487 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5278 (iii).
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3054 (ii).
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Biological Board of Canada (B. 118) 1°m., 4037; in Com., 4551 (iii); on Senate Amts., 5696 (iv).
Biological Board, Names, Salaries &c. (Ans.) 4258 (iii).
Bird Rock Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper (remarks) 5258 (iii).
Bourassa, Capt., Pet. *re* Dep. Harbour Master (Ans.) 1814 (i).
British Admiralty, Memo. *re* Conference between Can. and Australia &c. (Ans.) 559 (i).
Bronte Village, Lease of Land, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
Brymer, Arthur, Dismissal &c. (Ans.) 3752 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. (B. 143) in Com. on Res., 5156; 1°*, 5161; in Com., 5400 (iii).
Canadian Missionaries in China, Protection *re*, &c. (remarks) 1198 (i).
Canadian Navy, Tenders *re* Construction of Ships, Deposits, &c. (Ans.) 527 (i).
See 'Navy.'
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals from (Ans.) 974 (i).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal of (Ans.) 1208 (i).
Chicago Drainage Canal, Damage to Navigation (Ans.) 4260 (iii).
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton (Ans.) 1203 (i).
Dalaire, Mr. L. P., Dismissal of (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Dismissals in N. B. for Political Partisanship by Liberals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Cor., 1391 (i).
Dredge and Boiler Inspection (Ans.) 5954 (iv).
Ducharme, Pierre, Dismissal of (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Employees of Govt., Dismissed, Resigned, &c., on M. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) for Ret., 1818 (i).
False Creek Flats, Application for Lease from Marpole and Macdonald (Ans.) 5953 (iv).
Fisheries Act (oysters) Amt.(B. 140) 1°m., 5053; 2°m., 5271; in Com., 5276 (iii).
Fisheries, Contracts *re* Board for Crews, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 683 (i).
See 'Govt. Dredges.'
Fisheries Department, Reorganization of (remarks) 937 (i).
Fish, Fresh, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names and Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 3053 (ii).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4257 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2486 (ii).
Fishery Regulations *re* Hague Tribunal, (remarks) 3830 (ii).
See 'International.'
Fishery Treaty with U.S., Withdrawal of Canada (remarks) 409 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., Cost of Construction (Ans.) 4256 (iii).
Fish Scrap, Price paid *re* Fertilizing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 684-5 (i).
Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
Gasolene Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c. (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Gaspé Basin Marine Agent, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 878 (i).
Gaspé Marine Deptl. Inquiry, Apptmt. Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1358 (i).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Gaspé Tidal Wave, Govt. Aid *re* (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Govt., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3752 (ii).
Goucher, Wesley, Dismissal as Lightkeeper, &c. (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
Govt. Dredges, Contract *re* boarding Employees (Ans.) 5953 (iv).
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments (Ans.) 5952 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes (Ans.) 5263 (iii).
Griever, Mr. S., Charges *re* Lighthouse Keeper (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Harbour Commissioners Rep. (presented) 1571 (i).
Hatfield, Mr., Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5252 (iii).
Herring Fishery in B.C., Close Season, &c. (Ans.) 4256 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3713 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Terminal Ports, Surveys *re* Navigation, &c. (Ans.) 3943 (ii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2860 (ii).
Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of (Ans.) 4260 (iii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1004 (i).
International Fisheries Treaty, Memorandum (read) in Com. of Sup., 6646 (i).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
'Kestrel' Cruiser, Condemnation of (Ans.) 550 (i).
Kidson's Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re*, &c (Ans.) 3054 (ii).
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limit of Catch (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
Lightkeepers in N .S., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
Lightkeepers in P. E. I., Charges, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers at Repentigny, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Lobster Fishing Season in N. B., Date of Opening (Ans.) 722 (i).
Magdalen Island Marconi Connections (remarks) 3833 (ii).
—— (stmnt.) 4041 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4511, 4620 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension of (remarks) 490 (i).
Marine Hospital Ships, Establishment of (remarks) 6788 (iv).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Marine Workshops at Quebec, Instructions *re* closing (Ans.) 579 (i).
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c. (Ans.) 876 (i).
Montreal Docks, Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 97) Prop. Res., 2295; in Com. on Res., 2406, 2415; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3631 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 150) 1° m., 5258 (iii); in Com., 5696; 3° m., 5960 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Apptmt. of Accountant (Ans.) 6661 (iv).
—— Dismissal of Mr. J. A. Masse (Ans.) 3943 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal (remarks) 2057 (ii).
—— Resignation of Ms. Geoffrion and Ballantyne (remarks) 6555 (iv).
—— Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 1813 (i).
—— Res. from Corn Exchange, Delegation, &c., *re* Removal (Ans.) 2070 (ii).
—— Retention of (Ans.) 2062 (ii).
See 'Bourassa,' 'Harbour.'
Montreal Harbour Commission, Total Debenture Debt (Ans.) 1357 (i).
Montreal Harbour Officials, Apptmt. and Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 3944 (ii).
Murray, Dr., Charges *re* Poaching in East River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5248 (iii).
Naval Bill Repeal, &c. (Ans.) 4242 (iii).
Naval Cadets, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 6786 (iv).
Naval Defence, Pacific Coast, Res. from B. C. Legislature (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
Naval Discipline Act, Application to Canada (Ans.) 1203 (i).
Naval Service, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 970 (i).
Naval Service, O. C. *re* Instructions, Circulars, &c. (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
Naval Service, Tenders *re* Shipbuilding, &c. (Ques.) 527, 558 (i).
Naval Ships for Canada, Ref. *re* Completion (Ans.) 1206 (i).
Naval Service, Visit of Minister to England (remarks) 938 (i).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Contracts *re* Provisioning (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
—— Sale of (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
—— Repairs *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5225 (iii).
Oysters: *See* 'Fisheries Act.'
Pelagic Sealing, Compensation *re* Treaty (Ans.) 4776 (iii).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Service, Contract *re* Supplies (Ans.) 876 (i).
Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to, &c. (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Powers, Laurence, Dismissal from Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Charges *re* (Ans.) 3751 (ii).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Car Ferry, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5211 (iii).
Provost, Raoul, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2453 (ii).
Public Works Contracts given without tender (Ans.) 877 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 31) 1° m., 869; 2° m., 1025; 3° m., 1709 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Names of Members in 1896 and after (Ans.) 579 (i).
——— Resignation of Members (Ans.) 579 (i).
——— Solicitor, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1814 (i).
Railway Bridges in N.B., Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6377; on M. for 3°, 6394 (iv).
See 'St. John Valley,' &c.
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Richards, Mr. S., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Rivers, Lachapelle and L. Dubois, Messrs. Charges *re* (Ques.) 3752 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 5259 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Kyte) 5939 (iv).
Révillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. Baker) in Com., 5203 (iii).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Tenders *re* (remarks) 5694 (iv).
St. John N.B., Appropriation *re* Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2369 (ii).
St. John Ry. Co.'s Crossing at Haymarket Square, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 1404 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. Bridges Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) to M. for 3°, 6496 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bridges.'
St. Lawrence Channel, Average depth of Water between Montreal and Quebec, Cap a la Roche at low tide (Ans.) 544 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Emplymt. of Govt. Dredges (Ans.) 4257 (iii).
See 'Govt. Dredges.'
St. Lawrence Channel Ice Breaker (Ans.) 5680 (iv).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration (Ans.) 974 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Report (presented) 1571 (i).

HAZEN, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts, &c., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Papers, 2462 (ii).
——— Protection against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1041 (i); 6652 (iv); Naval Dept. (salaries) 1062 (i).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6579 (iv).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 5256 (iii); 6653 (iv); (inspectors, &c.) 5242 (iii); (international commission) 6646; (lighthouse keepers) 6650 (iv); (lobster hatchery) 5256; (oyster culture) 5255; (protection service) 5386 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys (Arctic) 5398; (Atlantic Coast) 5399 (iii).
Labour Dept. (inspection *re* shipping machinery) 1526 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aid to navigation) 5236, 5241; (constructions) 5237; (International Congress) 5237; (pensions 5236; (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and Newfoundland) 4728; (Magdalen Islands) 4732 (iii).
Marine (hospitals) 5238; (steamboat inspection) 5238 (iii).
Miscellaneous (St. John Ambulance Ass'n. 6584 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5303, 5335 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5186, 5211; (life saving awards) 5228; (live stock inspection) 5230; (patrol vessels) 5231; (registration) 5229; (schools of navigation) 5229; (wreck subsidies) 5229, 5231 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John) 634 (i).
Radiotelegraphic Surveys (wireless stations) 5399 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 4138 (iii).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5668 (iv).
White Head Island Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of P. Conway, &c. (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. (B. 138) 1°*, 4976 (iii); 2°m. and in Com., 5989 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com. 3933 (ii).
Binks, Mr., Promotion to Dead Letter Office (M. for cor.*) 3946 (ii).
Bronte Village, Lease of Land, &c. (Ques.) 3151 (ii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4109 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3239 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com. on Res., 5161 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2013 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4569 (iii).
E. F. Piper Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4238 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6261 (iv).
Freight Rates, Discrimination, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3200 (ii).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2779, 3170 (ii).
Highway Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3694 (ii).
Immigration Agents and Ontario Farm Labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6198 (iv).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Public Works, Appropriations *re* Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2804 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5919 (iv).
Renfrew, S., Election, Issue of Writ (remarks) 2059 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922; in Com., 6108 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5919 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3923 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5491 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (refrigerator cars) 5603 (iv).
Swift Current Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3265 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2736; in Com., 2881 (ii).
Watha Indian Reserve, Tenders *re* Timber (Ques.) 3055 (ii).

HEPBURN, Mr. B. R., *Prince Edward.*
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5875 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3231 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6571 (iv).
Prince Edward and Hastings Ry. Co.'s in corp. (B. 136) 1°*, 4976 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J., *King's P.E.I.*
Address, The, 482 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5297 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5857 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Payments to (remarks) 2668 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4583 (iii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5275 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3715 (ii).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2136 (ii).
Lightkeepers in P.E.I., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Magdalen Islands Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4508, 4637; on M. for 3°, 4838 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1694 (i) .
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2347 (ii).
P.E.I. Better Terms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
P.E.I. Car Ferry, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1206 (i).
P.E.I. Car Ferry System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5213 (iii).
P.E.I. Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (iii).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6132 (iv).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Ry. Accommodation (remarks) 3830 (ii).
Souris Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5661 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 5242 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5241; (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Magdalen Islands) 4731 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5192, 5213; (life saving awards) 5229 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs) 3235 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—P.E.I.—conc., 6794 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5664; (facilities) 5661; (Harmony-Elmira branch) 5659 (iv).

HUGHES, Hon. S. (Minister of Militia) *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5279 (iii).
Airships for Military Purposes, Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 533 (i).

HUGHES, Hon. S.—*Con.*
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker (Ans.) 3536 (ii).
Arsenal at Quebec, Payment to Employees (Ans.) 579 (i).
Automobiles, Purchase of: *See* 'Militia Touring Cars,' 'Supply—Militia.'
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* Vote, 5300 (iii).
Bisley Rules: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1190 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 1183 (i).
Drill Halls, in the West *re* Donation of Lands for Sites (Ans.) 1816 (i).
See 'Moosejaw,' 'Regina,' 'Supply—Militia.'
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, Ques. of Order, 6522 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty (B. 190) prop. res., 5558; 1°*, 6083; in Com., 6252, 6454 (iv).
Fenian Raid Vets, Land Grants to (Ans.) 3334 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Sale (B. 185) (prop. res.) 5557 (iv); in Com. on Res. 5696-7, 6064; 1°*, 6080; in Com., 6203 (iv).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. of 61st Regiment (Ans.) 723 (i).
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 729 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1662 (i).
Medical Director General Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 171) 1°m., 5556; 2°m., 6061 (iv).
Militia Civil Engineers, Recall from Quebec (Ans.) 580 (i).
Military Conference, Invitations *re* (Ans.) 552 (i).
Militia Council Report (presented) 2668 (ii).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks (Ans.) 533 (i).
Militia Touring Cars, Order to Ford Motor Co. (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
Montreal Military School, Purchase of Site (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Moosejaw Armoury Site, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) 3974 (ii).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Bisley Competition (remarks) 3742 (ii).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate (Ans.) 578 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Reorganization *re* (Ans.) 580 (i).
Rayne, R. W., Caretaker Truro Armoury, Dismissal (Ans.) 6184 (iv).
Regiments of Foreign Born Citizens, Organization of (Ans.) 534 (i).

HUGHES, Hon. S.—*Con.*
Regina Armoury, Erection of (Ans.) 580 (i).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Acquisition of Additional Lands (Ans.) 533 (i).
Ross Rifle: *See* 'Natl. Rifle Assn.'
Sarnia Armoury, Erection of (Ans.) 555 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Militia (salaries) 1037 (i).
Militia (allowances) 5447; (annual drill) 5452; (armouries) 5541; (associations and bands) 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv); (automobiles) 5492 (iii); (camps) 5521; (clothing) 5521; (customs dues) 5522; (headquarters staff) 5536 (iii); (Rockliffe ranges) 6654 (iv); (schools of instruction) 5546 (iii); (wages) 5546 (iii).
R. N. W. M. P. (pay of force) 5185 (iii).
Sutherland Rifle Sight: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to (Ans.) 1202 (i).
See 'Fenian,' &c.
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6451 (iv).
Winnipeg Military Property: *See* 'Fort Osborne.'

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*
Digby Clock Tower, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Railway Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 794 (i); in Com., 2011 (ii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5276 (iii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3707 (ii).
Steam Trawlers, Protection against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (protection service) 5389 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3326 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Halifax) 4739 (iii).

KAY, Mr. Wm. F., *Missisquoi.*
Bedford Postmaster, Dismissal, Inquiry for Ret., 5161 (iii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Customs Dismissals in Missisquoi (M. for cor.*) 3757 (ii).
Horsfall Herbert Relief (B. 109) 1°*, 3449 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Militia (annual drill) 5469; (associations and bands) 5528; (schools of instruction) 5549 (iii).

KEMP, Hon. A. E., *East Toronto.*
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3375 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto warehouse) 1963 (i).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, Ont.*
Hull City Hall Square, Improvements by Ottawa Commission (Ques.) 2293 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5285 (iii).
B. C. Lumber Combine, Challenge of Mr. A. E. Watts (remarks) 2297 (ii).
Cement Merger, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1518 (i).
Census Enumerators at Regina, Instructions, Complaints &c. (M. for stmnt.) 563 (i).
——— (remarks) 1440, 1574 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1506 (i).
Dismissals, &c., Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3263 (ii).
Elevators, Ownership and Operation by Govt. (remarks) 2853 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 873 (i); in Com., 2180, 2390, 2548, 2777, 3160, 3455, 3762 (ii), 4044; on Amt. (Mr. Cash) to M. for 3°, 4829; on Amt. (Mr. L. Thomson) to M. for 3°, 4799, (amt.) 4804 (iii).
Grain Act, Notice for Discussion (remarks) 1574 (i).
——— Tel. from Sec. Grain Growers' Association (read) 4744 (iii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4000 (ii).
——— Car Service (remarks) 5956 (iv).
Health Department, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5411 (iii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement (M. for papers) 582 (i).
——— Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1755 (i).
Members Travelling Allowance during Adjournments (remarks) 1848 (i).
Moosejaw Armoury, Cor. (read) 3972 (ii).
——— Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
——— Delegation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2206 (ii).
Moosejaw District, Proposed Sites, &c. (Ques.) 3342 (ii).
Moosejaw Post Offices, Names and Locations (Ques.) 976 (i).
Moosejaw P. O. Inspector, Pets. *re* Apptmt. (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4237, 4981 (iii).
Moosejaw Public Building, Tender of McDiarmid Co., Limited (M. for copy*) 562 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*
Public Ownership, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 649 (i).
Public Works, Appropriations of last year (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2437 (ii).
Regina Census, Inquiry for Ret., 1574 (i). *See* 'Census.'
Rutherford, Mr. John, Land Agent at Moosejaw, Dismissal, &c. (M. for papers) 1395 (i).
Saskatcheawn Bank incorp. (B. 89) 1°*, 2216 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Scrip, Delay *re* Decision by Govt. (remarks) 3153 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Veterans' Bounty Bill (remarks) 2061 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1501 (i).
Militia (automobiles) 5515 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5323 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 2205 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 2211; (Weyburn) 2213 (ii).
Svaigher, Adolphe, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6186 (iv).
Swift Current Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3263 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2158; in Com., 2872 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. Bill (remarks) 1577 (i).

KYTE, Mr. Geo. W., *Richmond, N.S.*
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Arichat and Canso SS. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4733 (iii).
Bissett, Geo. E., Dismissal from Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).
Boyle, Dougald R., Fishery Overseer at Arichat, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.) 3945 (ii).
Breakwaters, N.S., Inquiry for Ret., 4460 (iii).
Brymer, Arthur, Fishery Officer at Lower L'Ardoise, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3752 (ii).
——— (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).
Canal Staffs, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5802 (iv).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 1584 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Civil Service Commission Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3348 (ii).
Coast Trade, Foreign Shipping, &c. (M. for copies*) 2861 (ii).
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ques.) 3148 (ii).

KYTE, Mr. Geo. W.—*Con.*
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1193 (i).
——— Inside and Outside Service, Dismissals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2587 (ii).
Empire Trade Commission, Apptmt. of Representative (Ques.) 5951 (iv).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duty *re*, on M. for Sup., 5590 (iv).
Fish Reduction Works at Aricaht, Tel. *re* from Prime Minister (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2783 (ii).
Guysborough Branch Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1464 (i).
I.C. Ry. Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4223 (iii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5411 (iii).
Little Anse Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2043 (ii).
Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 6337 (iv).
McLeod, Dr. J. R., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury, Charges, &c. (M. for papers*) 3945 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1867, 1895 (i), 3130, 3364 (ii).
Payson, Mr. W. W., Dismissal from Deep Brook Post Office (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
Pelagic Sealing, Compensation *re* Treaty (Ques.) 4776 (iii).
Port Richmond Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 1585 (i).
——— (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Powers, Laurence G., Supt. of Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Dismissal, Charges *re* (Ques.) 3751 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 4781 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. (Diamond Light, &c., Co.) on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 5834 (iv).
Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as assistants (Ques.) 5954 (iv).
Public Works in N. S., Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2803 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2512 (ii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4223 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 5939 (iv).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2588 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canal—St. Peters (improvements) 5798 (iv).

KYTE, Mr. Geo. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4735; (Mahone and Tancook) 4733 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Arichat) 2039; (Petit de Grat) 2050 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5609 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2655; in Com., 2879, 3540 (ii).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Arsenal at Quebec, Payment to Employees, &c. (Ques.) 579 (i).
Marine Workshops at Quebec, Instructions *re* Closing (Ques.) 579 (i).
Militia Civil Engineers, Recall from Quebec (Ques.) 580 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Names of Members in 1896 and after (Ques.) 579 (i).
——— Reorganization of (Ques.) 580 (i).
——— Resignation from Board of Members (Ques.) 579 (i).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Highway Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3698 (ii).
Montcalm Postmasters, Pets. *re* Removal (Ques.) 575 (i).
St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 560 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2442 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue of P.O., &c. (Ques.) 724 (i).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Budget, The (remarks) 5070 (iii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4104 (iii).
Dunnville Customs Revenue for 1910-11, Postal Revenue &c. (Ques.) 2066 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6260 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3202 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6198 (iv).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3141 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2353 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 172) in Com., 6127 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agricultural Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6467 (iv).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3927; (regulations) 3914 (ii).
Militia (armouries) 5542; (associations and bands) 5530 (iii).

LAMARCHE, Mr. P. E., *Nicolet.*
Manitoba Boundaries B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4398; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) 4840 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and Amt. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1664 (i).
Naval Repeal Bill, Discussion *re* (Ques.) 4239 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*
Cockshutt Plough Co. Prices *re* (remarks) 820 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1194 (i); 3251 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 911 (i).
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. (B. 4) 1°m., 12 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3203 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2314 (ii); 4069 (iii).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6749 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 12; 2° m., 1597 (i); neg. (Y. 61; N. 87) 1706 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage B. 3.'
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4765 (iii).
Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 5) 1°m., 13 (i).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1947 (i).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6488 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2978 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6674 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6454 (iv).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie & Napierville.*
Budget, The, 5147 (iii).
Census Population of Canada, and Quebec Cities, &c. (Ques.) 731 (i), 3336 (ii).
Napierville Public Building. Purchase of Site (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
—— Instructions *re* (remarks) 3153 (ii).
—— Payment to Mr. Bourgeois (remarks) on M. to adjn., 2373 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1354 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I.C.Ry. (Ques.) 3050 (ii).
Courcy, Mr. P., Appmt. at St. Pacome de Kamouraska (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5821, (iv).
—— Emplymt. in Inland Revenue (Ques.) 5952 (iv).
Deschenes, Louis, Wharfinger at River Ouelle, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv). (iv).
Desjardins, Baptiste, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5806 (iv).
Garceau, Mr. N., Appmt. as Inquiry Commissioner (Ques.) 2860 (ii).
Girard, Louis, Dismissal as Postmaster at Ste. Angele de Merici, (M. for pets.*) 2587 (ii).
Herbert, Auguste, Postmaster at St. Pascal, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
—— Letters missing from Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Retirement Fund, Refund to dismissed men (Ques.) 2450 (ii).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. of 61st Regiment, Montmagny (Ques.) 723 (i).
Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs (Ques.) 1864 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
Lizotte, Luc, Postmaster at Pacome, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
Madore, Alphonse, Claims for Damages on I.C.R. (M. for cor.*) 3055 (ii).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4948 (iii).
Michaud, Mr. E., Dismissal from P.O. at St. Germain (M. for cor.) 1592 (i).
Moreau, Mr. Jos., Dismissal, &c. (M. for Cor.) 1818 (i).
N.T. Ry., Quebec-Moncton Section, Completion, &c., Operation by Govt. (Ques.) 723 (i).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate (Ques.) 578 (i).
Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of (Ques.) 578 (i).
Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 6781 (iv).
Public Officials, Inquiries *re* Conduct, &c., Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec (Ques.) 2063 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Railway Bills, Senate Amendments (remarks) 6577 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4744 (iii).
Rosignol, Major J. E., Qualifications *re* Commandant of 61st Regiment (Ques.) 723 (i).
St. Anaclet Postmaster, Request *re* Dismissal (M. for cor.) 2588 (ii).
St. André Wharf, Discontinuance of Work *re* (Ques.) 724 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Experimental Farm, Tenders *re* Erection of Buildings (Ques.) 577 (i).
St. Germain, Dismissal of Postmaster, (M. for cor.) 1592 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1579 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation *re* (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
St. Valier Wharf, Contract of Alex. Duchesneau (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
SUPPLY.
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6478 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6651 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6598 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5499 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6292 (iv).
Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* O.C. (Ques.) 1209 (i).
Ungava Territory, Legislation *re* Extension (Ques.) 577 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. L. A., *Montreal, St. James.*
N.T. Ry. and Montreal Branch Lines, Cor. O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 582 (i).
——— (Ques.) 573 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, *East Quebec and Soulanges.*
Address, The, 33, (amt.) 49; Neg. (Y. 77; N. 121) 517 (i).
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
Archives B. 66 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1494 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5290 (iii).
Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com., 3933 (ii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5850 (iv).
Burrard Power Co. v. The King, Judgment of Judicial Com. (M. for copy*) 1409 (i).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 6082; in Com., 6339; on M. for 3°, 6371 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (Aud. Gen.) Amt. B. 113 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 3632 (ii).
Civil Service Act (additional commissioner) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3143 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com. on Res., 3972 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) on Prop. Res., 1033; in Com., 1435 (i).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6084 (iv).
Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Mr. Borden) 10 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Borden) to present, 710, 794 (i).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5550; on M. for 3°, 5892; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5892; on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5963 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2842 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 893 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1092 (i).
Dismissals, &c., on Objection (Mr. Macdonald) to Mr. Dep. Speaker's Ruling in Com. of Sup., 3255 (ii).
Dismissals: *See* 'Inquiries B. 19,' 'Morine.'
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4238 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6260 (iv).
Fife, Duke of, Decease of (remarks) 2155 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks Sale B. 185 (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 6064; in Com., 6203 (iv).
Fishery Regulations *re* Hague Tribunal (remarks) 3830 (ii).
Freight Rates on Rys., &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 2377 (ii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Mr. Borden) 1969 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes (Ques.) 5262 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on Order for 3°, and in Com., 4153 (iii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6570 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 711 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. (Implementing P.C. judgment) on Prop. Res. (Mr. White) 2296 (ii).
See 'N.T.Ry. B. 95.'

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Gutelius, Mr. F., Form of Question, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (i).
Hague Tribunal: *See* 'Fishery.'
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 1°, 1572 (i); on M. for 2°, 3633; Amt. to ref. to Gov. Gen., 3641; in Com., 3667, 3729, 3946 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4140; Amt. neg. (Y. 50; N. 79) 4141 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6398 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c., 749 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B 19 (Mr Doherty) in Com, 1283, 1417 (i)
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5408 (iii), 6009 (iv).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 943 (i).
L'Assomption Public Works (remarks) *re* Answer, 6782 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6023 (iv).
Lobster Twine, Customs Duties, on M. for Sup., 1072 (i).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1781 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3539, 3840; on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4359; (amt.) 4375, neg. (Y. 65; N. 103) 4393; in Com. on Amts. (Mr. Borden) 4837; on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4888 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. *re* Settlement, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 778 (i).
—— Memorial from Premier to Gov. Gen. (remarks) 3630 (ii).
—— Swamp Lands, Acerage, Inquiry for Stmt., 3751 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1637 (i).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. *re* (remarks) 576 (i).
Morine, A. B., Charges *re* as Candidate for Election (remarks) 6185 (iv).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Borden) 4980 (iii).
Mounted Police, Increase in Pay (remarks) 4743 (iii).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1866 (i), 3130 (ii).
N.T.Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3061 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Factums, 2589 (ii). *See* 'G.T.P.'
N.T.Ry. Station at Quebec, Contract *re* Building (M. for cor. &c.) 755, 763 (i).
—— (remarks) 6786 (iv). *See* 'Gutelius.'

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Naturalization, Legislation *re* Uniformity, on M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor., &c. 772 (i).
Naval Defences (remarks) in Debate on Address, 42 (v).
Naval Service, Minister's Visit to England *re* (remarks) 938 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'
Newspaper Articles, Reading *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
Northumberland County Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 6186 (iv).
Ontario Boundaries, Extension (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, and Architects' Association (M. for cor.) 977 (i).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5972 (iv).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 4460 (iii).
—— Treaty between G.B., U.S. and Japan (M. for copy*) 1590 (i).
Piper, E. F., Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).
P. E. I. Subsidy, on Prop. Res. (Mr. White) 5558; in Com. on Res., 5860 (iv).
Provincial Rys. and Public Buildings, Govt. Assistance (M. for cor.*) 562 (i).
Public Accounts Com., 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc., 6492 (iv).
Quebec Boundary Extension, (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Quebec Boundary Extension, B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 5269 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Reconstruction, Reps., Plans, Tenders &c. (M. for papers) 1401 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 1028; on M. for 3°, 1709 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5896 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3883 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2505 (ii).
Railway Rates: *See* 'Freight Rates.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).
Reciprocity, Ref. to in debate on Address, 36 (i).
Renfrew, S. Election, Issue of Writ, on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn., 2230 (ii).
—— (remarks) 1576, 1707 (i), 1971, 2059, 2377 (ii).
—— Speech of Min. of Customs *re* Georgian Bay (remarks) 1573 (i).
Ste Agathe des Monts Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, (remarks) 6577 (iv.)
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) B. 75 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 1498 (i).
Separate Schools: *See* 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3 (i).
Speaker, Mr., Congratulations *re* Reading Prayers in French, 1808 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Agriculture (salaries) 1041; Charges of Management (dom. notes) 1033, 1034; Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1092 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); Inland Revenue (salaries) conc., 6770 (iv); Justice—Exchequer Court (D. Clark) 1035; Militia (salaries) 1037; Naval Dept. (salaries) 1063 (i).
Mounted Police (pay of force) 5179 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5310, 5358 (iii).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv); Buildings—Ottawa (grounds) 3240 (ii); Que. (Louiseville) conc., 6799 (iv); Que. (Quebec P.O.) 1851 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2158; in Com., 2862, 2947, 3024, 3555, (ii); on M. for 3°, 4144 (amt.) 4146, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 81) 4151 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6665, 6818 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 6080; in Com., 6428 (iv).
Thompson, Dr., Dismissal from N.W.M.P. (remarks) 6784 (iv).
Trade Relations between W. Indies, Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 1999 (ii).
Waterways Commissioners, Dismissal and Apptmts., on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Comsioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5991 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4556 (iii); in Com., 5569 (iv).

LAVALLEE, Mr. J. O., *Bellechasse.*
Chicago Drainage Canal, Damage to Navigation, &c. (Ques.) 4260 (iii).
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Cor. *re* Ry. Station Sites (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
—— Position *re* N. T. Ry. (Ques.) 2245 (ii).
Keewatin Separate Schools, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4241 (iii).
Lettelier, Judge Blaise, Residence *re* (Ques.) 3150 (ii).
N. T. Ry. St. Damien Station, Change in Plans (Ques.) 3532 (ii).

LAVALLEE, Mr. J. O.—*Con.*
Sorel Wharf, Claim of Mr. Larivière for Timber supplied (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
—— Contractors *re* (Ques.) 2859 (ii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*
Fish Trap Licenses issued to Capt. J. H. Thorburn (M. for copy of pets.*) 2861 (ii).
Hatfield, A. M., Charges *re* (M. for copy*) 5263 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5253 (iii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6193, 6680 (iv).
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3340 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 5252 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Halifax) 678 (i).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5187; (life saving awards) 5228; (schools of navigation) 5229 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 694 (i).
Webster, Dr., C. A., Port Physician at Yarmouth, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6186 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3273 (ii).
Yarmouth Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3269 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R., *Rouville.*
Address, The, 241 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5282 (iii).
Annuities Branch, Transfer to P. O. Dept., Dismissal of Agents (Ques.) 727 (i).
—— Extra Payment to Agents (Ques.) 973 (i).
Anse aux Canards Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 878 (i).
Anse à Valeau Postmistress, Charges *re* Madame Proulx (Ques.) 2072 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service: *See* 'Mail Service.'
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5847 (iv).
Banking Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1820 (i).
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* Vote, 5299 (iii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 2062 (ii).
Berlin Post Office Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Bird Rocks Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper (remarks) 5258 (iii).
Bourgoin, Geo., Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 5557 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Papers, 5259 (iii), 6188 (iv).
Bourque, Mr. Jeffrey, Claims for Damages *re* I.C.R. (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
B.C. International Boundary Line, Par. from Washington (remarks) 2754 (ii).
Cable Rates Exchange (M. for cor.*) 5557 (iv).
Cable Rates to G. B., on M. for Sup., 3237 (ii).
Cable Rates, Reduction of Fees (remarks) 931 (i).
Cable Rates, Parcel Post, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4088, (amt.) 4097, Neg. (Y. 40, N. 70) 4120 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Political Literature.'
Campeau, Michel, Dismissal of (M. for pets.*) 2460 (ii).
Canada-France Steamship Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 5262 (iii).
—— Notice for Discussion, 4742 (iii).
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6306 (iv).
Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation, &c. (Ques.) 1582 (i).
Cap Chat P. O., Pet. *re* Change of Name (Ques.) 1204 (i).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site (Ques.) 1020 (i).
Census Enumerators, Delays in Payments (Ques.) 2244 (ii).
—— Percentage retained of Salaries (Ques.) 933 (i).
—— (remarks) 935 (i).
Civil Service Act (additional commissioner) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3144; in Com., 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4569, 4578 (iii).
Civil Service Act (mail clerks) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. on Res., 3156 (ii); in Com., 4783, 5264 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill 105.'
Civil Service Act (postmasters) Amt. B. 124 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. on Res., 4583 (iii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3344 (ii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922; in Com., 6091 (iv).
Civil Service Commissioners, Increase in Number (Ques.) 728 (i).
Civil Service Reform, and Outside Servie (Ques.) 727 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Collingwood Dry Dock Subsidy, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Com. on Res., 3343 (ii).
Commercial Agent in France, Successor to Mr. A. Poindron (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ques.) 2242 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5551; in Com., 5862 (iv).
Customs Salaries: *See* 'C. S. Bill 116.'
Debates, Examination of Reporters, Inquiry for Papers, 6338 (iv).
—— Translation, 6613 (iv).
Deschamps, Mr. R., Apptmt. by Govt. (remarks) 6277 (iv)
Dismissals from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1275, 1955 (i), 3252 (ii).
Dismissals by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Par. in *Le Devoir* (remarks) *re* Question, 2453 (ii).
Dismissals from Post Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2035 (ii).
See 'Inquiries Act, &c.'
Dom. Notes and Stamps Printing Contract, Complaints of British Tenderers (remarks) 1842 (i); 5843 (iv).
Dry Docks Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) on prop. Res., 5560; in Com., 6201 (iv).
Ducharme, Mr. G. N., Apptmt. of (M. for cor.*) 4980 (iii).
—— Attack *re* Apptmt. to Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2830 (ii).
—— Resignation *re* (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship (Ques.) 4039 (iii).
Elevator Men employed by Govt., Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (Judges) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5553; in Com., 5894 (iv).
Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey, Change of Name B. 117 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4239 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Reimbursements *re* (Ques.) 528 (i).
Fast Atlantic SS Service, Conference *re* (remarks) 5695 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6253, 6454 (iv).
Fidelity Trust Co., Incorporation &c. (M. for papers*) 3757 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Relations, Apptmt. of Agents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5747 (iv).
See 'Can. and France, &c.'
Franking: *See* 'Political Literature.'
Gaspé Basin Marine Agency, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 878 (i).
—— Deptl. Inquiry, Salary &c. (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Gaspé Landing Pier, Appropriation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of (Ques.) 1204 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Gaspé Basin to Matapedia Line of Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4194 (iii).
Gaspé Shore Tidal Wave, Govt. Aid, *re* (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Construction &c. (Ques.) 544 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Govt., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3752 (ii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 4980 (iii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto Sale B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6181 (iv).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Cable,' 'Parcel,' 'Telegraph,' &c.
Griever, Mr. S., Lighthouse Keeper, Charges *re* (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Guimond, Eugene, Dismissal, of (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 5895, 6212 (iv).
Hamel, Hector, Customs Appraiser Montreal, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 3343 (ii).
Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1960 (i).
Harbour, Geo. T., Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii).
—— Letter *re* Dismissal (read) in Com. of Sup., 3252 (ii).
Harbours and River Works, Policy *re* Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3675 (ii).
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin (Ques.) 4261 (iii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c., (Ques.) 2860 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Dismissal, Number and Names (Ques.) 877 (i).
Immigration Agents in Belgium, Number, &c. (Ques.) 878 (i).
Immigration Agents in France, Number, &c. (Ques.) 878 (i).
I. C. R. Moncton Shops, Transfer of to Fraserville (Ques.) 544 (i).
—— Snow Blockade, Delay of Trains (remarks) 1409 (i).
—— Ties contracted for at Sayabec, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1311 (i).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6309 (iv).
Japan, Trade Relations with, Stmnt. by Japanese Consul at Vancouver (Ques.) 559 (i).
Justice, Dep. Min., Travelling Expenses (Ques.) 3150 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 940 (i).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe, Investigation *re* Liquidation (Ques.) 2069 (ii).
—— and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements &c. (Ques.) 528 (i).
Laberge, Mr., Mail Carrier, Compensation to widow (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
Langevin Block, Overcrowding: *See* 'Post Office.'
L'Assomption Public Works (remarks) *re* Answer, 6782 (iv).
Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4458 (iii).
Levis Dry Dock, on Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike in Montreal, Settlement &c. (remarks) 269 (i).
Magdalen Islands, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).
Magdalen Islands Marconi News Service, Copy. of Instructions *re* (M. for papers*) 4459 (iii).
—— (remarks) 3833 (ii), 4159 (iii).
—— (remarks) on stmnt. (Mr. Hazen) 4042 (iii).
—— Salary of Correspondent (Ques.) 4262 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 4777 (iii).
Mail Clerks: *See* 'C.S. Bill 106.'
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (M. for ret.*) 2460 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5693 (iv).
Mail Service between G.B. and Canada, Letter of Board of Trade, Quebec (read) 1843 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3852, 3896 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4461 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 783 (i).
Marconi Co., Negotiations *re* Wireless Messages to all Dominions (Ques.) 2585 (ii). *See* 'Magdalen Islands.'
Marriage Act Amt., Ref. to Privy Council, Provincial Representations (Ques.) 3755 (ii).
Marriage Laws, Ref. to Supreme Court (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Montreal Athletic Association at Nancy, Pet. *re* Govt. Aid (remarks) 1722 (i).
Montreal Circuit Judges, Addition, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 545 (i); 2855 (ii).
—— (remarks) 3907 (ii).
Montreal Customs House, Dismissals (Ques.) 4040 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Montreal Docks Construction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Montreal Dry Dock, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3301 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 1708 (i), 2057 (ii).
——— Resignation of Messrs. Ballantyne and Geoffrion (remarks) 6551 (iv).
——— Res. from Corn Exchange Protesting *re* Removal, Delegations, &c. (Ques.) 2069 (ii).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement of by Govt. (Ques.) 572 (i).
Montreal Military School, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 4040 (iii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
N.T.Ry. (Montreal Branch) Subsidy, in Com., 5896, 6215 (iv).
Naval Policy of Govt. ref. to in debate on Address, 250 (i).
Naval Service Cor. between Can. and G. B. (M. for copy*) 562 (i).
Naval Ships, Construction of, Rep. of Admiral Kingsmill (M. for copy*) 2459 (ii).
Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 724 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1384, 1832 (i).
Ontario Boundaries Extension B. 152 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6158 (iv).
Ottawa City Federal District, Referendum *re* (Ques.) 1356 (i).
Ottawa County Superior Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Parcel Post System, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2337 (ii).
See 'Cable,' 'Postal Regulations,' &c.
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, Signature *re* (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— (M. for papers) 1396 (i).
——— Request for Papers, 935 (i).
Parcel Post Rates to European Countries (Ques.) 4776 (iii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6175 (iv).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (remarks) 1586 (i).
Postal Regulations, &c., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2285 (ii).
Postmasters dismissed by Govt., List read in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase of Salary to (remarks) 3060 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2°, 3351; in Com. 3358 (ii).
See 'C. S. Bill 106.'
Post Office Deptl. Building, Condition of Offices, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i), 2010 (ii).
Post Office Dismissals, since Oct. 1911, Pets. *re* &c. (M. for ret.) 1395 (i).
Post Office Dept., Stmnt. *re* Dismissals since Oct. 1911 (M. for ret*.) 1589 (i).
——— Salaries: *See* 'Bill 106.'
——— List read, 6636 (iv).
Pouliot, Louis, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 4459 (iii).
Private Secretaries: *See* 'Bill 60.'
Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Provident Trust Co., Incorporation, &c. (M. for papers*) 3755 (ii).
Public Works, Dismissal of Workmen (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 5269 (iii); in Com., 6162 (iv); on M. for 3°, 6188 (iv).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction, &c. (remarks) 6784 (iv).
——— Subsidy, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6493 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Board, Removal of Members, &c. (Ques.) 560 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 5896, 6214 (iv).
Queen's Hotel Co., Limited, Litigation *re* (M. for cor.*) 3755 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5895; in Com., 6212, 6306 (iv).
Reciprocity, Ref. to in debate on Address, 244 (i).
Relatives appointed to Govt. positions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6295-97 (iv).
Rideau Hall Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Robitaille, J. C., Charges *re* Inland Revenue, Quebec (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922 (iv).
See 'Bill 179.'
Rural Mail Delivery, Extension (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Rural Mail Routes, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 4978 (iii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Routes, &c., Inquiry for, 5561 (iv).
St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Investigation *re* Charges (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
St. Agathe des Monts Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Bedard (Ques.) 973 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R—*Con.*
——— Investigation *re* Charges (M. for cor.) 1591 (i).
Ste Agathe des Monts Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).
St. Angele de Laval, County of Nicolet, Postmaster, Charges *re* (Ques.) 3755 (ii), 4039 (iii).
St. John Harbour Works, Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Average depth of water between Montreal and Quebec Cap a la Roche at low tide (Ques.) 544 (i).
St. Lawrence River Power, Res. from Board of Trade, Montreal (Ques.) 2456 (ii).
St. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of (Ques.) 1584 (i).
St. Paul d'Abbottsford Postmaster, P. L. St. Pierre, Investigation *re* (M. for papers*) 1589 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
Ste. Rosalie Branch, I.C.R., Lack of Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4134 (iii).
Sauve, Mr. L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal (Ques.) 575 (i).
Sayabec Post Office, Appmnt. of Miss Boulay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Separate Schools, Establishment of in Man. (M. for pets.*) 4263 (iii).
Separate Schools in Man. and Keewatin, Demand from Members (Ques.) 4247 (iii).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Sheldon v. Rex. (M. for papers*) 3756 (ii).
Sikhs in B. C., Decision *re* bringing in their Wives (Ques.) 2457 (ii).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1816 (i).
——— Vacancy (remarks) 1577 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Post Office (H. B. Verret) 6278; (promotions) 6280; Public Works (private Secretary) conc., 6779 (iv).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6580 (iv).
Fisheries (protection service) 5386 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6604 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys (Arctic) 5398; (Atlantic Coast) 5399 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3311 (ii).
Justice, Administration of (Montreal circuit court) 6598; (miscellaneous expenditure) 6560; (miscellaneous litigation) 6562; Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 6586 (iv).
Labour Dept. (contingencies) 6615; (Industrial Disputes Act) 6615 (iv).
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6461 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 4727; (Magdalen Islands) 4732; (Quebec and Gaspé) 4738 (iii).
D

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Militia (annual drill) 5457; (automobiles) 5516; (rifle ranges, Rockliffe) 6654 (iv).
Miscellaneous—(Parliamentary Documents translation) 6613; (Paris agency) 6614 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5304 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6290; Outside Service (inspectors) 6646 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (furniture) 3286 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 1951; (Renfrew) 1953; (Seaforth) 1953; (Sudbury) 1954; (Toronto warehouse) 1963 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Eastern Block) 1339; (examining warehouse) 1949 (i); (furniture) 3279, 3285; (grounds) 3240; (heating, &c.) 3278 (ii); (Historic Tableaus) 1336; (Library improvements) 1950; (plumbing, &c.) 1855 (i); (rents) 3291; (Rideau Hall repairs) 3285; (site for new buildings) 3242; (snow cleaning) 3279 (ii).
Public Works—(Buildings—Que. (Levis armoury) 1347 (i); (Louiseville) conc., 6794 (iv); (Maisonneuve) 1347; (Marieville) 1348; (Montreal barracks) 1350; (Montreal customs) 1351; (Montreal P. O. enlargement) 1348; (Montreal postal station F) 1353; (Quebec custom house) 1849; (Quebec drill hall) 1849; (Quebec P. O.) 1851; (St. Lambert) 1853 (i); (St. Laurent) conc., 6804 (iv); (St. Therese) 1854; (Shawinigan) 1852; (Three Rivers) 1854 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs) 3235 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John dry dock) 3299 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse au Canard) 2785; (Blue Rocks Island) 2043; (Levis graving dock) 3295; (Quebec harbour) 2836; (River St. Charles) 2837 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 2823; (monument to Madeleine de Verchères) 2824; (Temiskaming dam) 2830 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Gaspé) 3305; (Magdalen Islands) 3302; (repairs, &c.) 2817; (Yukon system) 3303 (ii).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Doncaster indian reserve) 6806 (iv).
Radiotelegraphic Service (wireless stations) 5399 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (construction) 4134 (iii).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5829 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2157 (ii).
Taylor, Hon. Geo., Promise *re* Senate Apptmt. (Ques.) 545 (i).
Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Govt. Ownership (remarks) 2007 (ii).
See 'Cable,' &c.
Therrien, J. F., Charges *re* Political Partisanship, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1413 (i), 3152 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iv).
(iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3339 (ii).
Tobacco Growers of Yamaska, Govt. Aid to (M. for cor.) 1591 (i).
Under Secretaries of State, Apptmt. of (remarks) 3059 (ii).
Ungava Annexation, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2060 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5907 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6219 (iv).
Veit, Frederick, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6176 (iv).
Williamsville Post Office, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Edwards) 6274 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4557 (iii); in Com., 5405, 5567 (iv).
Yule, Mr., Customs Officer at Aurora, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4779 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5291 (iii).
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5905 (iv).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2012 (ii).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 847 (i).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2841 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3651; in Com., 3670 (ii).
Marriage Bill 3 (Mr. Lancaster) remarks *re* 2nd reading, 582 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal B. 30 (Mr. G. V. White) in Com., 4699 (iii).
N.T.Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1894 (i); 3410 (ii).
Postal Regulations, on M. to take in Mondays (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Railway Committee, Apptmt. of Subcommittee *re* G.T.Ry. Bill, Liberals omitted (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5617 (iv).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, (remarks) 6456, 6494, 6577 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Naval Service (maintenance) 5320 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) Ques. of Order, 3618; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 3616 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6669, 6811 (iv).

LESPERANCE, Mr. D. O., *Montmagny.*
Carriere and Laine Property, Levis, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 731 (i).
Dismissals on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iv).
International Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 141) 1°*, 5156 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4863 (iii).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Address, The, 487, (M.) to adjn. debate, 487, 491 (i).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Service, Pets. from Boards of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4190 (iii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1154 (i).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duties *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5593 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1095 (i); Public Works—Buildings (Chatham) conc., 6804 (iv); Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 4138 (iii).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *Renfrew South.*
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 725 (i).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Master and Mates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii).
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 107 (i).
Archibald, Mr. P. S., Employmt. by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 933 (i).
Art Gallery of Painting (Ques.) 1865 (i).
Australian Pacific Cable, Proposals *re* &c. (Ques.) 576 (i).
Banking Act Legislation (remarks) 938 (i).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2411 (ii).
Benoit, Joseph, Dismissal from I.C.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4184 (iii).
Bisley Rules: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Bourassa, Capt., Pet. *re* Dep. Harbour Master (Ques.) 1814 (i).
British Admiralty, Memo. *re* Conference between Canada. and Australia, &c. (Ques.) 559 (i).
B.C. Boundary, Agreement *re* Subsidy (Ques.) 971 (i).
B.C. Fishing Ret., Inquiry for, 6277 (iv).
B.C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs. (Ques.) 573 (i).
'British News,' &c., Purchase of by Interior Dept. (Ques.) 6660 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Cable Rates, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 4102 (iii).
Canada and G.B. Mail Service, Renewal of Contract *re* (Ques.) 547 (i).
See 'G. B. and Canada.'
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5199 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com. on Res., 5161 (iii).
Cavanagh, Geo., Dismissal from Customs Service (M. for cor.*) 3342 (ii).
Census Returns, Number of Males, Females, &c. (M. for ret.*) 561 (i).
Christmas Adjournment, 927 (i).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6085 (iv).
Coal used in Govt. Buildings, Canadian (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
Connolly, John, Coal Inspector, Complaints *re* (M. for cor.*) 2588 (ii).
Continental Can. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 4396; in Com., 5204 (iii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5866 (iv).
Dartmouth and Denis Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 543 (i).
Deschamps, Raoul, Apptmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
Dismissals, Apptmt. of Commissioners in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3247 (ii).
—— Objections to Ruling of Dep. Speaker in Com. of Sup., 3254 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 921 (i).
'Earl Grey' and 'Minto,' Govt. Steamers, Names of Employees (M. for ret.*) 1816 (i).
East River, Pictou County, Deepening, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
Elevator Men in Govt. Employ (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
Excavators purchased from Mr. Harris &c. (Ques.) 559 (i).
Falconer, R. S., Dismissal as Inspector on I.C.R., Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 543 (i).
False Creek Flats, Date of Application for Lease from Messrs Marpole and Macdonald, (Ques.) 5953 (iv).
—— (M. for papers*) 6186 (iv).
Farmers Bank Investigation, Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith (remarks) 3332 (ii).
—— O. C. *re* Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith (M. for copy*) 3756 (ii).
D½

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Fenian Raid, Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6257 (iv).
See 'Veterans.'
Fishery Act Prosecutions in Pictou County, (M. for papers*) 1589 (i).
Fraser, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4188 (iii).
—— Dismissal of (Ques.) 3935 (ii).
Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of (Ques.) 546 (i).
See 'Stellarton.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 872 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. (B. 20), 1° m., 711; (M.) to suspend Rule, 713; 2°m., 795 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6572 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Employees Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i), 6572 (iv).
Gray, W. W., Coal Inspector, Charges *re*, Investigation by H. P. Duchemin (M. for papers*) 2588 (ii).
G. B. and Canada Mail Service, Contracts *re* (remarks) 1845 (i), 4718 (iii).
See 'Can. and G. B.'
Goods purchased by Public Works since Oct. 1911, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1578 (i).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Govt. Business on Mondays (remarks) 2377 (ii).
Govt. Printing, Patronage to French Papers in Quebec (Ques.) 1357 (i).
Govt. Purchases for Public Works, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1204 (i).
Governor General of Canada, Letters Patent (M. for copy*) 2247 (ii).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Co.'s Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1465 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5626 (iv).
Hale, Thomas, Dismissal as Correspondent *Labour Gazette*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 4459 (iii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 4263 (iii).
Hawkes, Mr.: *See* 'British News.'
Highway Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3656; in Com., 3719, 3947, 3956 (ii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 4142; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 85) 4142 (iii).
Immigration in Ont., Promise of Premier, *re* Assistance (Ques.) 546 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity, &c., on M. for Sup., 2420 (ii).
I. C. Ry., Coal Supply, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 2457 (ii).
—— Employees in Pictou, Charges *re* Political Partisanship (M. for cor.*) 2246 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
I. C. R. and Ry. Commission, Res. *re* Control (Ques.) 4979 (iii).
Japanese, Oriental, &c., Immigration, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 875 (i).
Leaitch, Alvena Bell Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 5156 (iii).
Lightkeepers in N.S., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
McAuley, Angus, Claims for Damages *re* Fire, Investigation (M. for rep.*) 3756 (ii).
McLeod, John, Dismissal as Postmaster at Denmark, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 4460 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3851; on M. for 1°, 3905 (ii); in Com., 4525 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4844; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4708 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. &c. *re* Settlement with Provs. of Man. and Ont. (M. for cor.) 774, 789 (i).
—— Terms *re* (Ques.) 716 (i).
Maritime Telephone Co., and P. E. I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1698 (i).
Marriage Law, Cor. with Federal Govt. *re* Legislation (M. for copies*) 3341 (ii).
—— Cor. with Prime Minister *re* Legislation (M. for copy*) 2861 (ii).
Matheson, Jas. W., Charges *re* (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c. (Ques.) 876 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmt. of Accountant (Ques.) 6661 (iv).
—— Dismissal of Mr. J. A. Masse &c. (Ques.) 3943 (ii).
Murray, Dr., Poaching on East River for Salmon (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1880 (i); 3378 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Commission, Investigation *re* Construction (remarks) 2060 (ii).
—— Rep. *re* (remarks) 2157 (ii).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Competition at Bisley (remarks) 3730 (ii).
Naturalization Legislation, Uniformity in (M. for cor. &c.) 765 (i).
Naturalization: *See* 'Imperial.'
Naval Defence of the Pacific Coast, Res., from B. B. Legislature &c. (Ques.) 4458 (iii).
Naval Discipline Act. Application to Canada (Ques.) 1203 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1822 (i).
Pariseau, Mr. S. B., Employee of Ry. Dept. and Cedar Rapids Co. (Ques.) 973 (i).
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Mail Service, Contract Supplies to Crews, &c. (Ques.) 876 (i).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).
Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to, &c. (Ques.) 5949 (iv).
Poaching for Salmon on East River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Postmasters and Town Councillors, Regulations *re* Acceptance (Ques.) 2587 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 3355 (ii).
P. E. I. Car Ferry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5189, 5210 (iii).
P. E. I. Ferry Papers, Inquiry for 4232 (iii).
P. E. I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6118, 6130 (iv).
Public Works, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 559 (i).
Public Works Contracts, Amounts given without Tender (Ques.) 877, 1578 (i).
—— Contracts in Montreal and Quebec, given without tender (Ques.) 877 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Supplies, Orders without Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2459 (ii).
—— (Ques.) 1204 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioner's Solicitor, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1814 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3884 (ii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Stmnt. (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Railway Facilities in N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).
Rayne, R. W., Caretaker, Truro Armoury, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6184 (iv).
Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. (remarks) 3331 (ii).
—— (personal explanation) 3449 (ii).
River John, Mail Carrier, Name, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1579 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 2247 (ii).
Rural Mail: *See* 'C. S. Bill 179.'
Salmon Fisheries, B. C., Negotiations *re* Exportations, &c. (M. for papers*) 3756 (ii).
Scotch Village Postmaster, Apptmt. in 1903, Charges *re* (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
Senate Vacancies (remarks) 5161 (iii).
Smith, Angus, Pilot of D. G. S. 'Earl Grey' Suspension of (M. for papers*) 1590 (i).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 546 (i).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Solicitor General, Vacancy (remarks) 5162 (iii).
Stellarton Postmaster Mr. John Fraser, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
See 'Fraser.'
Stellarton Station Mail Service, Cancellation of (M. for cor.*) 2247 (ii).
Sunny Brae to Guysborough Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 542 (i).
Sunnybrae Branch Ry. (remarks) in Com. of of Sup., 4216 (iii).
See 'Guysboro.'
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (oyster culture) 5255 (iii).
Immigration (agencies) 3307 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1468; (combines investigation act) 1501; (conciliation board) 1509; (industrial disputes act) 1500 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (International Congress) 5237; (pensions) 5236 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4718; (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Can. and S. Africa) 4726; (Halifax, Nfld. and England) 4728; (Magdalen Islands) 4732; (North Sydney) 678 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5453; (allowance) 5449; (associations and bands) 5528; (automobiles) 5492, 5513; (camps) 5521; (customs dues) 5522 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5189, 5210; (patrol vessels) 5231; (St. Lawrence channel) 5231; (wrecks) 5229; (wreck subsidies) 5231 (iii).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries, &c.) 6625 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 1951 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (electric power) 3286; (lighting) 3291 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (P.E.I. system) 3303 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 4136; (branch lines) 4135 (iii), 5620 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 4137 (iii); (coal contracts) 5611 (iv); (construction) 4130 (iii); (Guysborough branch) 676 (i); (SS. subsidies improvements) 5597 (iv); (working expenses) 4163 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (bounties act) 687 (i).
Supreme Court of Canada, Division *re* (Ques.) 547 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2159; in Com., 3551 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Report *re* (Ques.) 1202 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy, B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6406, 6439 (iv).
Vale Ry. Lease Bill, and Acadia Coal Co., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 933 (i).
—— Operation by I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iv).
Venoit, Mr. Joseph, Complaints *re* Suspension, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1817 (i).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to (Ques.) 1202 (i).
See 'Fenian.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6451 (iv).
Westville Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1531 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*
Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Co. (B. 36) 1°*, 969 (i); in Com., 2410 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 644 (i).
Dominion Trust Co.'s (B. 80) 1°*, 1862 (i); in Com., 4237 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6764 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of by late Govt., Judge Barron's Rep., &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Contract, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., 733 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (aids) Amt. (B. 87) 1° m., 2058 (ii).
Mexican Interurban Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 132) 1°*, 4835 (iii).
Moose Loyal Order incorp. (B. 158) in Com., 6126 (iv).
Patent Act (time limit) Amt. (B. 59) 1° m., 1020 (i).
Ry. Act (section men) Amt. (B. 86) 1° m., 2058 (ii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Halifax.*
'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew (remarks) 408 (i).
Archives B. 66 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1440 (i).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs at Coaticooke (M. for cor.) 1361 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5846 (iv).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2410 (ii).
Beaver Bank Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Bedford Mail Contract, Cancellation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Biological Board of Canada B. 118 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 4551 (iii).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Indian Medical Attendant at Chester, N.S., Dismissal &c. (Ques.) 4976 (iii).
B. C. Railway Belt, Unalienated Lands, O. C. *re* (remarks) 1200 (i).
Budget, The, 5011 (iii).
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Subsidies, Guarantee, &c. (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com. on Res., 5160 (iii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3344 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3348; in Com., 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 5264 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Delay *re* Compensation (remarks) 1199 (i).
Chester Canal, N.S., Discontinuance of Work (Ques.) 716 (i).
——— (remarks) 806 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2049 (ii).
Criminal Code (lumber) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Digby Clock Keeper, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1076 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 1183 (i).
Dismissal of Public Officials (M. for papers, &c.) 878 (i).
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Elevator Men in Govt. Employ (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion of Irrelevant Subjects (remarks) on Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker), 2444 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry for, 1575 (i).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 4196, 4719 (iii), 6496 (iv).
Fishery Treaty with U. S., Withdrawal *re* (remarks) 408 (i).
Financial Review, 6707 (iv).
Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Goucher, Wesley, Lightkeeper at Margaretsville, N.S. Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto Sale B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6181 (iv).
Govt. Loans, Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4777 (iii).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Co.'s Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1460 (i).
Halifax Terminal Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4196 (iii), 6496 (iv).
Ham, Robt., Dismissal from Trachoma Hospital, Halifax (Ques.) 875 (i).
Hawke, Mr. A., Apptmt. in Immigration Dept. on M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. C., 617 (i).
Hayden, W. W., Wharfinger at Digby, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Hefferman, Mr. F. S., Dismissal from Customs, (Ques.) 4039 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 1°, 1572 (i); in Com., 3689 (ii).
House of Commons Desks, Change of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2139 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1300, 1420 (i).
I. C. R. Brotherhood Unions, Agreements, &c. (M. for papers) 793 (i).
——— Pullman Conductors, Promotions &c. (Ques.) 1413 (i).
——— Truro Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 1412 (i).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1443 (i).
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Lobster Fishing Season in St. John, Date of Opening (Ques.) 722 (i).
Lobster Traps, Customs Change in Tariff on Twines (M. for papers) 1362 (i).
Lobster Twine Customs Duties, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 1070 (i).
McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
Mader, D., Dismissal from Mahone Post Office (Ques.) 722 (i).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Man. Boundaries B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 1°, 3906 (ii); in Com., 4524 (iii).
Medical Attendance free to Fishermen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 1812 (i).
Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour, Dismissal (Ques.) 4039 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1899 (i); 3446 (ii).
'Niobe' Cruiser, Repairs to (Ques.) 577 (i).
Nursery Stock, Purchase of Experimental Farm, N.S., (Ques.) 3333 (ii).
O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Office at Halifax (Ques.) 717 (i).
P. E. I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6124 (iv).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6174 (iv).
Railway Companies incorp. (B. 191) 1° m., 6492 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2056 (ii).
Revised Statutes, Correction *re* French Translation B. 65 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1438 (i).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Royal N. W. M. P., Annuties to families of Inspector Fitzgerald and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5176 (iii).
Spry Bay Post Office, Removal *re* (M. for cor*.) 582 (i).
——— (Ques.) 577 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs—Outside Ports (salaries) 1076; Marine Dept—(salaries) 1053 (i); Post Office (promotions) 6279 (iv).
Fisheries (lobster hatchery) 5256 (iii); (medical attendance, free) 680 (i).
Highways (subsidies) 6611 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 3305; (agents) 3918 (ii).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1501; (Gazette) 1476; (industrial training commission) 1527; (inspection dangerous machinery) 1527 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 4714; (Can. and Cuba) 4721; (Can. and G. B.) 4719 (iii); (Canada and Mexico) 5935 (iv); (Halifax and W. Indies) 4748; (Magdalen Islands) 4730; (St. John and Halifax) 4739 (iii); (St. John and W. Indies) 641 (i).
Militia (associations and bands) 5530 (iii). Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5186, 5216 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6286; Outside Service (salaries) 6616, 6621 (iv).
Public Works—B. C. (generally) 2215 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 3293 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Lawlor's Island) 1341; (Lunenburg) 1343; (Tracadie Lazeretto) 1531 (i).
Public Works—Ottawa—(H. of C. telephones) 3243 (ii); (observatory) 1322; (Sussex St.) 1322 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal P. O.) 1353 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Devil's Island) 2055 (ii); (dredging) 639 (i); (Yarmouth) 2056 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 677 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 622; (Dartmouth branch) 670 (i); (Halifax docks) 5596, 5601 (iv).
R.N.W.M.P. (pay of force, &c.) 5176 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (bounties on steel and iron) 5934 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2621; in Com., 2997, 3043, 3548 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 3617 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 3618 (ii).
Tariff Commission, Legislation *re* (remarks) 938 (i).
Trade Relations between W. Indies Australia and Canada, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 2002 (ii).
United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Appeal (Ques.) 6783 (iv).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*
Budget, The, 5041 (iii).
Cable Rates, Parcel Post, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4097 (iii).
Cement supplied to Ry. Dept., Tenders, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).
Combines Act, *re* Companies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1516 (i).
Companies, Over-capitalization of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1516 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 645 (i).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Cable Rates,' 'Parcel,' 'Public Ownership,' 'Ry. Rates.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2172; in Com., 2199, 2317, 3472 (ii), 4063 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4424; on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4946 (iii).
Man. Bill, Correction *re* Voting (remarks) 4984 (iii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1630 (i).
Parcel Post, Extension of System (amt.) on M. for Sup., 2329 (ii).
Public Ownership of Public Utilities, on M. for Sup., 645 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. for Sup., 1902 (i).
——— Notice of Discussion, 1494 (i).
Reciprocity in Trade (remarks) on M. for Sup., 645 (i).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines act) 1516 (i).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 688; (bounties act) 687 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com. on Res., 2158; in Com., 2959 (ii).
United Shoe Co.'s Machinery, Investigation, Application to Min. of Justice *re* (Ques.) 3148 (ii).
——— Proceedings *re* (Ques.) 2455 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908, Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 1°, 4975 (iii).

MACNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*
Adams, William Hollaway Relief (B. 122) 1°*, 4457 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3°, 4810 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Strike and Board of Conciliation (M. for cor.*) 3756 (ii).
Guarantee Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 154) 1°*, 5400 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1258 (i).
Isaac, Isabell, Relief (B. 131) 1°*, 4835 (ii).

MacNUTT, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2524 (ii).
Sutherland, George McKay, Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5400 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2749 (ii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*
Bank Act. Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) in Com., 5855 (iv).
Broderick Post Office, Change of Name (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 2664 (ii); in Com., 5198 (iii).
Coal in the West, Remission of duties (remarks) 178, 230 (i).
Drill Halls, in the West, Donation of Lands *re* Sites (Ques.) 1815 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2179; in Com., 2201, 3790 (ii); 4043, 4155; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4803 (iii).
Grain Congestion in the Northwest (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5760 (iv).
International Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 148) 1°*, 5257 (iii).
Moosejaw Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2208 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2349 (ii).
Prime Minister's Visit to Archbishop of Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 534 (i).
Railways in Man. and N.W., Subsidies &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 562 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c. on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1934 (i).
St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick P.O., Cor. &c. (read) on M. for Sup., 5922 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5764 (iv).
Wheeler, Seager, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at N.Y. Exhibition (Ques.) 542 (i).

McCREA, Mr. F. N., *Sherbrooke.*
Criminal Code (lumber) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Stevens) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Eastern Township, Field for Immigrants (remarks) 6557 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6267 (iv).
Immigration into Eastern Townships (remarks) 6557 (iv).
Postmasters, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Militia (automobiles) 5518 (iii).

McCREA, Mr. F. N.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6631 (iv).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *West Kent.*
Kennedy, John Angus Relief (B. 164) M. 1°*, 5549 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wheatley Creek) 640 (i).

McCURDY, Mr. F. B., *Shelburne & Queens.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6506 (iv).
Halifax Terminal Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4203 (iii).
Mail Subsidies *re* W. Indies Service, Establishment by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5634 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2933 (ii).
Trade Relations between Canada, Australia and W. Indies, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 2004 (ii).

McKAY, Mr. J., *Prince Albert.*
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3233 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1232 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c., 740 (i).
Keewatin Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation, incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1410 (i).
Northern Territorial Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1862 (i).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).
Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 794 (i).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1862 (i).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *North Cape Breton.*
Address, The, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt., 178 (i).
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3053 (ii).
Apples and Fruit Growing in N.S., Resolution of Fruit Growers' Ass'on. *re* Industry (remarks) 1719 (i).
Battlefields Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5303 (iii).
Bras d'Or Lakes SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5936 (iv).
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re* (Ques.) 5948 (iv).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5403 (iii).
Christmas Adjournment (remarks) 703 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4582 (iii).
Civil Service Commission, Attack *re* Apptmts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2834 (ii).
Clock Towers in Public Buildings, N.S., Votes *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5205 (iii).
Day, Luke, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
Dismissals, Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5803 (iv).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
See 'Inquiries B. 19.'
Dismissals from Public Works, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3251 (ii).
Estmere to Baddeck Branch Ry., Tenders *re* (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
Exchequer Court Act (judges) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5893 (iv).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6521 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6457 (iv).
Gillies, Cap., Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3261 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2563, 3507, 3767 (ii).
Grand Narrows Canal, Obstruction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation, on M. for Sup., 1456 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3710 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1301, 1416 (i).
I. C. R., Estende to Baddeck Branch Line Tenders *re* (Ques.) 576 (i).
——— Estmere to Baddeck Branch Line, Surveys, Tenders, &c. (M. for papers) 2494 (ii).
——— 'Market Tickets' to Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iv).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5409 (iii).
Kidson's Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re* &c. (Ques.) 3054 (ii).
Lighthousekeepers, Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5234 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6034 (iv).
McDonald, Dr. D., Dismissal from Indian Reserve, Baddeck (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4345; in Com., 4621 (iii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2838 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1876 (i).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5223 (iii).
Postmasters, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase of Salary (remarks) 3060 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 3362 (ii).
Public Works in Cape Breton County, Appropriations omitted from Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).
Public Works in Cape Breton, Tenders *re* (remarks) 805 (i).
Public Works, Votes for last year, Continuation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Inquiry for Answer to Question, 5561 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3489 (ii).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. Barker) in Com., 5203 (iii).
St. Patrick's Channel Lighthouse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6477; Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6481 (iv).
Excise (inspectors) 5825 (iv).
Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 6653 (iv); (protection service) 5386 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3309, 3916 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1475; (industrial training commission) 1527; (inspection *re* dangerous machinery) 1526 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aid to navigation) 5238; (salaries) 5232 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c.) 4714; (Bras d'Or Lakes) 4734; (Can. and Newfoundland) 4725; (Halifax and Nfld.) 4727 (iii); (North Sydney) 679 (i); (Sydney and Wycocomagh) 4740 (iii).
Marine (steamboat inspection) 5238 (iii).
Militia (armouries) 5544; (associations and bands) 5535; (customs dues) 5523 (iii).
Miscellaneous (honoraria *re* pelagic sealing) 5811 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5372 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5186; (life saving awards) 5228; (live stock inspection) 5229; (registration) 5229 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 3293 (ii); (generally) 1340 (i); (rents, &c.) 3290 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Baddeck) 6658 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (leases) 1324 (i); (water supply) 3294 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Cape Breton) 2817; (Wood Mountain) 2821; (working expenses) 3302 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 5765, 6607 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 4137; (Chatham diversion) 4139 (iii); (extensions) 673 (i), 5641; (Moncton shops) 5607; (refrigator cars) 5603; (Sydney diversion) 5658 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 691 (i).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5829 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2873, 3551 (ii), 4080 (iii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6423 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6453 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2983 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5989 (iv).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2142 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 786 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1620 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6140 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Car Ferry, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5207 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5196, 5207 (iii).
Universal Eyesight Insurance incorp. (B. 126) 1°*, 4835 (iii); in Com., 5907, 5940 (iv).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury and Queens, N.B.*
St. John Ry. Co.'s Crossing at Haymarket Square, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 1405 (i).

McMILLAN, Mr. J. A., *Glengarry.*
McRae, Mr. F. D., Pets. *re* Clemency (Ques.) 713 (i).

MARCILE, Mr. J. E., *Bagot.*
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).

MARCILE, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Excise (inspectors) 5812 (iv).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*
Budget, The, 5102 (iii).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3226 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2731; in Com., 3046 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*
Budget, The, 5154 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantees, &c. (Ques.) 4247 (iii).
Ministers from Quebec, Statements at St. Eustache Election Campaign Meetings (Ques.) 553 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina.*
Address, The, 464 (i).
Armoury at Regina, Erection of (Ques.) 580 (i).
British Western Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 3049 (ii).
Car Shortage *re* Grain Shipments (remarks) 802 (i).
Census Enumerators at Regina, Instructions, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) for stmnt., 564 (i).
Census of Saskatchewan, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 5261 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 4983 (iii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4579 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6456 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2170; in Com., 2563, 3182, 3491, 3767 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4808; on Amt. (Mr. Cash) 4816 (iii).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1862 (i).
Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office (Ques.) 5949 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4687, 4701 (iii).
Morine, A. B., Charges *re* Candidate in last Election (Ques.) 6185, 6335 (iv).
Mounted Police, Increase *re* Pay (remarks) 4743 (iii).
Natural Resources, Provincial Control of in the West, Promise *re* (Ques.) 553 (i).
Pacific Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 970 (i).
Provincial Boundaries, Res. from Leg. of Saskatchewan, *re* Negotiations for transfer of Resources (Ques.) 2577 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 466 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 5257 (iii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Board of Trade of Wilcox (remarks) 2299 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Regina) 2212 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2728 (ii).
Tariff Commission, ref. to in debate on Address, 465 (i).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6453 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Minister of the Interior (Ques.) 553 (i).
Western Dom. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 125) 1°*, 4835 (iii).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie.*
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2410 (ii).
Clarkboro, Sask., C. N. R. Right of Way, Title *re* (Ques.) 934 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 817 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2189, 2321, 3475, 3506, 3783, 4046 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4810, 4814 (iii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 602 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Power of Parlt. (remarks) *re* Questions, 798 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4286 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor. *re* Ont. Govt. (M. for copies*) 2459 (ii).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1870 (i); 3414 (ii).
N.T.Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3090 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 2414 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4774 (iii).
Railway Act (farm crossings) Amt. (B. 7) 1°m., 267 (i); 2°m., 2500 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2689; in Com., 2876, 2978, 3022, 3545-8 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2854, 2983; on M. for 3°, 3281 (ii).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
Railway Bridges, N.B., Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Senatorship from Mar. Prov., Pet. *re* French Apptmt. (remarks) 2755 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., Contract *re* (Ques.) 577 (i).
——— Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2460 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Contract to Grand Falls (Ques.) 4977 (iii).
SUPPLY.
Immigration (agencies) 3915 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *North Grey.*
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2847 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Papers, 956 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6268 (iv).
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1880 (i).
N.T.Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3069 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. (Diamond Light Co. &c.) 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 5832 (iv).
——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to adopt., Ordering Attendance of Mr. R. C. Miller, 6333 (iv).
——— 4th Rep. (presented) 6492 (iv).
——— 5th Rep. (presented) 6732 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3489 (ii).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Naval Service (maintenance) 5325 (iii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, (M.) to adjn. debate, 2664; resmd. debate, 2668; in Com., 2880, 3546 (ii).
Trade Relations between Canada, Australia and West Indies, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 2002 (ii).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*
Can. Northern Ry. Bridge at Morris, Representations *re* Objections (Ques.) 2587 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4596 (iii).
Man. Boundaries, Conference *re* Separate Schools (Ques.) 715 (i).
——— Eastern and Western Line, &c. (Ques.) 971 (i).
Parliament, Duration of Present Redistribution Bill, &c., Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Taylor (Ques.) 557, 715 (i).

MONDOU, Mr. A. A., *Yamaska.*
Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt., Salary &c. (Ques.) 1587 (i).
Address, The, 263, 270 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4455; in Com., (amt.) 4656; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4839; Neg. (Y. 24; N. 160) 4924 (iii).
——— Notice of Amt., 4537 (iii).
Naval Bill, Repeal of, &c. (Ques.) 3942 (ii), 4242 (iii).
Naval Policy of Govt., ref. to in debate on Address, 270 (i).
Yamaska Electoral Agent, (Ques.) 1584 (i).

MONK, Hon. F. D., (Minister of Public Works) *Jacques Cartier.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 223 (i).
Adjournment of House, *re* defective Electric Light (M.) 267 (i).
Anse aux Canards Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 878 (i).
Antigonish Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2022 (ii).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates, 1912, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) for Ret., 1819 (i).
Art Gallery, Purchase of Paintings (Ans.) 1865 (i).
See 'National.'
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5557 (iv).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3337 (ii).
Bissett, Geo. E., Dismissal from Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
Bridge Works at Fraserville, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou (Ans.) 549 (i).
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Cabinet Dissensions (remarks) in debate on Address, 233 (i).
Campeau, Michel, Dismissals from St. Louis du Mile End (Ans.) 1414 (i).
Canso Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) 581 (i).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2014 (ii).
Carrier Laine Property at Levis, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 732 (i).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ans.) 555 (i).
Cedar Rapids Power Co., Water Power Concessions to, *re* St. Lawrence River, &c. (Ans.) 728 (i).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 1584 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Chats Falls Timber Slide, Date of Deed, &c. (Ans.) 4549 (iii).
Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt. as Investigation *re* Public Works Dept., 1414 (i).
Chester Canal, Discontinuance of Work, (Ans.) 716 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2050 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmts. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2835 (ii).
See 'Dismissals,' 'Ducharme,' &c.
Coal, Canadian used for Govt. Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
Clocks in Towers of Public Buildings, N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock Subsidy B. 111 (M.) for Com. on Res., 3343, in Com. on Res., 3450, 1* of Bill, 3451; 2° m., 3633 (ii).
Courtenay Bay Harbour Works, Contracts *re* (remarks) 4743 (iii).
See 'St. John.'
Dauphin Custom House (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Decoste, Capt. Peter, Dismissal from Dredge Cape Breton (Ans.) 548 (i).
——— defective answer (remarks) 804 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) for Cor., 1270 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).
Deschamps, Raoul, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
——— (remarks) 6278 (iv).
Dismissals from Govt. Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1956 (i), 2018 (ii).
See 'Inquiries B. 19,' 'Ottawa.'
——— Official Inquiry in Hull (remarks) 4140 (iii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. (B. 180) in Com. on Res., 6047; 1°*, 5939; 2°*, in Com., 6201 (iv).
Ducharme, Mr., Attack of ex-P. M. G. *re* Appmt. to Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2832 (ii).
——— Resignation *re* (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
Dumelong, Mr. E., Dismissal from L'Assomption P. O. (Ans.) 720 (i).
Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 4039 (iii).
East River, Pictou County, Deepening, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2021 (ii).
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 725 (i).
Elevator Men Employed by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion of Irrelevant Subjects (remarks) *re* Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker), 2444 (ii).
Excavators purchased from Mr. Harris, &c. (Ans.) 559 (i).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3150 (ii).
Gaspe Landing Pier, Appropriation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2788 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Construction *re* (Ans.) 544 (i).
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ans.) 555 (i).
Govt. Works Tolls Act Amt. (B. 103) in Com., 3450 (ii).
See 'Timber.'
Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal &c. (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Harbours and Rivers Works, Policy *re* Tendering (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
House of Commons, Desks, Change of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
——— Improvements in Acoustics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
——— Parliamentary Restaurant, Payment to Waiters (Ans.) 2861 (ii).
——— Telephones in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3243, 3539 (ii).
Ice-Breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2452 (ii).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Genevieve Wharfs, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 557 (i).
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Can., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2427 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1299 (i).
I. C. Ry., Passes to Employees, Instructions *re* Newspaper Reporters, &c. (remarks) 2329 (ii).
——— Ocean Limited Express, Hauling Private Cars (remarks) on conc., 6776 (iv).
Inverness Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1535 (i).
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3340 (ii).
Kennedy, Mr., Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
Kennie, Capt. Edmund, Dismissal (Ans.) 6782 (iv).
L'Achigan Ice Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2295 (ii).
Lalonde, Mr. Alfred, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4779 (iii).
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer at Lake Aylmer (Ans.) 4550 (iii).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector (Ans.) 5055 (iii).
L'Assomption Public Works, Votes in Estimates (Ans.) 5951, 6781 (iv).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriation for (Ans.) 2451, 2579 (ii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property (Ans.) 2451 (ii).
Lemieux, Hon. R., late P.M.G., Par. in 'Le Devoir' *re* Dismissals (Ans.) 2665 (ii).
Lethbridge Armoury, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2210 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 728 (i).
Little Anse Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2043 (ii).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6025 (iv).
Lorneville Cove, Tests *re* Foundations (Ans.) 555 (i).
Lowe, Mr. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 3754 (ii).
McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2017 (ii).
Magdalen Islands Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of (Ans.) 550 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4407; in Com., 4548; on Amt. (Mr. Mondou) to M. for 3°, 4903 (iii).
Man. School Bill, ref. to in debate on Address, 226, 231 (i).
Maritime Telephone Co. and P.E.I. System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).
Melford, N.S. Public Wharf, Notice to suspend (Ans.) 549 (i).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks (Ans.) 533 (i).
Montreal Dry Dock, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3301 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i).
Moosejaw Armoury, Construction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040, 2207 (ii).
Moosejaw Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
Napierville Post Office Site, Purchase of (remarks) 2374, 3153 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Purchase of Paintings, &c. (Ans.) 6184, 6337 (iv).
——— Presentation of Oil Painting by H.R.H. Princess Louise (announcement) 5056 (iii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
Naval Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 234 (i).
Naval Question, Speech of Hon. Mr. Monk at Hull (Ans.) 551 (i).
New Harbour Breakwater (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2045 (ii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co., Prohibition *re* Grinding Machines (remarks) 2060 (ii).
Ottawa Dismissals, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).
See 'Dismissals,' &c.
Ottawa Plaza, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re* (Ans.) 876 (i).
See 'Sussex St.,' 'Supply—Buildings—Ottawa.'
Petawawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded (Ans.) 532 (i).
Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re* (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Pink Rock Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4257 (iii).
Point Aux Anglais Drainage Works (Ans.) 4778 (iii).
Port Hawkesbury Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i), 2016 (ii).
Port Richmond Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 1585 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Prince Rupert Dry Dock, Subsidy, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1811 (i).
Printing Bureau, Policy of Govt. *re* Erection (Ans.) 546 (i).
Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy *re* (Ans.) 2069 (ii).
Public Expenditures, Scandals, &c., by late Govt. (remarks) in debate on Address, 231 (i).
Public Works in Cape Breton, Tenders *re* (remarks) 805 (i).
Public Works in N.B., Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2436 (ii).
Public Works Contracts *re* (Ans.) 559 (i).
Public Works Contracts given without tender (Ans.) 877 (i).
Public Works Expenditure for last ten years in Different Provs. (Ans.) 2064 (ii).
Public Works Employees, Dismissal of workmen (Ans.) 2584 (ii).
Public Works, Engineering Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1058-9 (i).
Public Works now under construction, Approval of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
——— Purchases for Public Works, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1204 (i).
——— (remarks) 1579 (i).
Public Works, Suspension of, Names and Locations, &c. (Ans.) 530 (i).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
Public Works, Votes for last year, Continuation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Reconstruction, Reps., Plans, Tenders, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Papers, 1402 (i).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction *re* (Ans.) 4260 (iii).
——— (remarks) 6785 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Subsidy (remarks) 6493 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Board, removal of Members (Ans.) 560 (i).
Reciprocity Treaty, (remarks) in debate on Address, 231 (i).
Reid, Mr. Watson E., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4460 (iii), 6494 (iv).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Amount expended from 1896 to 1911 (Ans.) 876 (i).
——— Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupency (Ans.) 547 (i).
——— Lighting and Heating (remarks) *re* Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 727 (i).
Rivière des Prairies, Drainage, Continuation of, &c. (Ans.) 715 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Roy, Wm., Charges *re*, Rep., &c., on M. (Mr. Boulay) for Papers, 1394 (i).
St. André Wharf, Discontinuance of Work *re* (Ans.) 724 (i).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Post Office Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2442 (ii).
St. Jean and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction (Ans.) 551 (i).
St. John Harbour, Tugs employed, Amount paid per day (Ans.) 548 (i).
St. John Harbour Works, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
St. John and Courtenay Bay Contract, Signing, &c. (remarks) 6187 (iv).
See 'Courtenay.'
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2068 (ii).
Separate Schools: *See* 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Shediac Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2373 (ii).
Sorel Deep Water Wharfs, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
——— Claim of Mr. Lariviere for Timber supplied (Ans.) 3535 (ii).
Speaker, Mr., Congratulation *re* Reading prayers in French, 1808 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1848 (i).
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 5055 (iii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY.
Civil Govt.—Conservation Commission (salaries) 1069 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); Marine Dept. (salaries) 1050 (i); Public Works (private secretary) conc., 6779 (iv); Public Works (salaries) 1064 (i).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1469 (i).
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2825 (ii).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa river) 6806 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 2204; (Edmonton) 2206; (Lethbridge) 2212; (Strathcona) 2213 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (generally) 2215 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 3293; (furniture) 3286 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Hampton) 1527; (Hillsboro) 1528; (St. John quarantine) 1530 (i); (Shediac) conc., 6794 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Lawlor's Island) 1341; (Lunenburg) 1343; (Tracadie Lazeretto) 1530; (Wolfville) 1343 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Gananoque) 1855; (Kingston R.M.C.) 1855; (Midland) 1855; (Port Arthur) 1951; (Renfrew) 1953; (Seaforth) 1953; (Sudbury) 1954; (Toronto warehouse) 1964 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Eastern Block addition) 1339 (i); (electric power) 3286 (ii); (examining warehouse) 1949 (i); (furniture) 3279; (grounds) 3239; (heating, &c.) 3278 (ii); (leases) 1324; (library improvements) 1950 (i); (lighting) 3291 (ii); (observatory) 1321 (i); (rents, &c.) 3290; (Rideau Hall furniture) 3285; (site for new buildings) 3242; (snow cleaning) 3279 (ii); (Sussex St.) 1322 (i); (water supply) 3295 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachine) 1346, 1953; (Lévis armoury) 1346 (i); (Louiseville) conc., 6795 (iv); (Maisonneuve) 1347; (Montreal barracks) 1350; (Montreal customs) 1351; (Montreal P. O. enlargement) 1348; (Montreal postal station F) 1352; (Napierville) 1354; (Quebec customs house) 1849; (Quebec drill hall) 1849; (Quebec P.O.) 1851; (Rigaud) 1852; (St. Lambert) 1853 (i); (St. Laurent) 6804 (iv); (St. Thérèse) 1854; (Shawinigan) 1852; (Sherbrooke) 1853; (Three Rivers) 1854 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2204; (Humboldt) 2211; (Regina) 2212; (Weyburn) 2213 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta. (Athabaska river) 2815; (Edmonton) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 3235 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (repairs, &c.) 2814 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440 (ii); (dredging) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Bathurst) 2363 (ii); (Beaumont) 2366; (generally) 2368; (Goose Creek) 2373 (ii); (St. John) 627 (i); (St. John dry dock) 3297 (ii); (Sackville) conc., 6805 (iv).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Arichat) 2040; (Bayfield) 2041; (Blue Rocks Island) 2041; (Burke's Head) 2045; (Cape Breton) 2053; (Cole Harbour) 2055; (Cow Bay) 2055; (Devil's Island) 2056 (ii); (dredging) 639 (i); (Gillis Point) 2056; (Inverness) 2056; (Melford) 2056; (repairs, &c.) 2051; (Yarmouth) 2056 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) conc., 6777 (iv); (Toronto harbour) 2445 (ii); (Wheatley Creek) 640 (i); (York bridge) 2817 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Levis graving dock) 3296; (Quebec Harbour) 2836; (Rivieres des Prairies) 2441; (St. Charles River) 2837; (Three Rivers) 2441 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 2823; (Temiskaming dam) 2827 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. and Saskn. (Athabasca Landing) 2819; (Fort McMurray) 2819; (Moose to Durlingford) 2820; (North Battleford) 2823; (Peace River) 2822; (Wood Mountain) 2821 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs, Generally 3303; (repairs, &c.) 2817; (working expenses) 3303 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs, N.S. (Cape Breton) 2817 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (P.E.I. system) 3304 (ii); conc., 6794 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Gaspé) 3305; (Magdalen Islands) 3302 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon system) 3303 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 623 (i).

Sussex St. Property, Purchase by Govt., Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 1359 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) 2010 (ii).
Sutherland, Mr. Roderick, Dismissal of (remarks) 1274 (i).
——— *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2019 (ii).
Swift Current Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3268 (ii).
Temiskaming Dam, on Inquiry for Ret., 6662 (iv).
Tolls for Timber on Govt. Works (B. 103) 1°m., 3049 (ii).
See 'Govt. Tolls B. 103.'
Tower Clock, Repairs to (remarks) 1575 (i).
——— (explanation) in reference to repairs, 1708 (i).
Vegreville and Lloydminister Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
Waterways Commissioners, Dismissal and Apptmts., on M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6705 (iv).
Weedon Public Building, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 4550 (iii).

MONK, Hon. F. D.—*Con.*
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).
Westville Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for ten years (Ans.) 1812 (i).
Wright County Public Works Employees, Dismissal of (Ans.) 551 (i).
Yarmouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3274 (ii).

MORPHY, Mr. H. B., *North Perth.*
Agricultural Committee, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 2156 (ii).
Cattle diseased, Compensation *re* Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5882 (iv).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5740 (iv).
Farmers Bank Failure, Inquiry by Chief Justice Meredith (remarks) 6710 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6459 (iv).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6757 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6043 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2° (remarks) 4307 (iii).
Poaching in East River, N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5247 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6471 (iv).
Militia (associations and bands) 5533 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5365 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5625, 5633 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3011 (ii).

MURPHY, Hon. C., *Russell.*
Address, The, 501 (i).
Airships for Military Purposes, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 533 (i).
Archives B. 66 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1495 (i).
Bread Combines, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6320 (iv).
Cabinet Ministers from Quebec, Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Monk (Ques.) 526 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3349 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1436 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Civil Service Competitive Examination, Extension *re* (Ques.) 533 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
Coal Strike in the West, Settlement of (Ques.) 567 (i).
Companies Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 529 (i).
Companies Incorporation, Ref. to Supreme Court, Withdrawal by Govt. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5552; in Com., 5868 (iv).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
——— Limitations *re* Tenders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Reimbursement to Depositors (Ques.) 527 (i).
——— Indemnifying Shareholders, Speech Hon. Mr. Crothers *re* (Ques.) 3147, 3332 (ii).
——— Promises to Reimburse by Ministers, &c. (Ques.) 713 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6569 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Naturalization of, &c. (Ques.) 4242, 4978 (iii).
Hawkes, Mr. Arthur, Apptmt. *re* Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 527 (i).
House of Commons Sessional Employees, Number dismissed, &c. (Ques.) 568 (i), 2064 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1309, 1426 (i).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6309 (iv).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5413 (iii).
King's Printer, Apptmt. of Assistant (Ques.) 1809 (i).
Maritime Law International Conference, Invitation to Govt. *re* (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks (Ques.) 532 (i).
Militia Touring Cars, Order to Ford Motor Co. (Ques.) 4040 (iii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1879, 1889 (i),
N. T. Ry. Commission, Duties assigned to New Chairman (Ques.) 533 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Apptmt., Salary &c., of Messrs Gutelius and Staunton (Ques.) 4242, 4978 (iii).
Naval Policy, Interview with Hon. Geo. H. Perley in London (remarks) 1576 (i).
——— Promise *re* Referendum (Ques) 526 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
——— Tenders *re* Construction of Ships, Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 526 (i).
Petewawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded (Ques.) 532 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Changes *re* Duties (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
——— Dismissals and Apptmts. (Ques.) 1809 (i).
——— Salary Increases, &c. (Ques.) 2066 (ii).
——— Weekly Consultations (Ques.) 2243 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Policy of Govt. *re* Erection of (Ques.) 546 (i).
Public Works on Rys., Suspension *re*, Names and Locations (Ques.) 531 (i).
Public Works, Suspension of, Names and Locations, &c. (Ques.) 530 (i).
Renfrew, S. Election, Issue of Writ, on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse. 2238 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4836 (iii), 5560 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Acquisition of Additional Land (Ques.) 533 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture, Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6484; (International Institute) 6478 (iv).
Archives (salaries) 6462 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (lock improvements) 6611; Welland (construction) 6610 (iv).
Charges of Management (coin circulation) 1034 (i).
Civil Govt—Agriculture (promotions) 6485 (iv); Customs (salaries) 1040 (i); Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); Interior (salaries) 1039; Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1035 (i); (promotions) 6585 (iv); Militia (salaries) 1037; Post Office (salaries) 1067; Public Works (salaries) 1065; Secretary of State (printing bureau) 1038; (salaries) 1038 (i).
Civil Service Commission (additional commissioner) 6615 (iv).
Conservation Commission (Chicago canal) 6582 (iv).
Inland Revenue (explosives apparatus) 6604 (iv).
Justice (pecuniary claims) 6579 (iv).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1500; (Gazette) 1472; (industrial training commission) 1527 (i).
Militia (Rockliffe ranges) 6654 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 6485; (claim of Mrs. Wiley) 6489; (counsel fees *re* Lanctot inquiry) 6486; (Olympic games) 6486 (iv).
Printing Bureau (plant, &c.) 6611 (iv).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv).
Public Korks—Buildings—Ont. (Ganano-que) 1855 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Sussex St.) 1333 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) 6657; conc., 6776 (iv).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6607 (iv).

E

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) on Senate Amts., 6670 (iv).
Typewriters and Supplies, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 1809 (i).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6326 (iv).
Waterways Commission, Ratification of Apptmt. by late Govt. (Ques.) 533 (i).
W. Indies Trade Arrangements, Negotiations *re* (M. for papers*) 977 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 1820 (i).

NANTEL, Hon. W. B. (*Minister of Inland Revenue*) *Terrebonne.*
Courcy, Mr. P., Apptmt. at St. Pacome de Kamouraska (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iv).
——— Emplymt. in Inland Revenue (Ans.) 5952 (iv).
Courchene, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept. (Ans.) 1864 (i).
Desmarais, Mr., Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).
Dismissals from Inland Rev., Letter sent out (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iv).
Dumontier, Joseph Alphonse, Apptmt. as Inland Rev. Inspector, Quebec (Ans.) 3340 (ii).
Flemming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Rev. Dept. at Petrolia (Ans.) 4259 (iii).
Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges, &c. (Ans.) 726 (i).
Garceau, Mr. N., Apptmt. as Inquiry Commissioner (Ans.) 2860 (ii).
Inland Revenue Reports (presented) 565 (i)
Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4959 (iii).
Maple Sugar, Cancellation of O.C. *re* Standards (Ans.) 716 (i).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).
Robitaille, J. C., Charges *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (private secretary) 6490; (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); (salaries) 1040, 1061; Mines Dept. (salaries) 1066 (i).
Excise (customs duties) 5827; (inspectors) 5812; (salaries) 5812; (tobacco stamps) 5826; (travelling expenses) 5826 (iv).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6604 (iv).
Inland Revenue (explosive apparatus) 6603 (iv).

NANTEL, Hon. W. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mines (French reports) 6491; (ore deposits) 6602, 6490; (peat industry) 6491 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Doncaster Indian reserve) 6806 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspection electric lights) 5828 (iv).
Therien, J. F., Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 1413 (i).
Three Rivers, Charges *re* Collector C. D. Hebert (Ans.) 1209 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmt. of Excise Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*
Bounties on Steel Rods, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Census Enumerators and Returning Officers, Delays *re* Payment (remarks) 2156 (ii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks 824 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contract (M.) for O. Cs., &c., 732 (i).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2187, 2306, 2392, 2545, 2770, 3160, 3762 (ii), 4155 (iii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 592 (i).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1927 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings (generally) 2215; Sask. (Humboldt) 2211 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 622 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2904 (ii).
Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *North Oxford.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5907 (iv).
Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2411 (ii).
Budget, The, 5134 (iii).
Cable Rates, &c., Rural Mails, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4088 (iii).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5200 (iii).
Canal Staffs, Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5802 (iv).
Civil Servants and Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5204 (iii), 5903 (iv).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5862 (iv).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Dominion Trust Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 4238 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 872 (i); in Com., 2184, 2556 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3682 (ii).
Lumber Combine in B.C., Ques. of Order, 2299 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 4546 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Discussion *re* Man. School Questions (Ques.) 534 (i).
Manitoba Questions (remarks) *re* Answers, 581 (i).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3126 (ii).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1869 (i), 3372 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 2414 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 2°, 3354; in Com., 3361 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3881 (ii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2988 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) on M. for 1°, 5922 (iv).
See 'Cable.'
Rural Telephone System, placing in Post Office, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 2248 (ii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1°*, 970 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 620 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1041; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1040; Marine Dept. (salaries) 1046 (i).
Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 5793; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 5797 (iv).
Labour Dept. (industrial training commission) 1527 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 4717 (iii).
Militia (allowance) 5451; (annual drill) 5452, 5464; (associations and bands) 5535 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John quarantine) 1530 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals) 1327 (i).
Railways—Generally (salaries) 5801 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (board of commissioners) 5800; (litigation) 5801 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 698 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2696; in Com., 2871, 2903, 3546 (ii), 4080 (iii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Universal Eyesight Co.'s incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908 (iv).
West Ontario Pacific Railway Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 795 (i).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4559 (iii).

NICHOLSON, Mr. D., *Queens, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6150 (iv).

NICKLE, Mr. W. F., *Kingston.*
N.T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3437 (ii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1377 (i).
Queens Theological College incorp, (B. 69) 1°*, 1410 (i).
Queens University at Kingston (B. 68) 1°*, 1410 (i); in Com., 3874 (ii); 4745; Order called for Com., 4237; 3°m., 4869 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6770 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Justice—Penitentiaries (bonus) 6601 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2738 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Address, The, 357 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1632 (i).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Bisley Competition (remarks) 3746 (ii).
N.T. Ry. (P.C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3093 (ii).
Naval Policy of Govt., Ref. to in debate on Address, 357 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6434 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F., *Edmonton.*
Address, The, 448 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5293 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5564 (iv).
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of (remarks) 1575 (i).
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6314 (iv).
Alberta Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5904, 5942 (iv).
Budget, The, 5093 (iii).
Cable Rates, &c., on M. to withdraw Res., 3448 (ii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6323 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 189 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6373 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6361 (iv).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Staples) in Com., 5201 (iii).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (masters and mates) Amt. B. 143, in Com., 5401 (iii).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 929 (i).
Civil Service Commission Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 3348 (ii).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 3344 (ii).
Coal Strike in Alberta, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Cockshutt) 812, 815 (i).
Continental Can Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Fripp) in Com., 5205 (iii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6220 (iv).
Farm Implements, Price of: *See* 'Cockshutt,' 'Tariff Commission.'
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6455 (iv).
Freight Rates on Rys. on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3216 (ii).
See 'Ry.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2174, 2180, 2303, 2382, 2535, 2755, 3156, 3452, 3508, 3758 (ii), 4053; on Order for 3° and M. (Mr. Foster) for Com., 4153-4; (amt.) 4806; on Amt. (Mr. Cash) 4820 (iii).
See 'Man. Grain Act.'
Grain Congestion in the West, Car Distribution (remarks) 5956, 6556 (iv).
——Further Information, Inquiry for, 6186 (iv).
Grain Congestion, Transportation, &c., Remarks on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).
Grain Shipments from the West, Freight Rates, &c. (prop. res.) 3975; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 84) 4035 (ii).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Grain Shipments to Terminal Elevators (remarks) 6792 (iv).
Grain Storage at Minneapolis, Inquiry for Papers, 6493 (iv).
Grain Transportation in the West, Par. in Toronto Globe (remarks) 5928 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. (Brandon) Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5901 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Hawkes, Mr. A., Apptmt. in Immigration Dept. (M. for O.Cs.) 605 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3721 (ii).
Horses imported from U.S., Destruction for Glanders (remarks) 5693, 5939 (iv).
Horses destroyed at Weyburn, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6790 (iv).
House of Commons, Ventilation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1240 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c. 746 (i).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2146 (ii).
Immigration, Rep. of Mr. Hawkes, Inquiry for, 6551 (iv).
See 'Hawkes.'
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity in Canada, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to Com. of Sup., 2428 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6189, 6679 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6310 (iv).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6015 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6220, 6322 (iv).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 5899, 6219 (iv).
Live Stock Record Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 6022; in Com., 6023 (iv).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1794 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3870, 3886; on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4297; in Com. (amt.) 4673 (iii).
Manitoba Boundary Extension, Answer to Question (remarks) 3755 (ii).
—— Eastern Boundary Extension (Ques.) 3936 (ii).
—— Financial Terms, &c. (Ques.) 558 (i).
—— Inquiry for Papers (remarks) 3448, 3834 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 1°, 2406; on M. for 3°, 2575 (ii).
See 'Grain Act.'
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal B. 30 (Mr. G. V. White) in Com., 4699 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N. T. Ry. (P. C. judgment.) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3086 (ii).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1875 (i); 3426 (ii).
Ottawa City Items (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5969, 6175 (iv).
Public Works Estimates, Information *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4767 (iii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2513 (ii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4124 (iii).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1943 (i).
See 'Freight Rates,' 'Grain Congestion,' 'Hudson Bay Ry.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. on Res., 5899; in Com., 6218, 6310 (iv).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2985, 3332, 3484 (ii).
—— on Order for Com. (remarks) 3332 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 449 (i).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture &c. (census) 6463 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 1039 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6773 (iv); Interior (salaries) 1038 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3306, 3919 (ii).
Justice (N.W. Teritories) 6560; Penitentiaries (salaries) 6596 (iv).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1502; (Gazette) 1491 (i).
Marine (Govt. steamers) 1964 (i).
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2825 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 2205; (Edmonton) 2206 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (generally) 2215 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2204 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Athabaska River) 2814; (Edmonton) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (Athabaska Landing) 2819; (Fort McMurray) 2819; (North Battleford) 2822; (Peace River) 2821; (Wood Mountain) 2821 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6605 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (bounties act) 687 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) in Com. on Res., 2160; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2685; in Com., 2877, 2972, 2994, 3586, (ii); on Senate Amts., 6675 (iv).
Universal Eyesight Insurance incorp. B. 126 (Mr. McLean) in Com., 5908, 5940 (iv).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6218 (iv).
Veitch Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 933 (i).
Vegreville and Lloydminster Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6177 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2983 (ii).
Webster, Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5989 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 2°, 6182 (iv).

OSLER, Sir E. B., *West Toronto.*
Architectural Institute of Canada (B. 35) 1°*, 969 (i).
Canadian Mortage Investment Co.'s (B. 11) 1°*, 643 (i).
Fort Osborne Barracks Transfer (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 5709 (iv).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2542 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 5793 (iv).

PACAUD, Mr. L. T., *Megantic.*
Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame de Lourdes, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1863 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal of (Ques.) 2579 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6285 (iv).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*
Budget, The, 5151 (iii).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 970 (i); in Com., 2012 (ii).
Dismissals from Government Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).
Franco-Canadian Trade Relations (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5759 (iv).
French Canadian Repatriation, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 619 (i).
Immigration Agents for Farm Labourers, in Quebec, Number (Ques.) 1359 (i).
Immigrant Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1212 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Immigration, Amount expended, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 1211 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, Amount expended (Ques.) 1213 (i).
Immigration Hospitals, Number and Location (Ques.) 1210 (i).
Immigration Literature, French Publications (Ques.) 1212 (i).
Immigration Medical Examiners, Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1213 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amount expended (Ques.) 1212 (i).
Immigration Societies, State-Aid, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1211 (i).
I. C. R., Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Fence Poles, Charges *re* Removal, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4966 (iii).
N. T. Ry., Inspector of Stations, Apptmt. of Mr. Goulet (Ques.) 3935 (ii).
Paris Exposition, Payments for Space, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 582 (i).
SUPPLY—
Militia (annual drill) 5501 (iii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*
American Shoe Machinery Co., Discontinuance of Proceedings *re* (Ques.) 572 (i).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing at Montreal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5730 (iv).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6088 (iv).
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton, &c. (Ques.) 1203 (i).
Fleming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Revenue Dept., Petrolla (Ques.) 4259 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1376 (i).
P. E. I. Car Ferry, Tels., Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 2458 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Govt. Car Service, Tel. sent to A. A. McLean (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Rathburn Post Office, Removal of Postmaster, &c. (M. for papers*) 4262 (iii).
Sarnia Armoury, Erection of (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i); (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2208 (ii); (Ques.) 555 (i).
Sarnia Winter Harbour (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i); Inquiry for Ret., 5946 (ii).
Speaker, Dep., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to appoint, 519 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (regulations) 3911 (ii).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P. (Postmaster General), *Quebec County.*
Anse a Valeau, Charges against Postmistress Madame Proulx (Ans.) 2072 (ii).
Archambault, Emile, Letter Carrier, Dismissal (Ans.) 5950 (iv).
Australian Pacific Cable, Proposals *re* (Ans.) 576 (i).
Bedford Postmaster Dismissal, on Inquiry for Ret., 5161 (iii).
Boucher, Mr. F. O., Pet. *re* Dismissals (Ans.) 976 (i).
Brazeau, Mr. Emile, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal (Ans.) 6337 (iv).
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re* (Ans.) 5948 (iv).
Brown, Wm., Postmaster at Point Fortune, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4780 (iii).
Brown, William, Pet. from Dr. E. Montpetit *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 4977 (iii).
Buck, Mr. A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal of (remarks) 3910 (ii).
Cable Rates, Reduction of Fees, Tel. from Imp. P.M.G. (read) 931 (i).
See 'Australia.'
Cable Rates to G. B. (remarks) on M for Sup. 3238 (ii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4114 (iii).
See 'Parcel Post,' &c.
Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. 6306 (iv).
Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation (Ans.) 1582 (i).
Canso Postmaster, Pet. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 1207 (i).
Cap Chat P.O., Pet. *re* Change of Name (Ans.) 1204 (i).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site (Ans.) 1020 (i).
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 1863 (i).
Chevrier, Isidore, Charges *re*, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4039, 4780 (iii).
Civil Service Act (mail clerks) Amt. (B. 106) M. for Com. on Res., 3056; in Com. on Res., 3155 (ii); in Com., 4782; on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com., 5263 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill 105.'
Civil Service Act (postmasters) Amt. (B. 124) M. for Com. on Res., 4042; in Com. on Res., 4583; 1°*, 4584 (iii).
Clouthier, Joseph, Postmaster at St. Adolphe de Dudswell, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4550 (iii).
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 3148 (ii).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Dismissal of Conservative Postmasters *re* Political Partisanship (Ans.) 2295 (ii).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 915 (i).
Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame de Lourdes, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1863 (i).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c. (Ans.) 3754 (ii).
Dumelong, E., Postmaster at L'Assomption, Dismissal of (Ans.) 580 (i).
Dupré, Dr., Postmaster at St. Robert, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Monk) on prop. Res., 5560; in Com. on Res., 6051; in Com., 6201 (iv).
East Roman Valley Post Office, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
Farly, Mrs. Paul, Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
Franking Privilege: *See* 'Political Literature.'
Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of (Ans.) 546 (i).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of (Ans.) 1204 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Policy (remarks) 1971 (ii).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c. (remarks) 804 (i).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Parcel Post,' 'Postal Regulations,' 'Rural Telephones.'
Henry, Norbert, Mail Contract between Scott Junction and Station (Ans.) 975 (i).
I. C. R. Branch Lines, in prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1010 (i).
Investigations *re* Political Partisanships, Cost of (Ans.) 5951 (iv).
Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
Laberge, Mr. H., Compensation *re* Death as Letter Carrier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
Lachenaie Postmaster, Charges *re* (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Lacombe, J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastien P. O., Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 975 (i).
Langevin Block, Condition of: *See* 'P. O. Deptl. Bldg.'
Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Legault, Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 5950 (iv).
Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office (Ans.) 5949 (iv).
Linwood and Grosvenor's Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 6337 (iv).
Lotbinière County Postmasters, Dismissed, Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 972 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office (Ans.) 2243 (ii).
McPherson, John H., Dismissal of (Ans.) 4259 (iii).
Mader, Mr. D., Dismissal from Mahone Bay P. O. (Ans.) 722 (i).
Magdalen Island Marconi News Service, Salary of Correspondent (Ans.) 4262 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4042 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms (Ans.) 4777 (iii).
Mail Clerks: *See* 'C. S. Act,' P. O. B. 105.'
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 5693 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4426; on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4946 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor. (remarks) 780 (i).
Marconi Co., Negotiations *re* Wireless Message to all Dominions (Ans.) 2586 (ii).
See 'Magdalen.'
Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1685 (i).
Marriage Bill, Correction *re* Speech, 3532 (ii).
Michaud, Mr. J., Dismissal from St. Moïse Station (Ans.) 1864 (i).
Montcalm Postmasters, Pets. *re* Removal (Ans.) 575 (i).
Moosejaw Post Office Inspector, on Inquiry for Ret., 4981 (iii).
Moosejaw Post Office, Proposed Sites, &c. (Ans.) 976 (i), 3342 (ii).
Moreau, Mr. J., Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Lapointe) for Cor., 1818 (i).
Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P.O. Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6321 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Station, Quebec City, Construction (remarks) 6786 (iv).
——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for O.Cs., &c., 760 (i).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage B. 3.'
Neuville Mail Contract and C. N. Ry. Station, Cancellation *re* (Ans.) 2067 (ii).
Newspaper Postage, Opinion from P. M. G. *re* Regulations (Ans.) 2291 (ii).
New Waterford Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 724 (i).
Northumberland Co., Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 6186 (iv).
Notre Dame des Anges, Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ans.) 554 (i).
Parcel Post between Canada and France, Signature *re* (Ans.) 569 (i).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2354 (ii).
See 'Postal Regulations.'
Parcel Post, Rates to European Countries (Ans.) 4777 (iii).
Payson, W. W., Dismissal from Post Office at Deep Brook (Ans.) 2243 (ii).
Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2580 (ii).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage (Ans.) 1586 (i).
Postal Convention between Canada and France (remarks) 935 (i).
Postal Regulations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2258 (ii).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Postmaster dismissed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissals (Ans.) 6781 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 3060 (ii).
Postmasters in Temiscouata Co., Dismissals, &c., Ans., 549 (i).
Postmasters and Town Councillors, Acceptance *re* (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 105) in Com. on Res., 3154; 2° m., 3349; in Com., 3355 (ii).
Post Offices, Change in Name (remarks) 3751 (ii).
Post Office Deptl. Buildings, Charges *re* Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1857 (i), 2015 (ii).
Post Office Dismissals, Policy *re* (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Pouliot, Louis, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4459 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 1030; on M. for 3°, 1711 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6214 (iv).
Ry. Mail Clerks: *See* 'C.S. Act,' 'P.O. Bill 105.'
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6214, 6305, 6321 (iv)

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4744 (iii), 5560 (iv).
Rigaud Postmaster, Applications *re* (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
River John Mail Carrier, Amount paid *re* (Ans.) 1579 (i).
Robert, Mr., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office (Ans.) 3537 (ii), 4778 (iii).
Rogers, J. M., Postmaster at East Roman Valley, Dismissal of (Ans.) 723 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery (B. 179) prop. Res., 5680; in Com. on Res., 5921; 1°m., 5922; in Com., 6084 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery, Extension, &c. (remarks) 2061 (ii).
——— Number of Boxes in Ont. (Ans.) 6782 (iv).
——— Routes, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
——— Routes, &c. (remarks) 5561 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Mail Boxes (Ans.) 1580 (i).
Rural Telephone System, Placing in Post Offices, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 2250 (ii).
St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Charges *re* R. Molloy, Investigation (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
St. Agathe des Monts, Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Bedard (Ans.) 973 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Charges, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Cor., 1592 (i).
St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick, on M. for Sup., 5926 (iv).
St. Amour Post Office, Changes since Jan. 1912 (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
St. Ancilet Postmaster, Request *re* Dismissal, on M. (Mr. E. Lapointe) for Cor., 2588 (ii).
St. Angele de Laval Postmaster, Charges *re* (Ans.) 3755 (ii); 4039 (iii).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contracts, Expiry of (Ans.) 5952 (iv).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail (Ans.) 5260 (iii).
St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6308 (iv).
St. Germain, Dismissal of Postmaster C. Michaud, on M. (Mr. E. Lapointe) for Cor., 1594 (i).
——— Changes *re* Apptmt. (Ans.) 1579 (i).
St. Isidore Postmastership, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 561 (i).
Ste. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of (Ans.) 1584 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation *re* (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
St. Paul L'Ermite Mail Carrier, &c. (Ans.) 2583 (ii).

PELLETIER, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
St. Paul L'Ermite Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts (Ans.) 3342 (ii).
St. Peter of Wakefield Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6288 (iv).
Ste. Therese and Laurentides Post Offices, Revenues, &c. (Ans.) 3336 (ii).
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Sayabec Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay (Ans.) 2068 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Postmistress, and Apptmt. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).
Scotch Village Postmaster in 1903, Charges *re* &c. (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Seamen St., Annapolis County, Post Office, Date of Opening (Ans.) 3755 (ii).
Small Pox in Ottawa Post Office (explanation) 1242 (i).
——— (remarks) 1280 (i).
Sorel and St. Victoria Mail Service, Date of Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
Spry Bay Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 577 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Naval Dept. (salaries) 1064 (i); Post Office (H. B. Verret) 6278 (iv); (salaries) 1066 (i); 6278 (iv).
Inland Rev. (salaries) conc., 6770 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5306 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6282; Outside Service (inspectors) 6646; (salaries) 6616 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec drill hall) 1851; (Quebec P.O.) 1852 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (French River) 6657 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 691 (i).
Sydney and Glace Bay Mail Service, Delay, &c. (stmnt.) 934 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2906 (ii).
Thibodeau, George, Resignation &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4249 (iii).
Val des Eboulis Mail Service, Date of William Roberts' Contract (Ans.) 3537 (ii), 4778 (iii).
Vaudreuil Post Office, Dismissal of J. B. A. Valois (Ans.) 3537 (ii).
Weedon Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Whitehead, N. S., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 2855 (ii).

PERLEY, Hon. G. H., *Argenteuil.*
Dry Docks Subsidy Act (prop. res.) 5559 (iv).
St. John Harbour, Dredging Tenders *re* (remarks) 5695 (iv).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1678 (i).

POWER, Mr. Wm., *West Quebec.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6510 (iv).
Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P.O. Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1583 (i).
SUPPLY—
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 6631 (iv).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*
Agricultural Committee, Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto Globe, 2156 (ii).
Car Shortage *re* Transportation of Hay Crop (remarks) 2753 (ii).
Daoust, Done, Postmaster at Alfred, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 3945 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3955 (ii).
Judges Act (additional) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5413 (iii), 6001 (iv); on M. for 3° (amt.) 6062 (iv).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4423; on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4967 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1691 (i).
Peat Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Renfrew, N., Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
Renfrew, S., Apptmts. to Public Service (Ques.) 3334 (ii).
——— Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
St. Amour Postmaster, Changes since Jan., 1912 (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
——— Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
St. Isidore de Prescott Postmastership, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6460 (iv).
Mines Branch (ore deposits) 6602 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4561 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm., *St. John City.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 139 (i).
Agricultural Aid B. 100 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 5277 (iii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 5561 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. White) on M. for 1°, 5555 (iv).
Bath, N.B., Dismissal of Postmistress (remarks) 966 (i).
Bathurst Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2363 (ii).
Battlefields Commission (remarks) *re* Vote, 5300 (iii).
Boundary Waterways Treaty, Apptmt. of Commissioners, Inquiry for Ret., 2589 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3833 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Brodie, Mr., Dismissal *re* St. John Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1529 (i).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) to M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4099, 4111 (iii).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Paquet) in Com., 2012 (ii).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6350 (iv).
Census Enumerators and Commissioners, Payments to (remarks) 1020 (i), 3835 (ii).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ques.) 554 (i).
Christmas Holidays, Adjournment *re* (remarks) 702, 927 (i).
Civil Service Act (private secretaries) Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 1435 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4577 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock Subsidy B. 111 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 3633 (ii).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5868; on M. for 3° (amt.) to ref. back to Com., 5960 (iv).
Dismissal of Public Officials, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 963-4 (i).
Dismissals from Govt. Service *re* Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1166, 1562 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 5559; in Com. on Res., 6050 (iv).
See 'Collingwood.'
Elevators, &c., ref. to in debate on Address, 154 (i).
Estimates, Discussion of outside works (remarks) *re* Ruling of Mr. Deputy Speaker, 2443 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) *re* Adjournment, 5937 (iv).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6510 (iv).
See 'G.B. & Can.'
Fenian Raid Veterans, Gratuity Res. (remarks) 5559 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Fisheries, Contracts with Stewards *re* Boarding Crews (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 681 (i).
Fish Scrap, Price *re* for Fertilizer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Flags, Use of, B. 74 (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for 1°, 1411 (i).
Fort Howe and Fort Cumberland, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Fort Osborne Barracks Transfer (Mr. Hughes) in Com. on Res., 5698 (iv).
——— Papers asked for, 5558 (iv.)
Gaspé Pier, Appropriation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2790 (ii).
Good Roads: *See* 'Highways.'
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re* (Ques.) 555 (i).
Govt. House Property, Toronto Transfer, B. 182 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 1°, 5958 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 869, 871 (i), 3521 (ii).
G.B. and Canada Mail Service, Contracts *re* (remarks) 1846 (i).
See 'Fast Atlantic.'
Hampton Spur Line, Construction *re*, &c. (Ques.) 572 (i).
Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2366 (ii).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4124, 4171 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1843 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 2°, 3647 (ii).
Highways and Road Construction, ref. to in debate on Address, 152 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 2°, 1021; in Com., 1284, 1415 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Acquisition by Govt., Tel. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 994 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6012 (iv).
Kennie, Capt. Edmund, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6782 (iv).
'Labour Gazette' Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., on M. for Sup., 1443 (i).
Lake Temiskaming Dam, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 2459 (ii).
See 'Temiskaming.'
Langevin Block, Condition of: *See* 'P. O. Deptl. Bldg.'
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6024 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater, N.B., Tests *re* Foundation, &c. (Ques.) 555 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3854; on M. for 1°, 3905 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4271; in Com., 4585; (amt.) *re* Subsidies, 4496; Amt. Neg. (Y. 62, N. 101) 4641; on Amts. (Mr. Borden) to M. for 3°, 4837; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4708 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension of, Par. in 'Montreal Star' (remarks) 489 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 781 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege, Signing of Resolution, 801 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 869; in Com. on Res., 871 (i).
Marcil, Mr. Tancrède, Application *re* Govt. Position (remarks) 2069 (ii).
National Ports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2839 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1868 (i).
N. T. Ry. Commissioners, Notification of Dismissal (remarks) 1196 (i).
N.T. Ry., Moncton to Levis, Portion uncompleted (Ques.) 932 (i).
Naval Ships for Canada, Ref. of Min. of Marine *re* Completion (Ques.) 1206 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Powers of Parlt. (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 797 (i).
——— Questions asked by the late Govt., Concurrence by present Govt., &c. (Ques.) 719 (i).
Ontario Boundaries Extension B. 152 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6155 (iv).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 5968 (iv).
Post Office Deptl. Building, Charges *re* Condition (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1858 (i).
Preferential Tariff with G. B., prop. Res. (M.) to withdraw, 1390 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy B. 178 (Mr. White) in Com., 6119, 6151 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies: *See* 'Highways,' 'Man. Boundaries,' &c.
Public Works Engineering Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1059 (i).
Public Works, N.B., Appropriation last year (correction) 2436 (ii).
Public Works, now under construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Quebec Boundaries Extension B. 151 (Mr. Borden) in Com., 6160 (iv).
Railway Bridges, N.B., Subsidy B. 188 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6374; on M. for 3°, 6394 (iv).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4123 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, ref. to in debate on Address, 142 (i).
Reid, Mr. Watson E., Dismissal as Inspector of Hillsboro Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2377 (ii).
Returning Officer W. H. Downey, Delay in Payments (remarks) 2057 (ii).
Rideau Hall, Expenditure *re*, Ques. of Priv., *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire,' 799 (i).
——— Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupancy (Ques.) 547 (i).
——— Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Kemp *re* Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 726 (i).
Rivière à la Prairie Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 622 (i).
Rooms alloted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re* (remarks) 670 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Tenders *re* (remarks) 5694 (iv).
——— Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623, 669 (i), 2371 (ii).
——— Improvements, Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities (Ques.) 566 (i).
——— Wharf Appropriation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2370 (ii).
St. John Harbour, Tugs employed, Amount paid per day (Ques.) 548 (i).
St. John Ry. Co.'s Crossing at Haymarket Square (M.) for Cor., &c., 1402 (i).
St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction (remarks) 4461 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4232 (iii). *See* 'Ry. Bridges.'
Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co., Cor. *re* Opening of Hillsborough Ry. (M. for copy*) 562 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1846 (i).
Sussex St. Property and Govt. Buildings Explanation *re* Abandonment, 2007 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census and statistics) 619 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 1040; Charges of Management (dom. notes) 1033; (salaries) 619; Conservation Commission (salaries) 1069; Finance (contingencies) 1068 (i); Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771 (iv); (salaries) 1062; Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 1036, 1039; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1041; Militia (salaries) 1037; Naval Dept. (salaries) 1062; Public Works (salaries) 1064; Railways (salaries) 1064 (i).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1469; (inspection *re* shipping machinery) 1525 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Cuba) 4721; (Can. and G. B.) 4718 (iii); (Canada and Mexico) 5935 (iv); (Halifax and Nfld.) 4729; (Halifax and W. Indies, &c.) 4740 (iii); (Mar. Provs. and Porto Rico (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 686 (i); (Pelee Island) 678; (St. John and Cuba) 678; (St. John and W. Indies) 640 (i).
Militia (armouries) 5543; (automobiles) 5515; (customs dues) 5522 (iii); (public buildings) 620 (i).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5319, 5327 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 5187 (iii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (water storage dams, Temiskaming dam) 2827; (monuments) 2825 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings (generally) 623 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hampton) 1527; (Hillsboro) 1528; (St. John drill hall) 1529 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Gananoque) 1855; (Kingston R.M.C.) 1855 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec customs house) 1849; (Quebec P.O.) 1852; (St. Lambert) 1853; (Shawinigan) 1852 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (repairs, &c.) 2814 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2441; (dredging) 2816 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 2363; (Goose Creek) 2372 (ii); (St. John) 623 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burke's Head) 2045; (repairs, &c.) 2051 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 2445; (York bridge) 2817 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivieres des Prairies) 2441; (Three Rivers) 2441 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (Athabasca Landing) 2819; (North Battleford) 2823 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 4137; (construction) 4133 (iii); (extensions) 5639 (iv); (Hampton) 4225 (iii); (Hampton spur) 675 (i); (working expenses) 4165 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 689; (bounties act) 687 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3044, 3541 (ii); 4080 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6668 (iv).
——— Appeal from Ruling (Mr. Bennett) 3615 (ii).
Temiskaming Dam, Inquiry for Ret., 5928, 6661 (iv).
See 'Lake Temiskaming.'
Transportation Question: *See* 'Fast Atlantic,' 'National Ports,' 'Dry Docks, St. John.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6180 (iv).
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Commissioners (M. for O. Cs., &c.) 981 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Waterways Commission, Dismissal and Apptmts., on M. for Sup., 6680 (iv).
—— (remarks) 966 (i).
See 'Boundary.'
West Indies, Australia and Canada Trade Relations, on M. for Sup., 1971 (ii).

RAINVILLE, Mr. J. H., *Chambly Verchères.*
Address, The, 337 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) to M. for 3°, 4865 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Resignation of Messrs. Ballantyne and Geoffrion (remarks) 6554 (iv).
Postmasters, Dismissals by Liberal Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6296 (iv).

REID, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 5054 (iii).

REID, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs) *Grenville.*
American Goods shipped into Canada, Names of Firms (Ans.) 3533 (ii).
Asbestos Importations, Total Value, on M. (Mr. Beland) for Ret., 1818 (i).
Asbestos Manufactures, Imports, &c. Value &c., on M. (Mr. Beland) for Ret., 1591 (i).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 1362 (i).
Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs (Ans.) 3151 (ii).
Boots and Shoes, Imports and Prices into Canada for 1908-9-10, on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Ret., 1267 (i).
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
Cement Importations, Quantity and Value, 1910-11 (Ans.) 3534 (ii).
Chubb, George, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4459 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufactured and Imported in each prov. for 1905 (Ans.) 556 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. (B. 116) (M. for Com. on Res.) 3829 (ii); in Com. on Res., 3971; 1°*, of Bill, 3972 (ii); 2°m., 4563; in Com., 4564 (iii).
Coasting Trade, O.C. extending Time (Ans.) 1815 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices, (remarks) 854 (i).
Cream Exports into U.S., Quantity and Value for 1911 (Ans.) 3535 (ii).
Customs Contracts given without tender (Ques.) 877 (i).
Customs Deptl. Report (presented) 971 (i).
Customs Smuggling Case, Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Ans.) 2072 (ii).

REID, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, on stmnt. (Mr. Sinclair) to M. for Sup., 5594 (iv).
Gerrior, Wm., Dismissal from Larry's River Customs Port (Ans.) 3052 (ii).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 539 (i).
Hattie, Mr. W. A., Preventive Officer at Mulgrave, Dismissal (Ans.) 1815 (i).
Hefferman, Mr. F. S., Customs Officer at Spring Hill, Dismissal (Ans.) 4039 (iii).
Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs, 1864 (i).
Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
Lobster Trap Twine, Change in Customs Tariff, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Papers, 1362 (i).
—— (remarks) 1071 (i).
See 'Twine.'
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, (amt.) suggested, 582; Reply to, 589 (i).
—— Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1803 (i).
McLean, W. S., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang (Ans.) 4780 (iii).
Miner, Bill, Escape (remarks) 939 (i).
Montreal Customs House, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour (Ans.) 4040 (iii).
Mundle, Mr. D. I., Dismissal from Customs at Richibucto (Ans.) 4780 (iii).
N.T.Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3366 (ii).
Oyster Pond Preventive Officer, Pet. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 1207 (i).
Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Quebec Customs (Ans.) 2071 (ii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 83 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3280 (ii).
Renfrew Election, Minister's speech *re* Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) 1573 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2057 (ii).
Robinson, Fred. P., Apptmt. as Preventive Officer, N.B. (Ans.) 4241 (iii).
Stoves, Ranges, Incubators exported to Argentine Republic, Value, &c. (Ans.) 561 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1040; Outside Ports (salaries) 1073 (i).
Marine (Govt. steamers) 1964 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 622 (i).
Therrien, J. F., Dismissal from Inland Revenue (Ans.) 3152 (ii).
Twine Materials Importations (Ans.) 3536 (ii).
See 'Lobster.'

REID, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Yule, Andrew, Customs Collector at Aurora Dismissal (Ans.) 4779 (iii), 5950 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*
Fast Atlantic Service, and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6501, 6516 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Line Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5628 (iv).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provinces (prop. res.) 2072 (ii).
Molson, Kenneth Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 3449 (ii).
Political Literature, Distribution *re*, Racial Prejudices (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6516 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Railways—I.C.R. (branch lines) 5628; (double tracking) 5637; (extensions) 5639 (iv).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*
O'Leary to West Point Ry. Branch Lines, Construction *re* (Ques.) 721 (i).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*
Cedar Rapids Power Co., Water Power Concessions to *re* St. Lawrence River, &c. (Ques.) 728 (i).
Cement Importations, Quantity and Value for 1910-11 (Ques.) 3534 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4572 (iii).
Cream Exports into U.S., Quantity and Value for 1911 (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Complaints *re* Weighing at Montreal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5741 (iv).
Dynamite and Explosives, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 724 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 2179; in Com., 2182, 2541, 3167, 3760 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6190 (iv).
Live Stock Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6032 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6330 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (branch stations) 6478; (farm bulletins) 6467; Miscellaneous (Toronto exhibition) 6482 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5488 (iii).

ROCHE, Hon. W. J., (Secretary of State) *Marquette.*
Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 2450 (ii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 2062 (ii).
Canadian Agents, Names of Appointees in Europe (Ans.) 5557 (iv).

ROCHE, Hon. W. J.—*Con.*
Canadian Missionaries in China, Stmnt. from Home Govt. (read) 6559 (iv).
C.P. Ry. Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers (Ans.) 5262 (iii).
Carleton County Electoral District, Issue of Writ, &c. (Ans.) 1810 (i).
Chinese and Japanese in B.C., Number naturalized, &c. (Ans.) 556 (i).
Civil Service List, on Inquiry for (remarks) 6187 (iv).
Commissioners of Investigation, Number employed by Govt., Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 6336 (iv).
Companies Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 529 (i).
Dunnville Customs and Postal Revenue for 1910-11 (Ans.) 2066 (ii).
Election Accounts, Delay *re* Payments (remarks) 2156 (ii), 4461 (iii).
Govt. Printing, Patronage to French Papers in Quebec (Ans.) 1357 (i).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Naturalization of (Ans.) 4978 (iii).
Joint Stock Companies Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 2857 (ii).
Joliette, Elections, Returning Officer (Ans.) 4979 (iii).
Keewatin, Pet. *re* Education Clauses (Ans.) 3149 (ii).
King's Printer, Apptmt. of Assistant (Ans.) 1809 (i).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6314 (iv).
Maritime Law, International Conference, &c. (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Maskinonge Election Expenses, Settlement of (Ans.) 4776 (iii).
Public Officials, Inquiries *re* Conduct of, Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec District (Ans.) 2063 (ii).
Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as assistants (Ans.) 5954 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Clocks, Number installed, Expenditure (Ans.) 2859 (ii).
——— Dismissals and Apptmts. (Ans.) 1809 (i).
——— Employees, Changes *re* Duties (Ans.) 2243 (i).
——— Salary Increases, &c. (Ans.) 2067 (ii).
——— Weekly Consultations (remarks) 2243 (ii).
Renfrew, N., Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 2857 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ans.) 2857 (ii).
Renfrew, S., Apptmts. to Govt. Service (Ans.) 3334 (ii).

ROCHE, Hon. W. J.—*Con.*
Renfrew, S., Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue, &c. *re* P.O. (Ans.) 725 (i).
Secretary of State, Report (presented) 565 (i).
SUPPLY.
Civil Govt.—Secretary of State (salaries) 1038 (i).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette*) 1472 (i).
Miscellaneous (additional commissioner) 6615; Parliamentary Documents (translation) 6614 (iv).
Printing Bureau (plant, &c.) 6611 (iv).
Tuberculosis in St. Jean and Iberville, Information *re* (Ans.) 3533 (ii).
Typewriters and Supplies, Names of Firms, &c. (Ans.) 1809 (i).
Vickers-Maxim Co., Contract *re* Montreal Dry Dock (Ans.) 2450 (ii).
Yamaska Electoral Agent, &c. (Ans.) 1584 (i.).

ROGERS, Hon. R. (Minister of the Interior) *Winnipeg.*
Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt. and Salary (Ans.) 1587 (i).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 1814 (i).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Medical Indian Attendant at Chester, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4976 (iii).
B. C. Railway Belt Lands, O. C. *re* Transfer (remarks) 1200 (i).
British News, &c., Purchase of by Int. Dept. (Ans.) 6660 (iv).
See 'Hawke.'
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6371 (iv).
Carpet Weavers Union, Violation of Immigration Act by J. C. Murray (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Census Enumerators, Payments to (remarks) 2668 (ii).
Chard, Mr. J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re* (Ans.) 2458 (ii).
Coal Supply in the West, Remission of Duties (remarks) 230 (i).
Combines in Trade, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1519 (i).
Crown Lands in Man., Alberta and Sask., Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands (Ans.) 1588 (i).
Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal (Ans.) 552 (i).
Dupont, Rene, Dismissal at Immigration Agent (Ans.) 1864 (i).
Eastern Township, Field for Immigration (remarks) 6558 (iv).

ROGERS, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Farm Labourers Immigration: *See* 'Immigration.'
Forts and Military Property, Improvements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).
French Canadian Repatriation (remarks) 619 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2781 (ii).
Grain Congestion in the West, Car Distribution (remarks) 6557 (iv).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6205 (iv).
Grain Shipments to Terminal Elevators (remarks) 6792 (iv).
Ham, Robt., Dismissal from Trachoma Hospital at Halifax (Ans.) 875 (i).
Hawkes, Mr. Arthur, Apptmt. in Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 527 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. C., 615 (i).
See 'British News,' 'Immigration.'
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3727 (ii).
Homestead Inspectors in Sask., Number dismissed, &c. (Ans.) 1588 (i).
House of Commons Desks, Change of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 1213 (i).
Immigration Agents in Belgium, Number, &c. (Ans.) 878 (i).
Immigration Agents, Dismissals, Number and Names (Ans.) 877 (i).
Immigration Agents *re* Farm Labourers, Number appointed (Ans.) 874 (i).
——— in Quebec, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1359 (i).
Immigration Agents in France, Names and Salaries (Ans.) 878, 1212 (i).
Immigration Agents, Notification to Booking Agents *re* Bonus (Ans.) 875 (i).
Immigration Agents and Ontario Farm Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3928 (ii).
Immigration from U.S., Opposition of Govt. (remarks) 3154 (ii).
Immigration Hospitals, Number and Location (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Immigrant Inspection before sailing for Canada (remarks) 618 (i).
Immigration Literature, French Publications (Ans.) 1212 (i).
Immigration Medical Examiners, Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1213 (i).
Immigration, Money expended, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ans.) 1211 (i).
Immigration Office in London, Ont. (Ans.) 2451 (ii).

ROGERS, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2143 (ii).
Immigration Premiums, Amount expended (Ans.) 1212 (i).
Immigration, Rep. of Mr. Hawkes, 6551 (iv). *See* 'Hawkes.'
Immigration Societies, State-Aid, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 1211 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1319 (i).
Japanese, &c., Immigration, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 875 (i).
Laforce, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 2242 (ii).
Land Grant to Railways in Western Provs., prior to 1896 (Ans.) 726 (i).
Laurier, R., Immigration Agent at Detroit, (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to M. for 2°, 4375; in Com., 4537; on Amt. (Mr. Béland) to M. for 3°, 4934; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4682 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 787 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act (prop. res.) 793 (i).
Man. Swamp Lands, Sale of by Auction (remarks) 4308 (iii).
Mining Rights Administration, O. Cs. *re* Resolution (remarks) 6792 (iv).
Municipal Elections and Civil Servants (Ans.) 1813 (i).
Murray, J. P., Breach of Immigration Regulations *re* Carpet Employees (Ans.) 550 (i).
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6244 (iv).
O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Buildings at Halifax (Ans.) 717 (i).
Oriental Immigration into B. C., Total Number (Ans.) 4779 (iii).
Peace River Railway Belt and Block (B. 149) 1°*, 5257 (iii); in Com., 5968, 6175; 3° m., 6188, 6338; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6401; 3° m., 6401 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6244 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2855 (ii).
Sevigny, Mr., Apptmt. *re* Immigration Office (Ans.) 1205, 1588, 1814 (i).
S. A. Veterans' Bounty Bill (remarks) 2061 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Scrip, Delay *re* Decision (remarks) 3154 (ii).
Statue erected on Govt. Lands in Quebec City by Provl. Govt. (Ans.) 2668 (ii).

ROGERS, Hon. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 1039; Interior (salaries) 1038 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 3306, 3915; (regulations *re*) 3912 (ii).
Labour Dept—(Gazette) 1468 (i).
Militia—(public buildings) 620 (i).
Miscellaneous (Paris agency) 6615 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (London, Eng.) 6655 (iv).
Svaigher, A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6186 (iv).
Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* Cancellation (Ans.) 1209 (i).
Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908 Amt. (B. 137) 1° m., 4974 (iii); 2° m., 5968 (iv); in Com., 6176, 6450 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act (remarks) 1577 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Min. of the Int. (Ans.) 553 (i).
Water Rights in Ry. Belt.: *See* 'Peace River.'
Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
White, Mr. James, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5989 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 5939; in Com., 6182 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 928 (i).
Canadian Public Health Association incorp. (B. 127) 1°*, 4835 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Stmnt. *re* Prices (remarks) 814 (i).
Grain Act. Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2170, 2181, 2304, 2383, 2535, 2759, 3157, 3458, 3473 (ii), 4069 (iii).
Grain Carriage to Duluth, &c., Ref. to Washington Despatch (remarks) 2576 (ii).
Grain Shipments from the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3978 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1248 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contract *re*, on M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., &c., 734 (i).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1731 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4763 (iii).
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1945 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals, &c.) 1331 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2967 (ii).
Wheat Grades, &c. (remarks) on Public Ownership debate, 663 (i).

SEGUIN, Mr. P. A., *L'Assomption.*
Archambault, Emile, Letter Carrier, Montreal, Dismissal (Ques.) 5950 (iv); (M. for cor.*) 5957 (iv).
Can. Northern Quebec Ry. Co., Maintenance of Road on L'Ile Bourdon (Ques.) 5261 (iii).
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1862 (i).
Coffin, Henry, Apptmt. as Messenger H. of C., Dismissal of M. Picotte (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
Dumelong, M. E., Dismissal from L'Assomption P. O. (Ques.) 580, 720 (i).
Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges (Ques.) 726 (i).
Ice-Breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 2451 (ii).
Lachenaie Postmaster, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5949 (iv).
L'Achigan Ice-Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
L'Assomption Public Works, Votes in Estimates (Ques.) 5951, 6781 (iv).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriation *re* (Ques.) 2451, 2579 (ii).
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property (Ques.) 2451 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers at Repentigny, Charges *re* &c. (Ques.) 3752 (ii), 5949 (iv).
——— (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c (Ques.) 3338 (ii).
Picotte, Mederic, Messenger H. of C., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2065 (ii).
St. Paul L'Ermite &c., Mail Carrier, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).
——— Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts (Ques.) 3341 (ii).
Ste. Therese and Laurentides Post Office, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3335 (ii).

SEVIGNY, Mr. A., *Dorchester.*
Address, The, in Answer to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 27 (v).
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6213 (iv).
Joint Stock Companies, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 2857 (ii).

SEVIGNY, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Beland) to M. for 3°, 4945, 4956 (iii).
N. T. Ry. Commission, Payments to Mr. E. Taschereau (Ques.) 2244 (ii).
——— Payments to Taschereau, Cannan & Co. (Ques.) 2245 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Damages in Dorchester Co., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 6184 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6213 (iv).
Vickers-Maxim Co., Contract *re* Construction of Dry Dock at Montreal (Ques.) 2450 (ii).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *East Peterborough.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 1st. Rep., Ref. to Printing Com. (M.) 3933 (ii).
——— Reports (presented) 2375 (ii).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 818 (i).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2557 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *North Ontario.*
Chats Falls Timber Slide, Date of Deed to D. O'Connor, &c. (Ques.) 4549 (iii).
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6089 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6458 (iv).
Imperial Loan and Investment Co.'s (B. 184) 1°*, 6061 (iv).
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6038 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1665 (i).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1890 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4759 (iii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2987, 3490 (ii).
Senate Amendments to Railway Bills, on M. for Sup., 6549 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Labour Dept. (*Gazette*) 1493 (i); Militia (customs dues) 5525 (iii); Railways—P.E.I. (car ferry) 5672 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3018, 3557 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6451 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16 (Mr. Aikins) in Com., 2984 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*
Budget, The, 5109 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2312, 2777, 3165, 3498, 3520 (ii), 4159 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2894 (ii).

SHEPHERD, Mr. F. H., *Nanaimo.*
B. C. Herring Fishing, Authority *re* Close Season (Ques.) 4256 (iii).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., Cost of Construction (Ques.) 4256 (iii) .
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2481 (ii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 3360 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Address, The, 323 (i).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates of 1913 (M. for ret.) 1819 (i).
Barss, Mr. Archibald, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Biological Board of Canada B. 118 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 4552 (iii).
Biological Board, Names, Salaries, &c., (Ques.) 4257 (iii).
Blind River Post Office, Change of Name (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 5928 (iv).
B. C. Fishing Licenses, Transfer, &c. (M. for pets.*) 3945 (ii).
Canadian Coal for Govt. Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3288 (ii).
Canals, Capital Expenditure, Total Cost (Ques.) 1811 (i).
Canal Tolls, Abolition of, O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 2861 (ii).
Canso Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) 581 (i).
——— Dismissal of R. Sutherland (M. for cor.*) 1409 (i).
——— Pet. *re* (Ques.) 1207 (i).
See 'Sutherland.'
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ques.) 974 (i).
Carleton County Electoral Vacancy, Issue of Writ, &c. (Ques.) 1810 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1208 (i).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 928 (i).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4572 (iii) .
Civil Service Investigation *re* Political Partisanship (Ques.) 1581 (i).
Coasting Trade, O.C. extending Time (Ques.) 1814 (i).
Commissioners appointed by Govt. *re* Investigations, Number, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5680, 6336 (iv).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Conciliation Board, Apptmt. of *re* International Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1508 (i).
Conway, Patrick J., Lightkeeper at White Head Island, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 2587, 3342 (ii).
See 'Whitehead.'
Cox, Mr. A. B., Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6784 (iv).
Cresine, Geo., Quarter Master on SS. 'Scotia,' Dismissal (Ques.) 1582 (i).
Crown Lands in Man. Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands, &c. (Ques.) 1587 (i).
Davis, John, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2845 (ii).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest (Ques.) 1811 (i).
Decoste, Capt., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3271 (ii).
Dismissals from Govt. Service *re* Political partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1088, 1557 (i), 2018, 3248, (ii),4187 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Papers, 944 (i).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re* (M. for cor.) 1391 (i).
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6514 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6255 (iv).
Ferguson, S. M., Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 2459 (ii).
Fish, Fresh, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
Fisheries Act (leases) Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 2°, 5273 (iii).
Fisheries Department, Reorganization of (remarks) 936 (i).
Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 3053 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3055 (ii).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4257 (iii).
Fishery Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2470 (ii).
Fish Scrap sold as Fertilizer, Increase in Price (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duties *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5587 (iv).
Gasolene Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c. (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2242 (ii).
Gerrior, Mr. William, Dismissal from Customs at Larry's River, N.S. (Ques.) 3051 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Gerrior, Mr. William, (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).
Glenelg, N.S. Postmaster, Complaints *re* Pets., &c. (M. for papers*) 1817 (i).
Guysborough Branch Line Subsidy (remarks) 1445 (i), 5261 (iv).
Hagerty, S. W., Dismissal from Inspector ship of Ry. Station (Ques.) 4976 (iii).
Halifax Terminal Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4205 (iii).
Harris, W. H., Postmaster at White Head, Dismissal, &c. (M. for papers*) 2588 (ii).
Hattie, Mr. W. A., Preventive Office, Mulgrave, Dismissal (Ques.) 1815 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 2460 (ii) .
Hendsbee, David S., Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries Dept. (M. for cor.*) 3342 (ii).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3703 (ii).
House of Commons, Improvements *re* Acoustics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1335 (i).
I.C.R., Guysborough Branch, Construction *re* (Ques.) 571 (i).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 6006 (iv).
Kelly, Edward, Dismissal from Canso Reduction Works (M. for cor.*) 3341 (ii).
Land Grants to Railways in Western Provs. prior to 1896 (Ques.) 725 (i).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector (Ques.) 5055 (ii).
Linwood and Grosvenor's Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
McGrath, James, Postmaster at Aspen, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 2587 (ii).
McPherson, John H., Complaints *re* as Postmaster at Tracadie Road (Ques.) 4259 (iii).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Man. and N.S., Federal Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 4258 (iii).
Marine Hospitals, Ships for Fishermen (remarks) 6787 (iv).
Melford, N.S., Wharf, Notice to suspend Work, &c. (Ques.) 549 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 97 (Mr. Hazen) 2416 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Total Debenture *re* Debt. (Ques.) 1357 (i).
N.T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 1871 (i).
N.T. Ry. (P. C. judgment) B. 95 (Mr. White) on M. for 2°, 3102 (ii).
Naval Policy of Govt., Ref. to in debate on Address, 331 (i).
Ne Temere Decree, Stmnt. of Member for Peterborough (Ques.) 731 (i).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
New Harbour Breakwater (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
Oyster Ponds, Preventive Officer, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1207 (i).
Panama Canal, Tolls, &c., Repts. of U.S. Papers (remarks) 2446 (ii).
Political Partisanship, Letter sent to Officers Inland Rev. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iv).
Post Office Dismissals, Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
Public Works under construction, Estimates *re* (remarks in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Public Works in Mar. Provs., Appropriations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2436 (ii).
Public Works for N.S., omitted from Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2794 (ii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6305 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4769 (iii).
Railway Contracts, Terms *re*, Applicable to N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4233 (iii).
Railway Estimates, Annual Statement (remarks) 4122 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6228, 6305 (iv).
Reciprocity Treaty, Ref. to in debate on Address, 323 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S. from 1890 to 1891 (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
Richards, Mr., Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5821, 6652 (iv).
Roberts, Capt. Alex., Postmaster at Canso, Dismissals, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3341 (ii).
Rogers, J. M., Dismissal from East Roman Valley Post Office, N.S. (Ques.) 722 (i).
——— (M. for pets.*) 1409 (i).
Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. of Acadian in N.B. (Ques.) 541 (i).
Smith, Lyman C., Customs Collector at Oshawa, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 2861 (ii).
——— Letter (read) in Com. on Bill, 4575 (iii).
Steam Trawling on Can., Coasts and Outside (M.) for Papers, 2461 (ii).
Steam Trawlers and Fisheries Bounties, (M. for pets.*) 5957 (iv).
Steam Trawlers, Protection against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5388 (iii).
Steel and Iron Bounties, *re* Budget Speech (Ques.) 4249 (iii).
Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Ry., I.C.R., Appropriation *re* (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 4262 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Sunnybrae to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6228 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6468; (fumigating stations) 6479; (Toronto exhibition) 6481 (iv).
Civil Govt. — Customs — Outside Ports (salaries) 1088 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6278 (iv).
Fisheries (lighthouse keepers) 6650 (iv); (protection service) 5387 (iii); (scrap as fertilizer) 684 (i).
Labour Dept. (combines investigation act) 1503 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 4714; Can. and G.B.) 4719; (Can. and S. Africa) 4727; (Halifax and Nfld.) 4728 (iii); (North Sydney) 679 (i); (Sydney and Wycocomagh) 4742 (iii).
Marine (Govt. steamers) 1964 (i).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 6486; (pelagic sealing) 5811 (iv).
Naval Service (maintenance) 5308, 5383 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 6281, 6294; Outside Service (salaries) 6622 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Wolfville) 1343; Ont. (Sarnia) 1952; Ottawa (leases) 1324 (i); Ottawa (rents, &c.) 3290 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2440; (Cole Harbour) 2055; (Melford) 2056 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 6606 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of management) 4136 (iii); (branch lines) 5621 (iv); (Dartmouth) 671 (i); (double tracking) 5638 (iv); (highways) 4226; (Mulgrave) 4225 (iii); (SS. Scotia) 5655; (wages) 5809; (Wallace Harbour spur line) 6604 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (annuities act) 695; (bounties act) 687 (i).
Sutherland, Mr., Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2018; Cor., &c. (read) 2022 (ii).
——— (remarks) 1274 (i).
See 'Canso.'
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3549 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6418 (iv).
Tory, H. L., Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
Tracadie Road Post Office, Charges *re* (M. for cor.*) 4459 (iii).
Twine Materials Importations, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Webber, James, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 6783 (iv).
White Head Island Lighthouse, Dismissal of Patrick Conway, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
See 'Conway.'
SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Whitehead, N. S., Dismissal of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2855 (ii).
——— Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
Williams, Mr., Dismissal from H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Hazen) in Com., 5999 (iv).
SMITH, Mr. Wm., *South Ontario.*
Live Stock Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6038 (iv).
SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule) *East Grey.*
Address, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Blondin) 372 (i).
Address, The, 'Trusts and Mergers,' applied to Min. of Fin., Member asked to withdraw, 63 (i).
Agriculture, 1st Rep. of Com., Irregularity *re* (remarks) 2375 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com., 3934 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Demers) on M. to introduce (remarks) 407 (i).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36, on M. for 3°, 2413 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec. (read) 794 (i); 3236 (ii); 4775 (iii).
Bills, Royal Assent, 4849 (iii).
Cable Rates to G.B., on M. for Sup., Members remarks checked, 3237 (ii).
Cable Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lemieux), Irrelevancy of debate, 4108 (iii).
——— Members remarks checked, 4104 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage dues) Amt. Bill (Mr. Edwards) on M. to introduce (remarks) 229, 267 (i).
Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) on M. for 3°, (ruling) 6371 (iv).
Canso Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker (remarks) 581 (i).
Car Shortage in the West, Members remarks checked, 1709 (i); 2754 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment, on M. (Mr. Borden) 930 (i).
Chicoutimi Electoral District, Controverted Election Certificate of Judge (presented) 11 (iv).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 820 (i).
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Doherty) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) to M. for 3°, 5962; on M. for 3°, 5892 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2847 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Dismissals, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fowler) 952 (i).
Documents handed in to 'Hansard,' not read (ruling) 6718 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 644 (i).
Dom. Notes Printing Contract, Members remarks checked, 1843 (i).
Educational Bills, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bickerdike) *re* Dom. Jurisdiction, 3873 (ii). *See* 'Queens.'
Estimates, Discussion in Conc., (remarks) 6805 (iv).
Fenian Raid Vets., Gratuity (remarks) *re* Resolution, 5559 (iv).
Fishery Treaty with U.S. (remarks) *re* Notice of Question, 408 (i).
Flags, Use of, B. 74 (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for 1°, 1411 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Guthrie) 3213 (ii).
——— (ruling) *re* permission to insert table in 'Hansard', without reading, 3222 (ii).
Georgian Bay Route and French River, Members's remarks checked, 6785 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3°, members remarks checked, 4813 (iii).
——— (ruling) *re* irrelevancy of debate, 4800 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3996 (ii).
G.T.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 711; on M. for 2° (remarks) 796 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 6576 (iv).
Gutelius, Mr. Fred., Apptmt. *re* Improper form of Question (remarks) 3934 (ii).
Hamilton Harbour B. 32 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 2449 (ii).
Highlands Bridge Construction, Member called to Order, 1197 (i).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to 2°, 3640 (ii); Senate Amendments (presented) 6731 (iv).
Immigration from U.S., Members remarks checked, 3154 (ii).
Immigration from the U.S., *re* Wm. Pearson Co., Members remarks checked, 3152 (ii).
Inquiries Act. Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for 2° (remarks) 1025 (i).
——— (ruling) *re* Procedure, 1281 (i).
Judges Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Doherty) on M. for Com. on Res., 5958 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Juvenile Delinquents B. 2 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com. (remarks) 939 (i).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c., Members remarks checked, 1412 (i).
Lobster Twine, Customs Duties, Members remarks checked, 1072 (i).
Lumber Combine in B. C., Distribution in Member's Boxes (personal explanation) 2299 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) Members remarks checked, 2297 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Rep. *re* Winnipeg 'Free Press' (remarks) *re* Question, 2446 (ii).
Man. Boundaries B. 115, on M. for 1°, Members remarks checked, 3902 (ii).
——— Ques. *re* Voting (Mr. Mondou) on 2°, 4398 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Vote on 3°, 4984 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* M. to ref. back to Com., 4890 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. *re* Settlement, &c., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for cor. (remarks) 777 (i).
——— Eastern Boundary Extension (ruling) *re* Question (Mr. Oliver) 3936 (ii).
——— Members remarks checked, 490 (i).
Man. Grain Act, on M. for Com. on Res., 869 (i).
Marine Hospital Ships, Members remarks checked, 6787 (iv).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, Members Remarks checked, 1604 (i).
Marriage Law, Par. in Toronto 'Star,' (ruling) *re* Question, 3942 (ii).
Members remarks checked, 177 (i).
Mess from His Ex. Estimates, 1911-12 (presented) 525 (i).
Moosejaw Armoury Site, Members remarks checked, 3974 (ii).
Moosejaw Inspector, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) Ruling, 4982 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal of (remarks) 1708 (i).
Morine, A. B., Charges *re* as candidate for election (remarks) 6185 (iv).
——— Correction *re* Ruling on Question, 6335 (iv).
Napierville Post Office Site, Members remarks checked, 3153 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Question *re* Ownership (remarks) 6337 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Station at Quebec, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for O. Cs. (remarks) 760 (i).
Naval Service Act, Repeal of (ruling) *re* Question (Mr. Mondou) 3943 (ii).
Ne Temere Decree, Questions asked, Members remarks checked, 720 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Newspaper Articles, Reading of, &c. (ruling) 3059 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Currie) on M. for 3°, (remarks) 2414 (ii).
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. B. 99, on Senate Amts. (ruling) 5679 (iv).
Panama Canal, Tolls, Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) checked, 2447 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) members remarks checked, 2346 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Armstrong) 2348 (ii).
Parliament Opening, Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec., 6 (v).
Peace Memorial Monument, Members remarks checked, 2590 (ii).
Peace River and Ry. Belt Water Power B. 149 (Mr. Rogers) on M. for 3°, 6188 (iv).
Piper, E. F., Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Fripp) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage, Ques. of Order, 1587 (i).
P. E. I., Better Terms, Member (Mr. J. J. Hughes) remarks checked, 5172 (iii).
Printing Com., 1st Rep. of Joint Com., on M. (Mr. Currie) to conc., 3330 (ii).
Private Bills, Rep. of Examiner of Pets., &c., Divergency *re* Rules (remarks) 643 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 6780 (iv).
——— Mess from the Senate, 6824 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., 2nd Rep., Ques. of Order., 5839 (iv).
Public Ownership, Members remarks checked, 666 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Hazen) on M. for 1°, 869 (i).
Quebec West Electoral District, Controverted Election Certificate of Judge (presented) 407 (i).
Queen's College B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) on Senate Amts., 6770 (iv).
See 'Educational.'
Questions to be asked, Proper Form, &c. (remarks) 4983, 5054 (iii).
Questions and Notices of Motions, Rules *re* Standing (remarks) 1015 (i).
Question *re* (Mr. Lemieux) ruled out of Order, 2580 (ii).
Railway Com., Reports of (remarks) 5999 (iv).
Renfrew S., Election, Issue of Writ, Members remarks checked, 2059 (ii).
——— Vacancy (notification) 926 (i).
Rideau Hall Expenditure, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) Members Remarks checked, 800 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Rural Telephone System, prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) Ruled out of Order, 2250 (ii).
——— Further Ruling, 2287 (ii).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Members remarks checked, 5695 (iv).
Seed Grain Distribution, Members remarks checked, 2300 (ii).
Senate Amendments Railway Bills (remarks) 6550-1 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Charges *re* Damien Lalonde, Objection *re* Question, 4249 (iii).
Speaker, (remarks) *re* Election, 6 (v).
Speaker, Dep., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to appoint, Member asked to withdraw Stmt., 522 (i).
Speech from the Throne (read) 8 (i).
Stenographic Assistance for Members (remarks) 1847 (i).
Shipping Act Amt. Bill, Ruling *re* M. to introduce, 229, 267 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Inland Revenue (promotions) conc., 6771, 6772 (iv).
Dismissals, &c., members remarks checked, 2039 (ii).
Public Works—Bridges (Ottawa River) 6806 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Louiseville) Members remarks checked, on conc., 6797 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 on Appeal from Chairman (Mr. Pugsley) 3616 (ii).
——— Member (Mr. Oliver) cannot impute motives, 2688 (ii).
——— Senate Amendments (presented) 6808 (iv).
——— on Senate Amts., Irrelevancy of debate, 6674 (iv).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16, on M. for 3°, 3280 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY (Mr. P. E. Blondin) *Champlain.*
Address, The, Ques. of Order *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 371 (i).
Barcelona Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. Macdonnell) in Com., amt. (Mr. Nesbitt) (ruling) 2412 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 4578 (iii).
Dismissals &c., Irrelevancy of Debate, in Com. of Sup., 3253 (ii).
——— Members remarks checked, 1960 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Maclean) 1184 (i).
Estimates, Members remarks checked, 2439 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., Members remarks checked, 3711 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY (Mr. P. E. Blondin) —*Con.*
I. C. Ry. Estimates, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Stevens) 4219 (iii).
Napierville Post Office Site, Payments *re* Members remarks checked, 2373 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 4759 (iii).
——— (ruling) *re* Amts., 4774 (iii).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 2992 (ii).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Post Office Site, Members remarks checked, 2442 (ii).
Sterling Life Assurance Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 2448 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Members remarks checked, 2043 (ii).
Militia, Member called to Order, 5538 (iii).
Naval Service (maintenance), Member called to order, 5317 (iii).
Post Office, Irrelevancy of debate (ruling) 6299 (iv).
Tariff Bill, Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) ruled out of Order, 3615 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. H. Clark) 2997 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 3617 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 3619 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., Irrelevancy of debate 6423 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Subsidy, in Com., 6304 (iv).
Dismissals from Public Service, Apptmt. of Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3249 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6190 (iv).
I. C. R., Provident Fund, Payments to Dismissed Officials (remarks) 5933 (iv).
——— Market Tickets to Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
Railway Com., G.T. Ry. Bill, Apptmt. of sub-Committee, Liberals omitted (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5617 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6304 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2057 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3306 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C., addition) 1951 (i); Weights and Measures (inspectors) 5830 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3012 (ii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 970 (i); in Com., 5201 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 850 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2309, 2541, 2759, 3168, 3187, 3467, 3781 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Freight Rates, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3985 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1726 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3893 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4308; on Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 4679 (iii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Tenders *re* Mail Boxes, &c. (Ques.) 1580 (i).
St. Lorette, Lake Man. Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2813 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2826 (ii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (repairs, &c.) 2813 (ii).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2909 (ii).
Voters' Lists for Man., Distribution from Printing Office (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief B. 16, on M. for 3°, 3281 (ii).

STEELE, Mr. M., *South Perth.*
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6266 (iv).
Highways Improvements B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3684 (ii).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 4762 (iii).

STEVENS, Mr. H. H., *Vancouver.*
Address, The, 281 (i).
Agriculture, 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 2375 (ii).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6318 (iv).
Can. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 5200 (iii).
Chinese entering B.C., Total Number (Ques.) 4778 (iii).
Chinese Tax in B.C., Ref. to in debate on Address, 285 (i).
Chinese and Japanese in B.C., Number naturalized (Ques.) 555 (i).
See 'Oriental.'
Coal Combine in B.C., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 4240 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 853 (i).
Criminal Code (piracy of logs) Amt. (B. 9) 1°m., 407; 2°m., 944, 1821 (i); in Com., 2532 (ii).

STEVENS, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Elevators, Terminal, ref. to in debate on Address, 287 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6222 (iv).
Fishery Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2473 (ii).
Fisheries Question in B.C., ref. to in debate on Address, 290 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3232 (ii).
See 'Ry. Rates.'
Good Roads, ref. to in debate on Address, 284 (i) .
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3986, 3998 (ii).
I. C. Ry. Estimates, Ques. of Order, 4218 (iii).
'Kestrel' Fishery Cruiser, Condemnation of (Ques.) 549 (i).
Logs, Stealing of: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 9.'
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1747 (i).
N.T. Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3423 (ii).
Naval Policy, ref. to in debate on Address, 291 (i).
North Arm Bridge and Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 643 (i).
Oriental Immigration into B.C., Total Number (Ques.) 4779 (iii).
See 'Chinese.'
Railway Rates, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1925 (i).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Railway Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6218, 6318 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2936 (ii).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) 1°*, 4976 (iii).
Vancouver Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 643 (i).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6218 (iv).
——— Bridge Subsidy, in Com., 6325 (iv).

STEWART, Mr. T. J., *West Hamilton.*
Hamilton Harbour (B. 23) 1°*, 794 (i); in Com., 2449 (ii).

SUTHERLAND, Mr. D., *South Oxford.*
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6265 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2554, 2767 (ii).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3695 (ii).

SUTHERLAND, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Immigration Agents *re* Farm Labourers Number appointed, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).
——— Notification to Booking Agents *re* Bonus, &c. (Ques.) 875 (i).
Immigration Agents for Placing Farm Labourers in Ont., Complaints *re* (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 5263 (iii).
Immigration Policy *re* Mar. Provs., on prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2126 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture—Experimental farms (branch stations) 6485 (iv); Immigration (agencies, &c.) 3923 (ii); Railways—I. C. R. (branch lines) 5624 (iv).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6412 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 2840 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Interpretation and Enforcement, on M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 594 (i).
——— Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1766 (i).

THOBURN, Mr. Wm., *North Lanark.*
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Pelletier) in Com., 6090 (iv).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Prices *re* (remarks) 828 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans Bounty B. 190 (Mr. Hughes) in Com., 6264 (iv).
Grain Congestion in the West, Transportation, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6206 (iv).
Negro Immigration (remarks) on Immigration Question, 608 (i).

THOMPSON, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*
Fishery Protection Service on Pacific Coast, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Papers, 2484 (ii).
Mounted Police, Annuities to families of Messrs. Fitzgerald, and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5177 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Mines (ore deposits) 6490 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. W. T. White) on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to M. for 2°, 2741 (ii).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4562 (iii); in Com., 5568 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Rogers) in Com., 6182 (iv).

THOMSON, Mr. L., *Qu'Appelle.*
Gold Coinage by Mint (Ques.) 1213 (i).

THOMSON, Mr. L.—*Con.*
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2183, 2304, 2323, 2397, 2536, 2783, 3794 (ii), 4064, 4158 (iii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3°, 2576 (ii).
Grain Act B. 32 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3° (amt.) 4794, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 92) 4801 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors, Number employed in Sask., Number dismissed, &c. (Ques.) 1588 i).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act, on Amt. (Mr. Turriff) 1742 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2519 (ii).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*
Live Stock Records Association B. 167 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 6045 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Animals destroyed at North Ham, Pet. *re* Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Capital Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 177) 1°*, 5831 (iv).
Carrier, Mr., Postmaster at St. Francis Xavier de Brampton, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 4578 (iii).
Clouthier, Joseph, Postmaster at St. Adolphe de Dudswell, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4549 (iii).
——— (M. for papers*) 4781 (iii).
Desmarais, Mr., Dismissal *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).
Disraeli Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Garthby, Lake Aylmer Wharf Construction (M. for papers, &c.*) 4781 (iii).
Ham Nord Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer on Lake Aylmer (Ques.) 4550 (iii).
Postmasters dismissed, Investigation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Shurtleff, Dr., Investigation *re* J. Clouthier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (animals health) 6472 (iv).
Militia (headquarters staff) 5537 (iii).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries, &c.) 6615 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, Generally (London, Eng.) 6656 (iv).
Weedon Public Building, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4550 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— (M. for cor.*) 4781 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 6492 (iv).

TREMAIN, Mr. H. B., *Hants.*
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals, on M. for Sup., 6512 (iv).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*
Address, The, 388 (i).
Annuities Branch Lecturers, Charges *re* J. B. Leger &c. (Ques.) 1413 (i).
Caraquet North Shore Ry. Branch Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4192 (iii).
Customs Collector P. J. Venoit, Dismissal of (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Fishery Overseer, J. A. Doucet, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1590 (i).
Fishery Overseer, W. C. Robichaud, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1589 (i).
——— Dismissal of, Inquiry for Ret., 5259 (iii).
Fishing Twine for Lobster Nets, Duty *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5594 (iv).
Highways Improvement B. 77 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3965 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1003 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 4585 (iii).
Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re* (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6230 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 2364 (ii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*
Alberta Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5945 (iv).
Canadian Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 187 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6368 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Delay *re* Payments (remarks) 4460 (iii).
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices, &c. (remarks) 842 (i).
Customs Tariff, Changes *re* Jute Cloth, Dressed Lumber, &c. Rulings, &c. (M. for copies*) 2459 (ii).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
Election Accounts, Payments of (remarks) 4460 (iii).
Flaxseed, Shipment of, Excessive Freight Rates (remarks) 661 (i).
Freight Rates, Discrimination in the West (amt.) on M. for Sup., 3194 (ii).
——— Notice of Discussion, 3048 (ii).
See 'Grain Shipments.'
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Public.'
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 2317, 2535, 2758, 3169, 3502, 3761 (ii), 4065 (iii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Grain Congestion in the West, Transportation, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6207 (iv).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4012 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway Construction, on M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1252 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., &c. 742 (i).
Immigration from U.S., Opposition of Govt. (remarks) 3154 (ii).
——— *re* Wm. Pearson Co. (remarks) 3152 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 1008 (i).
Lumber Duties, Inspection as reported in Winnipeg 'Free Press' (remarks) 2446 (ii).
Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act (amt.) 1723; neg. (Y. 62; N. 107) 1806 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3869 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Settlement *re*, on M. (Mr. Macdonald) for Cor., 781 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Inquiry for, 1820 (i).
N.T.Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3140 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co., Prohibition *re* Grinding Machines (re, marks) 2059 (ii).
Parcel Post Extension, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Post Office Dismissals, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
Public Ownership of Govt. Utilities, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
See 'Parcel.'
Railway Act (tariffs) Amt. (B. 6) 1°m., 176 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 6) 2°m., 944; 2°m., 1015 (i).
——— resmd. adjourned debate on 2°, 2499 (ii).
——— on M. for adjnd. debate, 1821 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2529 (ii).
Ry. Construction in the West, Shortage of Steel Rails (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6543 (iv).
Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief B. 84 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 3491 (ii).
Railway Question, Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1921 (i).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Wilcox Board of Trade (remarks) 2301 (ii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 6303 (iv).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 2928, 2969, 3024 (ii); on Senate Amts. 6673 (iv).
Yukon Judges Annuities B. 123 (Mr Doherty) in Com. on Res., 4557 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Address, The, 276 (i).
Budget, The, 5056 (iii).
Campeau, Michel, Dismissal from P.O. at St. Louis du Mile End (Ques.) 1414 (i).
Cold Storage Establishments in Canada, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3343 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5561 (iv).
Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
I.C.R., Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation (Ques.) 6748 (iv).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Apptmt. in Richelieu County (Ques.) 2292 (ii).
Labour Gazette Correspondents, Names of Apptmts. (Ques.) 1865 (i).
——— Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 1411 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1441 (i).
Lord's Day Act (musicians) Amt. (B. 85) 1°m., 2057 (ii).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of (Ques.) 550 (i).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application for Leave (Ques.) 5954 (iv).
Murray, J. P., Carpet Co., Breach of Immigration Regulations (Ques.) 550 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., ref. to in debate on Address, 279 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1375 (i).
Parliamentary Restaurant, Payments to Waiters, &c. (Ques.) 2861 (ii).
Reciprocity, ref. to in debate on Address, 277 (i).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 1471 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5502 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve, 1347 (i).
Tariff Commission B. 88 (Mr. White) in Com., 3041 (ii).
Waiters in Restaurants, &c., Minimum Wages paid to (Ques.) 3049 (ii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *Center York, Ont*
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1630 (i).

WARNOCK, Mr. D., *Macleod.*
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6315 (iv).

WARNOCK, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Chabot) in Com., 5906 (iv).
Coal Shortage in the West, for Household Consumption, &c. (Ques.) 568 (i).
Coal Strike in Fernie, B. C., Information *re* (Ques.) 568 (i).
Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3504 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4790 (iii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2530 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 183 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. 6315 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 2212 (ii).

WEBSTER, Mr. J., *Brockville.*
Address, The, 372 (i).
Dairying Industry, Complaints *re* Weighing at Montreal, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5727 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6574 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6197 (iv).

WEICHEL, Mr. W. G., *North Waterloo.*
Address, The, 401 (i).
Customs Weighing of Goods, Decree of French Govt. (Ques.) 721 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*
Canal Traffic, Total Tonnage for 1911 (Ques.) 3051 (ii).
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1409 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 795 (i); in Com., 4699 (iii).
Stoves, Ranges, Incubators, &c., Exported to Argentine Republic, Value, &c. (Ques.) 561 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (surveys) 5789 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5470 (iii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry. Subsidy, B. 186 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 6422 (iv).
Welland Canal, Quantity of American Freight passing through (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
—— Water Power, Diversion, &c. (Ques.) 6747 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. Wm. H., *Victoria, Alberta.*
Grain Act Amt., B. 32 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3519 (ii).
Grain Shipments in the West, Regulations of Freight Rates, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 4001 (ii).
Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal (Ques.) 6183 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. Wm. H.—*Con.*
Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 2068 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Clocks, Number installed, Expenditure (Ques.) 2859 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Telegraphs—Alta. (Moose to Durlingville) 2820 (ii).
R. N. W. M. P. (pay of force) 5180 (iii).
Vegreville and Lloydminster Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).

WHITE, Hon. W. T., (Minister of Finance) *Leeds.*
Address, The, 440 (i).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 970 (i).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 5555; in Com., 5846 (iv).
Banking Act Legislation (remarks) 938 (i).
Bank Note Contract: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Battlefields Commission, (M.) to strike out vote (remarks) 5299 (iii).
Bounties on Steel Rods, &c. (Ans.) 529 (i). *See* 'Steel.'
British American Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 155 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 5946 (iv).
British Empire Trust Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Cromwell) on M. for 2°, 1201 (i).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 4985 (iii). *See* 'Financial Review.'
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Subsidy (B. 144) M. for Com. on Res., 4140; in Com. on Res., 5162; in Com., 5404 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantee &c. (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
Civil Service Act (Aud. Gen.) Amt. (B. 113) prop. Res., 3539; in Com. on Res., 3632 (ii); 1°* of Bill, 3633 (ii); in Com., 4081 (iii).
Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman (Ans.) 2667 (ii).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest (Ans.) 1811 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 4778 (iii).
—— Limitations *re* Tenders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
—— Complaints of British Companies (explanation) 5843 (iv).
Estimates, The (1911-12) presented, 525 (i).
Estimates (1912-13) presented, 971 (i).
Estimates Supply (remarks) 1576 (i), 6154 (iv).
Estimates, Supply (1912) M. to ref. to Com., 4974 (iii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Reimbursements *re* (Ans.) 528 (i).
Farmers' Bank and Banque St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors (Ans.) 551 (i).

WHITE, Hon. W. T.—*Con.*
Financial Review (reply) to Mr. A. K. Maclean, 6722 (iv).
See '*Budget.*'
Gold Coinage, by Mint (Ans.) 1213 (i).
Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 4778 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry. Implementing Judgment (B. 95) prop. Res., 2296; in Com. on Res., 2378; 1°*, of B., 2381, 2°m., 3060, 3115 (ii).
See 'N. T. Ry.'
Hull City Hall Square Improvements *re* (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
Inquiries Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 1304 (i).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe, Investigation *re* Liquidation (Ans.) 2069 (ii).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements *re* (Ans.) 528, 551 (i).
Loans: *See* 'Govt.'
Manitoba Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3848 (ii); in Com., 4530 (iii).
Man. and N.S. Federal Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 4259 (iii).
Marriage Act. Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, and M. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, 1665 (i).
Montreal Athletic Association, Pet. *re* Govt. Aid (remarks) 1723 (i).
National Battlefields Rep. (presented) 565 (i).
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3366, 3395 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Bill 95 (remarks) *re* Factum, 2589 (ii).
Notes, Printing of: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burnham) 1368 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Rep. (presented) 565 (i).
Preferential Tariff to G.B., Increase of (Ans.) 554 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy (B. 178) (prop. res.) 5558; in Com. on Res., 5859; 1°*, 5862; in Com., 6114, 6128 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies: *See* 'Man. Boundaries,' 'P.E.I. Subsidy.'
Public Accounts Rep. (presented) 11 (i).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. (B. 170) 1° m., 5556; in Com. and 3°*, 5859 (iv).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3878 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 447 (i).
Royal Society of Canada Rep. (presented) 565 (i).
Steel and Iron Bounties, *re* Budget Speech (Ans.) 529 (i); 4249 (iii).

WHITE, Hon. W. T.—*Con.*
Steel and Iron Bounties, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2589 (ii).
Supply (M.) for Com., 525 (i).
Supply (B. 18) prop. Res., 702; 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 703 (i).
Supply (B. 193) in Com. on Ways and Means, 6807 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1040, 1061 (i); Charges of Management (coin circulation) 1034; (dom. notes) 1033; (salaries) 619; Conservation Commission (salaries) 1069; Finance (salaries) 1068 (i).
Labour Gazette (Gazette) 1488 (i).
Tariff Commission (B. 88) Res. prop.., 1839 (i); in Com. on Res. 2157; 2° m., 2591; in Com., 2862, 2939, 3026, 3540 (ii), 4079; 3° m., 4144 (iii); on Senate Amts. (M.) *re* concurrence, 6663; (objections) 6808 (iv).
Travelling Allowance to Members during adjournments (remarks) 1849 (i).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 4985 (iii).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 525, 702 (i).

WILCOX, Mr. O. J., *North Essex.*
Brian, Mr., Dismissal for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Dismissals for Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077, 1169 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 130 (Mr. Currie) in Com., 6752 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs Outside Ports (salaries) 1077 (i); Militia (automobiles) 5508 (iii).
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2217 (ii).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4248 (iii).
Civil Service List, Inquiry for, 6187 (iv).
Copyright Law, Legislation *re* Uniformity (Ques.) 557, 1208 (i).
—— (remarks) 935 (i).
Dismissals from Ottawa Depts., Inquiry for Ret., 3834 (ii).
Govt. Employees, Dismissal, resigned, &c. (M. for ret.) 1818 (i).
G.T.P. Workshops at Quebec, Site for Building (Ques.) 3050 (ii).
House of Commons Dismissals, Inquiry for Ret., 6807 (iv).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Geneviève Wharfs, Completion of Repairs (Ques.) 557 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (grain) Amt. B. 178 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 6194 (iv).
Maple Sugar, O.C. *re* Standard, Annullment of (Ques.) 716 (i).
Marriage Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1691 (i).

WILSON, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Penitentiary Employees Salaries, Increase *re* (Ques.) 1205 (i).
Queen's University B. 68 (Mr. Nickle) in Com., 3876 (ii).
Rivières des Prairies, Drainage, Continuation of, Amount voted *re* (Ques.) 714 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
SUPPLY—
Justice—Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 6586 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Doncaster Indian Reserve) 6807 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways—I.C.R. (locomotives) 5657 (iv).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Doherty) in Com., 5571 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. G. C., *Wentworth.*
N. T. Ry. (commissioners) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Cochrane) in Com., 3420 (ii).

WRIGHT, Mr. Wm., *Muskoka.*
Cockshutt Plough Co.'s Prices (remarks) 853, 861 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt. and Salary: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1587 (i).

'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 408 (i).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Hazen) 489 (i).

Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Pilots: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii) .

Adams, Wm. Holloway, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Address, The, in Answer to His Royal Highness' Speech: Moved (Mr. R. B. Bennett) 14; Seconded (Mr. Sevigny) 27 (i).

DEBATE.

(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 33 (amt.) 49; Neg. (Y. 77, N. 121) 517; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 50; (Mr. Guthrie) 62; (Mr. Foster) 72; (Mr. Carvell) 82; (Mr. Aikins) 94; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 107; (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 127; (Mr. Pugsley) 139; (Mr. Hazen) 162; (Mr. McKenzie) 178; (Mr. A. DeWitt Foster) 201; (Mr. M. Clark) 210; (Mr. Monk) 223, 231; (Mr. Lemieux) 241; (Mr. Mondou) 263, 270; (Mr. Verville) 276; (Mr. Stevens) 281; (Mr. Ethier) 295; (Mr. Burnham) 318; (Mr. Sinclair) 323; (Mr. Rainville) 337; (Mr. Devlin) 348; (Mr. Northrup) 357; (Mr. German) 364; (Mr. Webster) 372; (Mr. Turgeon) 388; (Mr. Weichel) 401; (Mr. Buchanan) 403; (Mr. Fripp) 409; (Mr. Emmerson) 413; (Mr. W. T. White) 440; (Mr. Oliver) 448; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 464; (Mr. Gauthier) 475; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 482; (Mr. Loggie) 487, 491; (Mr. Boivin) 497; (Mr. Murphy) 501 (i).

Address, The, Precedence: M. (Rt. Hon. Mr. Borden) 9 (i).

——— M. to Present (Mr. Borden) 519 (i).

——— Reply from H.R.H.: Presented (Mr. Borden) 932 (i).

Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2449 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 100.'

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1041 (i), 6485 (iv).

Agricultural and Colonization Com., 1st Rep.: M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to ref. to Printing Com., 3933 (ii) .

——— M. (Mr. Sexsmith) to conc., 2375; objection (Mr. Speaker) 2375 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 2155 (ii).

Animals destroyed at North Ham, Pet. *re* Compensation: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Animals Health, Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).

Apples and Fruit Growers Association, N.S., Resolution *re* Industry: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 1719 (i).

Archives Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).

Cattle Diseased, Compensation *re* Damages: Remarks (Mr. Morphy) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).

Cattle Embargo by G.B., Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 557 (i).

Cattle Quarantine at Beauceville, Res. from Chamber of Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 4984 (iii).

Dom. Exhibition, Grant to Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).

Experimental Branch Stations for Farms: in Com. of Sup., 6477 (iv).

Experimental Farm Bulletins, Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).

Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).

Horses imported from U.S., Destruction of for Glanders: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 5693, 5939, 6790 (iv).

International Institute of Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv) .

Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).

Nursery Stock, Purchase of for Experimental Farm, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3333 (ii).

Paris Exposition, Payments for Space: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Paquet) 582 (i).

Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).

Tobacco Growing, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv).

Toronto Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 6480 (iv) .

Wheeler, Seager, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at N.Y. Exhibition: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 542 (i).

Year-book: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
See 'Marine.'

Air Brakes, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii).

Airships for Military Purposes, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Alabama Traction Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 1575 (i).
Alberta Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6314 (iv).
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Albert Mines and Hillsborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6246, 6304 (iv).
See 'Harvey.'
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3053 (ii).
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3536 (ii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5897, 6216, 6312 (iv).
Algoma Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34."
American Freight passing through Welland Canal: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
American Goods shipped into Canada, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 3533 (ii).
American Shoe Machinery Co., Discontinuance of Proceedings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 572 (i).
See 'United Shoe.'
Anderson, Mr., Salary Increase: in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Animals destroyed at North Ham, Pet. *re* Compensation: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Animals Health, Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).
Annuities Branch: in Com. of Sup., 688 (i).
Annuities Branch Lecturers, Charges *re* J. B. Leger, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Turgeon) 1413 (i).
—— Extra Payment to Agents: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 973 (i).
—— Transfer to P. O. Dept., Dismissal of Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 727 (i).
Anse aux Canards Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Anse au Canard Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Anse à Valeau Postmistress, Charges *re* Madame Proulx: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2072 (ii).
Antigonish County Public Works Appropriations: Remarks (Mr. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2438 (ii).
Antigonish Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2022 (ii).
Antigonish to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6227 (iv).
See 'Railways.'
Apples and Fruit Growers' Association, N.S., Resolutions *re* Industry: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 1719 (i).
Appropriations omitted from Estimates of 1913: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sinclair) 1819 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Archambault, Mr. Emile, Dismissal *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Séguin) 5957 (iii).
—— Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Séguin) 5950 (iv).
Archibald, Mr. P. S., Emplymt. by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).
Architectural Institute of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Archives Dept.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Archives, Dep. Minister: in Com. of Sup., 6460 (iv).
Archives Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).
'Arctic' Steamship, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5398 (iii).
Arichat and Canso Mail Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 4733 (iii).
Arichat, Retaining Wall: in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Armouries and Public Buildings, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Armouries: in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).
See 'Public Works.'
Art Gallery: in Com. of Sup., 2825 (ii).
—— Purchase of Paintings: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 1865 (i).
See 'National Art Gallery.'
Asbestos Manufacture Imports, Total Value, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Béland) 1590, 1817 (i).
Ash, Mr. Earl, Claims *re* Damages for Fire on I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Emmerson) 2246 (ii).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment for: M. (Mr. Borden) 3343 (ii).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
Assent to Bills: *See* 'Bills.'
Athabasca Landing to Grand Prairie Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).
Athabaska River Landing: in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
Atlantic Coast Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Temporary Clerks: *See* 'B. No. 113.'
Aud. Gen.'s Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 970 (i).

Aurora Public Building, Papers, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 561 (i).

Australian Pacific Cable, Proposals *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 576 (i).
See 'Cable.'

Australian Trade Possibilities: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 1981 (ii).

Automobiles purchased for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
See 'Militia.'

Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4714 (iii).

Baddeck Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6658 (iv).

Bait, Cold Storage: in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'

Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs at Coaticooke: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1361 (i).

Ballots, Voting by Divisions: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 4979 (iii).

Bands, and Associations Grants, *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv).

Banking Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Demers) on M. to introduce (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).

Bank Act (extension of charters) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'

Banking Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1820 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 938 (i).

Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Barss, Mr. Archibald, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).

Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).

Bath Postmistress, Dismissal: in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
See 'Boham.'

Bathurst Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2363 (ii).

Battlefields Commission: M. (Mr. White) to strike out vote, 5299 (iii).

Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).

Bayfield Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).

Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3337 (ii).

Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3151 (ii).

Beaumont Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2366 (ii).

Beaver Bank Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).

Bedford Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).

Bedford Postmaster, Dismissal: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Kay) 5161 (iii).
See 'Jones.'

Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I. C. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3050 (ii).

Benoit, Mr. Joseph, Complaints *re* Suspension, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1817 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4184 (iii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2062 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'

Berlin P. O. Clock: Remarks (Mr. Clare) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).

Berthier-en-Haut Post Office, Purchase, Repairs, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Barrette) 1409 (i).

—— Desmarais, Mr., Dismissal *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).

Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4248 (iii).

Bills, Sen. Amts., 6493, 6544, 6577 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, 819 (i), 3241 (ii), 4849 (iii), 6824 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 794 (i), 3236 (ii), 4775 (iii).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Mr. Borden).
1°*, 9 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 12; 2°, 939; in Com., 939; 3°*, 1596 (i).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Marriage Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 12; on Order for 2°, 581; 2° m., 1597; Amt. (Mr. Borden) to adjn. debate, agreed to (Y. 87; N. 61) 1707 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 12 (i).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 13 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 176; 2° m., 944, 1015, 1821 (i); 2499 (ii).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 267 (i); 2°, 2500 (ii).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Burnham).
1°, 337; 2° m., 1017 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°, 407; 2° m., 944; 2°, 1821 (i); in Com., 2532; 3°, 2535 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 10) Respecting the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 643; 2°*, 1120; in Com., and 3°*, 1577 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the Canadian Birkbeck Investment and Savings Company, and to change its name to The Canadian Mortgage Investment Company.—(Mr. Osler).
1°, 643, 2°*, 1120 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2061 (ii).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1120 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) To incorporate the Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 643; 2°*, 795 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 14) To incorporate the North Arm Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1530 (i).

Bill (No. 15) To incorporate the Vancouver Life Insurance Company, of Vancouver, B.C.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting certain Patents of Thomas Wadge.—(Mr. Aikins).
1°, 643; 2°*, 1200 (i); in Com., 2854, 2983, 3280; 3°*, 3283 (ii).

Bill (No. 17) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 644 (i).

Bill (No. 18) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1912.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
In Com. on Ways and Means, 702, 1°*, 2°* in Com., and 3°*, 703 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To amend the Inquiries Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 710; 2m., 1021; ruling, 1281; 2° and in Com., 1283, 1318, 1414; 3°*, 1494 (i).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.— (Mr. Macdonald).
M. for leave to introduce, 711; 1°*, 713; 2°, 795; in Com., and 3°*, 797 (i).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. Cochrane).
1°*, 713; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 797 (i).

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., 2011; 3°*, 2012 (ii).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Harbour of Hamilton.—(Mr. Stewart, Hamilton).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., 2449; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121; in Com., and 3°*, 1577 (i).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 794; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 795; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 795; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew).
1°*, 795; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com., 4699; 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act, 1899.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 869; 2°, 1025; in Com., 1032; 3°, 1709 (i).

Bill (No. 32) Respecting Grain.—(Mr. Foster).
Res. prop., 793, 869; in Com. on Res., 870; 1°* of Bill, 874 (i); 2°, 2161; in Com., 2179, 2186, 2302, 2382, 2535, 2560, 2755, 3156, 3451, 3491, 3630, 3757 (ii); 4042, 4153, 4787; 3°m., 4788; agreed to, 4835 (iii).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Alberta Electric Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Alberta Interurban Railway Company.'—(Mr. Bennett, Calgary).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Algoma Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Boyce).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting the Architectural Institute of Canada.—(Sir Edmund Osler).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Barcelona Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.'—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 969; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., 2410; 3°* 2413 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Staples).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., 5201; 3°*, 5202 (iii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Canadian Northern Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.—(Mr. Guilbault).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Guilbault).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company and the Carillon and Grenville Railway Company.—(Mr. Achim).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Cap de la Magdeleine Railway Company.—(Mr. Paquet).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., 2012; 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Baker).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting *La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.*—(Mr. Achim).
1°*, 970, 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Dominion Trust Company, and to change its nome to 'British Empire Trust Company.'—(Mr. Cromwell).
1°*, 970; 2°, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4237 (iii).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Kootenay and Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 970; 2*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2415 (ii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., 2413; 3°m., 2414; 3°*, 2784 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Boyce).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2015 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Pacific Trans-Canada and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 53) Respecting certain Patents of Edmund F. Piper.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 970; 2°m., 1201; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Quinze River and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Brabazon).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4171 (iii).

Bill (No. 55) Respecting certain Patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1530 (i).

Bill (No. 56) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the Union Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1318 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Department of External Affairs.—(Mr. Borden).
1°, 971; 2°*, 1434; in Com., and 3°*, 1434 (i).

Bill (No. 59) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 1020 (i).

Bill (No. 60) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. Prop., 1018; in Com. on Res., 1032; 1°* of B., 1033; 2° and in Com., 1434 (i); 3343, 3540; 3°*, 3631 (ii).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Gatineau and Ungava Railway Company, and to change its name to The Ottawa and Ungava Railway Company.—(Mr. Chabot).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the Premier Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Bennett, Calgary).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1530 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act.—(Mr. Bradbury).
1°, 1069 (i).

Bill (No. 65) To correct certain Clerical Errors in the French Version of the Revised Statutes, 1906.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 1197; 2° and in Com., 1438; 3°*, 1440 (i).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Public Archives.—(Mr. Borden).
In Com. on Res., 1282; 1°* of B., 1282; 2°, 1440; in Com., 1494; 3°*, 1713 (i).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew).
1°*, 1409; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting Queen's College at Kingston, and to change its name to 'Queen's University at Kingston.'—(Mr. Nickle).
1°*, 1410 (i); 2°*, 2560; Remarks, 3730, 3873; in Com., 3874 (ii), 4237, 4745; 3°, 4869 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate Queen's Theological College.—(Mr. Nickle).
1°*, 1410 (i); 2°*, 2560 (ii); in Com., 4237, 4775; 3°*, 4869 (iii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Keewatin.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting a certain patent of the Spirella Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2449 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) To incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Blain).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., 2448; 3°*, 2559 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Barnard).
1°*, 1410; 2°*, 1577 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the use of Flags.—(Mr. Bradbury).
1°, 1411 (i).

Bill (No. 75) To amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
Res. prop., 1414; in Com. on Res., 1497; 1°* of B., 1498; 2° and in Com., 1713; 3°*, 1714 (i).

Bill (No. 76) To amend The National Transcontinental Railway Act.—(Mr. Cochrane).
1°, 1571; 2° and in Com., 1866 (i); 3126, 3364; 3°*, 3539 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) To Encourage and Assist the Improvement of Highways.—(Mr. Cochrane).
1°, 1571 (i); 2°, 3633; in Com., 3667, 3672, 3946 (ii); 3°, 4140 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6397, 6731 (iv).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Foster).
In Com. on Res., 1839; 1°* of B., 1839 (i); 2° and in Com., 6188, 6678; 3°*, 6680 (iv).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company—(Mr. Buchanan).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Dominion Trust Company, Limited, and to change its name to Dominion Trust Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., 4237; 3°*, 4238 (iii).

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 82) To incorporate the Northern Territorial Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Saskatchewan Power Company.—(Mr. McKay).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 84) Respecting certain Patents of Thomas D. Rambaut.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 1862 (i); 2°*, 2186; in Com., 2855, 2985, 3280, 3284, 3332, 3479; 3°*, 3491 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Lord's Day Act.—(Mr. Verville).
1°, 2057 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 2058 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 2058 (ii).

Bill (No. 88) To provide for the appointment of a Tariff Commission.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 1839 (i); in Com. on Res., 2157; 1°* of B., 2161; 2°m., 2591, 2668; Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 2614, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 104) 2752; in Com., 2862, 2939, 2994, 3540 (ii), 4079; 3° m., 4144 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6663, 6808 (iv).

Bill (No. 89) To incorporate the Bank of Saskatchewan.—(Mr. Knowles).
1°*, 2216; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 2854 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Clements).
1°*, 2216; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 91) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Clements)
1°*, 2217; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 2217. 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) Respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia (Limited).—(Mr. Buchanan).
1°*, 2217; 2°*, 2415; in Com., and 3°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—(Mr. Wilcox.)
1°*, 2217; 2°*, 2784 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4171 (iii).

Bill (No. 95) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 2296; in Com. on Res., 2378; 1°* of B., 2381; 2°, 3060; in Com., and 3°*, 3126 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Foster, Toronto).
Res. prop., 793 (i); in Com. on Res., 2405; 1°*, of B., 2°*, and in Com., 2406; 3°, 2575 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Hazen.)
Res. prop., 2295; M. for Com. on Res., 2406, 2415; in Com. on Res., 2420; 1°* of B., 2420; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3632 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 2664; 2°*, 3284 (ii); in Com., 5198; 3°*, 5201 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 2664; 2°*, 3284 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4171 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) For the Aid and Encouragement of Agriculture.—(Mr. Burrell).
1° m., 2849 (ii); 2° and in Com., 5277 (iii); 3° m., 5561 (iv).

Bill (No. 101, from the Senate) To incorporate the British Western Loan Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 3049; 2°*, 3284 (ii).

Bill (No. 102, from the Senate) For the Relief of Edna Wells.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 3049; 2°*, 3285; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 103) To amend the Government Works Tolls Act.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 3049; 2° and in Com., 3450; 3°*, 3539 (ii).

Bill (No. 104) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 2862; in Com. on Res., 3143; 1°* of B., 3146; 2°, 3347; in Com., 3349; 3°*, 3539 (ii).

Bill (No. 105) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 3056; in Com. on Res., 3154; 1°* of B., 3155; 2°, 3349; in Com., 3355; 3°*, 3364 (ii).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 3056; in Com. on Res., 3155; 1° of B., 3155 (ii); 2° and in Com., 4782, 5264; 3°*, 5268 (iii).

Bill (No. 107, from the Senate) Respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. Bennett, Simcoe).
1°*, 3449 (ii).

Bill (No. 108, from the Senate) Respecting The Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. Baker).
1°*, 3349; 2°*, 3672 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4237 (iii).

Bill (No. 109, from the Senate) For the relief of Herbert Horsfall.—(Mr. Kay).
1°*, 3449; 2°*, 3672 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) For the relief of Kenneth Molson.—(Mr. Rhodes).
1°*, 3449; 2°*, 3672 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) To authorize the payment of a subsidy to the Collingwood Ship-Building Company, Ltd.—(Mr. Monk).
Res. prop., 3343; in Com. on Res., 3450; 1°* of B., 3451; 2°, 3633; in Com., and 3°*, 3633 (ii).

Bill (No. 112, from the Senate) For the relief of James Denny.—(Mr. Aikins).
1°*, 3630 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 3539; in Com. on Res., 3632; 1°* of B., 3633 (ii); 2° and in Com., 4081; 3°*, 4082 (iii).

Bill (No. 114, from the Senate) To incorporate Révillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 3828 (ii); 2°*, 4171; in Com., 5202; 3°*, 5204 (iii).

Bill (No. 115) To provide for the Extension of the Boundaries of the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 3538; in Com. on Res., 3835; 1° of B., 3898 (ii); 2°m., 4263, 4353; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 m. h., 3886, 4375; Amt. Neg. (Y. 65; N. 103) 4395; 2° resmd. 4397, 4461; agreed to (Y. 114; N. 76) 4495; in Com., 4496, 4584, 4656, 4701, 4836; 3°m., 4838; Amt. (Mr. Mondou) Separate Schools, 4839; Neg. (Y. 24; N. 160) 4925; Amt. (Mr. Beland) 4934; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 108) 4973; 3° agreed to, 4974 (iii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).
Res. prop., 3829, in Com. on Res., 3971; 1° of B., 3972 (ii); 2°, 4563; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4787 (iii).

Bill (No. 117, from the Senate) To change the name of Ezra Butler Eddy Bessey.—(Mr. Fripp.)
1°*, 4139; 2°, 4238; in Com., and 3°*, 4701 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To create the Biological Board of Canada.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 4037; 2° and in Com., 4551; 3°*, 4555 (iii); Sen. Amdts., 5690 (iv).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Continental Can Company.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 4236; 2°, 4395; in Com., 5204, 5483 (iii); 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate) For the relief of Ethel May Stewart.—(Mr. Clark).
1°*, 4237; 2°*, 4397; in Com., and 3°* 5259 (iii).

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate) Respecting the Rainy River Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 4457; 2°*, 4701; in Com., 5198; 3°*, 5198 (iii).

Bill (No. 122, from the Senate) For the relief of William Holloway Adams.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 4457; 2°*, 4701; in Com., and 3°*, 5259 (iii).

Bill (No. 123) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
Res. prop., 3630 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4555; 1°* of B., 4563; 2° and in Com., 5405; (iii); 5567; 3°*, 5571 (iv).

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Civil Service —(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 4042; in Com. on Res., 4583; 1°* of B., 4584; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4787 (iii).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) To incorporate the Western Dominion Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5259 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To incorporate the Universal Eyesight Insurance Company.—(Mr. McLean, Queens).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5259 (iii); in Com., 5907, 5940; 3°*, 5942 (iv).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Public Health Association.—(Mr. Schaffner).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 128, from the Senate) To incorporate the Montreal Transcontinental Railway Company.—(Mr. Coderre).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) Respecting the Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Chabot).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., 5904, 5942; 3°*, 5946 (iv).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., 5947, 6563, 6749; 3°*, 6769 (iv).

Bill (No. 131, from the Senate) For the relief of Isabell Isaac.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) Respecting Mexican Interurban Electric Traction Company, Limited, and to change its name to Mexican Interurban Electric Railway Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 4835; 2°*, 5260 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) Respecting the Methodist Church.—(Mr. Aikins).
1°*, 4975; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) Respecting the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 4976; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate) Respecting the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Stevens).
1°*, 4976; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate) To incorporate the Prince Edward and Hastings Railway Company.—(Mr. Hepburn).
1°*, 4976; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 137), To amend the Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908.—(Mr. Rogers).
1°, 4974 (iii); 2°, 5968; in Com., 6176, 6450; 3°*, 6454 (iv).

Bill (No. 138) To incorporate the Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 4976 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5988; 3°*, 6062 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa and Lake McGregor Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin).
2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 140) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 5053; 2°, 5271; in Com., 5276; 3°*, 5277 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) To incorporate The Interprovincial Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Lesperance).
1°*, 5156; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com. ,and 3°*, 5911 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate) For the relief of Alvena Bell Leaitch.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 5156; 2°*, 5260 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Hazen).
Res. prop., 5156; in Com. on Res., 5161; 1°* of B., 5161; 2° and in Com., 5400; 3°*, 5404 (iii).

Bill (No. 144) Respecting Aid toward the construction of the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 4140; in Com. on Res., 5162; 1°* of B., 5166; 2° and in Com., 5404; 3°*, 5405 (iii).

Bill (No. 145, from the Senate) To ratify and confirm certain Agreements between the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission and the Grand Trunk Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., 5947, 6769; 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 146, from the Senate) Respecting the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate) For the relief of Isabella Helen Horncastle.—(Mr. Clark, Red Deer).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate) To incorcorporate International Guarantee Company.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 5257; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 149) Respecting Water in the Railway Belt and Peace River Block of Land.—(Mr. Rogers).
1°, 5257 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5968, 6175; 3° m., 6188, 6338, 6401 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Hazen).
1°, 5258 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5690; 3°*, 5960 (iv).

Bill (No. 151) To extend the Boundaries of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5268; 1°* of B., 5270 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6160, 3°, 6188, 6338 (iv).

Bill (No. 152) To extend the Boundaries of the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Borden).
Res. prop., 3944 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5270; 1°* of B., 5271 (iii); 2°, 6155; in Com., 6155; 3°*, 6188 (iv).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) For the relief of George MacKay Sutherland.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 5400; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5947 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) To incorporate The Guarantee Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. MacNutt).
1°*, 5400; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate), To incorporate the British American Trust Company.—(Mr. Blain).
1°*, 5400; 2°*, 5484 (iii); in Com., 5946; 3°*, 5947 (iv).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Judges Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
In Com. on Res., 5407, 5958; 1°* of B., 5415 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6000; 3° m., 6062 (iv).

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) To incorporate the Grand Lodge of the Loyal Order of Moose in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., 6126; 3°*, 6127 (iv).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) Respecting the Mexico Northwestern Transportation Company, Limited, and to change its name to Mexico Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 2°*, 5550 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 160, from the Senate) Respecting Alabama Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 2°*, 5550 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 5948 (iv).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Fripp).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., 6127; 3°*, 6127 (iv).

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) For the relief of William Alexander Hunt Jenkins.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith Harriet Duffy.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 5549 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of John Angus Kennedy.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 5550 (iii); 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 165) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 5549; 2° and in Com., 5862; 3°m., 5892, 5960 (iv).

Bill (No. 166) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 5552; 2° and in Com., 5892; 3°*, 5893 (iv).

Bill (No. 167) Respecting the Incorporation of Live Stock Record Associations.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°, 5553; 2°, 6021; in Com., 6023; 3°*, 6062 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 168) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°, 5553; 2° and in Com., 5893; 3°*, 5894 (iv).

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
1°, 5555; 2° and in Com., 5846; 3°*, 5859 (iv).

Bill (No. 170) To amend the Quebec Savings Bank Act.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
1°, 5556; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5859 (iv).

Bill (No. 171) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
1°, 5556; 2° and in Com., 6061; 3°*, 6062 (iv).

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Lalor).
1°*, 5680; 2°*, 5903; in Com., 6127; 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 173, from the Senate) For the relief of Henry Greek Wills.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 5680; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) For the relief of Keitha Seeley.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate) For the relief of David George Davidson.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Dominion Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) To incorporate Capital Trust Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. Tobin).
1°*, 5831; 2°*, 5903; in Com., and 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 178) To provide an additional Annual Grant to the Province of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
Res. prop., 5558; in Com. on Res., 5859; 1°* of B., 5862; 2° and in Com., 6114, 6128; 3°*, 6154 (iv).

Bill (No. 179) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Pelletier).
Res. prop., 5680; in Com. on Res., 5921; 1°* of B., 5921; 2° and in Com., 6083; 3°*, 6114 (iv).

Bill (No. 180) To amend the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910.—(Mr. Monk).
Res. prop., 5559; in Com. on Res., 6047; 1°* of B., 5939; 2° and in Com., 6201; 3°*, 6203 (iv).

Bill (No. 181) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Rogers).
1°, 5939; 2°, 6181; in Com., 6182; 3°*, 6182 (iv).

Bill (No. 182) Respecting the Government House property, Toronto.—(Mr. Doherty).
In Com. on Res., 5957; 1° of B., 5957; 2° and in Com., 6181; 3°*, 6181 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 183) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the Lines of the Railways and Bridges therein mentioned.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5681; in Com. on Res., 5894, 5911, 6060; 1°* of B., 6061; 2° and in Com., 6211, 6304, 6395; 3°m., 6395 (iv).

Bill (No. 184) Respecting the Imperial Loan and Investment Company of Canada —(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°*, 6061; 2°*, 6128; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 185) To authorize the sale to the Province of Manitoba of certain Ordnance Lands, in the city of Winnipeg. —(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
In Com. on Res., 5690, 6064; 1°* of B., 6080; 2° and in Com., 6203; 3°*, 6203 (iv).

Bill (No. 186) To authorize the granting of Subsidies to the Government of the Province of Ontario in aid of the construction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5681; in Com. on Res., 6080; 1°* of B., 6082; 2° and in Com., 6401; 3°*, 6449 (iv).

Bill (No. 187) To authorize the granting of a Subsidy to the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company, in aid of the construction of the Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5690; in Com. on Res., 6081; 1°* of B., 6082; 2°m., 6331; in Com., 6338; 3°, 6495 (iv).

Bill (No. 188) To aid the construction of certain Bridges on the Railway of the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company, and to confirm an agreement between the Company and the Governments of Canada and New Brunswick. —(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5691; in Com. on Res., 6083; 1°* of B., 6083; 2°, and in Com., 6373; 3°, 6496 (iv).

Bill (No. 189) To aid the construction of the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway.—(Mr. Cochrane).
Res. prop., 5841; in Com. on Res., 6083; 1°* of B., 6083; 2° and in Com., 6372; 3°*, 6373 (iv).

Bill (No. 190) To authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown during the Fenian Raids.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
Res. prop., 5558; in Com. on Res., 6083; 1°* of B., 6083; 2° and in Com., 6252, 6454; 3°*, 6460 (iv).

Bill (No. 191, from the Senate) To provide for the Incorporation of Railway Companies.—(Mr. Maclean, Halifax).
1°, 6492 (iv).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa and Lake McGregor Railway Company.—(Mr. Barker).
1°, 6495; 2°, 6576; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 193) To grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively 31st of March, 1912, and 31st March, 1913.—(Mr. White, Leeds).
In Com. on Ways and Means, 6807; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6808 (iv).

Bill (No. 194) To amend an Act of the present Session intituled An Act respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°, 6577; 2° and in Com. 6578; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 195) Respecting the Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°, 2°, 6578; in Com., and 3°*, 6770 (iv).

Binks, Mr., Promotion to Dead Letter Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Henderson) 3946 (ii).

Biological Board of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'

Biological Board, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4257 (iii).

Bird Rocks Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5258 (iii).

Bisley Rules: *See* 'N. R. A.'

Blind River Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Sinclair) 5928 (iv).

Blue Rocks Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).

Board of Management, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii), 5800 (iv).

Bohan, John W., Dismissal from Customs at Bath: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3055 (ii).

Boots and Shoes, Imports and Prices into Canada for 1908-9-10: M. for Ret. (Mr. Carvell) 1267 (i).

Boucher, Mr. O. F., Pet. *re* Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 975 (i).

Boundary Waters Treaty, Apptmt.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Pugsley) 2589 (ii).

—— Negotiations *re* Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 3833 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'

Bounties on Steel and Iron, Administration of Act: in Com. of Sup., 687 (i), 5934 (iv).

Bounties on Steel Rods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 529 (i).
See 'Steel.'

Bounties to Veterans: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'

Bourassa, Capt., Pet. *re* Dep. Harbour Master: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1814 (i).

Bourgoin, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 5557 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 5259 (iii); 6188 (iv).

Bourque, Geoffrey, Accident on I. C. Ry., Inquiry *re* M. for Reps.* (Mr. Boulay) 2459 (ii).

Bourque, Geoffrey: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
——— Claims *re* Damages on I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2243 (ii).
Boyle, D. R., Fishery Overseer at Arichat, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Indian Medical Attendant at Chester, N.S.: Dismissal, &c. Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4976 (iii).
Branch Lines, I C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 622 (i).
——— Subsidies to &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5618 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'
Bras D'Or Lakes Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5936 (iv).
Brazeau, Mr. Emile, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 6337 (iv).
Breakwaters, N. S.: Inquiry for Rets. (Mr. Kyte) 4460 (iii).
Brian, Mr., Dismissals for Political Partisanship: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Bridge Strengthening I. C. R.: in Com of Sup., 4137 (iii).
British Admiralty, Memo *re* Conference between Can. and Australia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 559 (i).
British American Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
British Colonial Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
B. C. and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
B. C. Boundary Agreement *re* Subsidy: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 971 (i).
B. C. Fishing Licenses, Transfers, &c.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3945 (ii).
B. C. Fishing Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6277 (iv).
B. C. Herring Fishing, Authority *re* Close Season: Ques. (Mr. Shepherd) 4256 (iii).
B. C. International Boundary Line, Par. from Washington: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 2754 (ii).
B. C. Lumber Combine, Challenge of Mr. A. E. Watts: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 2297 (ii).
B. C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 573 (i).
B. C. Public Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
B. C. Railway Belt Lands, O. C. *re* Transfer: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1200 (i).
British Empire Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 5948 (iv).
'British News,' &c., Purchase by Dept. of Int.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6660 (iv).
See 'Immigration.'
Britiish Preference, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 553 (i).
British Western Loan Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
B. W. India Trade Arrangements, Negotiations *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Murphy) 977 (i).
Broderick Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCraney) 5263 (iii).
See 'St. Aldwyn.'
Bronte Village, Lease of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3151 (ii).
Brown, Wm., Pet. from Dr. E. Montpetit, *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).
——— Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4779 (iii).
Brown, Mr., M.P., Smuggling: *See* 'Customs Smuggling.'
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6314 (iv).
Brymer, Arthur, Fishery Officer at Lower L'Ardoise, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3752 (ii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 4781 (iii).
Buck, A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Budget, The (annual statement) 4985:
Debate: (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5011; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5041; (Mr. Verville) 5056; (Mr. Broder) 5083; (Mr. M. Clark) 5085; (Mr. Lalor) 5070; (Mr. Oliver) 5093; (Mr. Marshall) 5102; (Mr. Burnham) 5101; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5109; (Mr. Cockshutt) 5118 (iii); (Mr. Nesbitt) 5134; (Mr. Bellemare) 5146; (Mr. R. Lanctot) 5147; (Mr. Paquet) 5151; (Mr. M. Martin) 5154 (iii).
Budget: *See* 'Financial Review.'
Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1358 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Burke's Head Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 2045 (ii).
Burrard Inlet and Tunnel Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6318 (iv).
Burrard Power Co. v. The King, Judgment of Judicial Com.: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1409 (i).
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Borden) 4980 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Cabinet, Constitution of: Remarks in Debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 56 (i).
Cabinet Dissensions: Remarks in Debate on Address (Mr. Monk) 233 (i).

Cabinet Ministers from Quebec, Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Monk: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 526 (i)

See 'Ministers,' 'Que. Minister.'

Cable Rates Exchange: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 5557 (iv).

Cable Rates to G. B. on M. for Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3237 (ii).

——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 3237 (ii).

——— Res. on Order Paper, Withdrawal of: Remarks (Mr. Borden) 3448; M. (Mr. Armstrong) 3448 (ii).

——— Parcel Post, &c.: M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4082; Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) 4097; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 70) 4120 (iii).

——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Borden) 931 (i).

See 'Australian,' 'Telegraph.'

Cadet Corps, Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6323 (iv).

Calgary Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).

Campaign Literature, Franking: *See* 'Political.'

Campeau, Michel, Dismissal from P.O. at St. Louis du Mile End: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1414 (i).

——— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).

Campbellton Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).

Camps for Militia Training: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).

See 'Militia.'

Camrose Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Douglas) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).

Canada and Australia Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4714 (iii).

Canada-Australia Trade: M. for Papers* (Mr. Ames) 582 (i).

See 'Trade Relations.'

Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Canada and G.B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).

——— Renewal of Contract: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).

See 'Post Office,' 'Fast Atlantic.'

Canada, Mexico and S. America Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iv).

Canada and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).

Canada and South Africa Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).

Canada-France Steamship Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 5262 (iii).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Lemieux) 4742 (iii).

See 'Franco-Canadian.'

Canada and Gulf Terminal Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6305 (iv).

Canadian Agencies in Europe, Names of Appointees: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 5261 (iii), 5557 (iv).

Can. Birkbeck Investment and Savings Co.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'

Canadian Coal used to heat Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).

Canadian Marine Insurance, Govt. Co-operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1582 (i).

Canadian Missionaries in China, Refusal of British Gunboat for Protection, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1198 (i).

——— Relief *re* Dangers: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 229 (i).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Borden) 268 (i).

——— Stmnt. from Home Govt.: Read (Mr. Roche) 6559 (iv).

Canadian Navy, Repudiation by Nationalists: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 714 (i).

——— Speeches *re* Election Campaign, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 552 (i).

——— Tenders *re* Construction of Ships, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 526 (i).

See 'Naval.'

Can. Northern Alta. Ry., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 144.'

Can. Northern Alta. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'

Can. Northern Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39.'

Can. Northern Ont. and Carillon and Grenville Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'

Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'

Can. Northern Ont. Ry., Subsidy, Guarantee, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4781 (iii).

Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 187.'

Can. Northern Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 6081 (iii).

Can. Northern Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'

Can. Northern and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Maintenance of Road in L'Ile Bourdon: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5261 (iii).

Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantees *re* Montreal Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Martin) 4247 (iii).

Can. Northern Ry. Bridge at Morris, Representations *re* Objections: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 2587 (ii).

Canadian Offices in London, Cor. *re* Accommodation: M. (Mr. Bradbury) for Copies, 1396 (i).
See London.'
C.P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
C.P. Ry. (Toulon) Subsidy: in Com., 6217 (iv).
C.P. Ry., Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5262 (iii).
Can. Public Health Assn.; *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage) Amt.: M. for Com. on Prop. Res. (Mr. Edwards) 1817 (i).
Canada Shipping Act (pilotage dues) Amt. Bill (Mr. Edwards) on M. to Introduce: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 229; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 267 (i).
CANALS:
American Freight passing through Welland Canal: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
Canals, Capital Expenditure, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1811 (i).
Canal Staff, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Kyte, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Canal Tolls, Abolition of, O. Cs.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sinclair) 2861 (ii).
Canal Traffic, Total Tonnage for 1911: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3051 (ii).
Carillon Canal, Hydraulic Power Lease, Name of Lessee: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2293 (ii).
Chicago Canal, Rep., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, Lower Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Galops Canal, Upper Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Lachine Canal Lock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
——— Rockfield Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5790 (iv).
Murray Canal, Levelling High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Commission *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong) 1319 (i).
——— Meeting at Newmarket: Par. in Press (Mr. Emmerson) 3057 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Bank St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
——— New Dredging Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
St. Peters Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Locks: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claim of Denis Martin for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2292 (ii).
——— Charges *re* Damien Lalonde: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249 (iii).
CANALS—*Con.*
Soulanges Canal, Cueillerrier, Jos., Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iv).
——— Employees, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4250 (iii).
——— Guard Pier: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
——— Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3537 (ii).
——— Methot, Denis, Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4255 (iii).
——— Patronage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3536 (ii).
——— Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
Trent Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5799 (iv).
——— Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (iv).
——— Water Power, Claims of Prov. of Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Welland Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6607 (iv).
——— Quantity of American Freight passing through: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5786 (iv).
——— Water Power, Diversion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 6747 (iv).
Canso Post Office, Dismissal of R. Sutherland: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).
——— Pet. *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 581; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 581 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 974 (i).
Cap Chat P.O., Pet *re* Change of Name: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Cap de la Magdeleine Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
Cape Breton Public Works: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 2052 (ii).
Cape Breton Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Capital Trust Corporation, Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Caraquet and North Shore Branch Line, I.C. Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Turgeon) 4192 (iii).
Caretakers for Militia, Wages, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).
Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6320 (iv).
Carillon Canal Hydraulic Power Lease, Name of Lessee: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2293 (ii).
Carillon and Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Carleton County Electoral Vacancy, Issue of Writ: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1810 (i).

Carmichael, Dr. A. G., Supt. of Fish Hatchery, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A.W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).
Carriere and Laine Property, Lévis, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lesperance) 731 (i).
Carrier, Mr., Postmaster at St. François Xavier de Brompton, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Car Shortage in Grain Shipments: Remarks (Mr. W. M. Martin) 802 (i).
Car Shortage *re* Transportation of Hay Crop: Remarks (Mr. Proulx) 2753 (ii).
Car Shortage in the West: Remarks (Mr. Buchanan) 1709 (i).
——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 1709 (i).
——— Govtl. Action *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Buchanan) 1714 (i).
See 'Grain Congestion,' &c.
Cattle and Stock Pedigree Records: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Cattle diseased, Compensation *re* Damages: Remarks (Mr. Morphy) in Com. of Sup., 6471 (iv).
Cattle Embargo by G.B., Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 557 (i).
Cattle killed by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Cattle Quarantine at Beauceville, Res. from Chamber of Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Béland) 4984 (iii).
Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1020 (i).
Cavanagh, Geo., Dismissal from Customs Service: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3342 (ii).
Cedar Rapids Power Co., Water Power Concessions to *re* St. Lawrence River: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 728 (i).
Cement Importations, Quantity and Value for 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 3534 (ii).
Cement supplied to Ry. Dept., Tenders, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4244 (iii).
Census Employees, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 3335 (ii).
——— Delay in Payments: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 1971 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2668 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 935 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 933 (i), 2244 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1199 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 1020 (i), 3835 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 4460 (iii).
Census Population of Canada and Quebec Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 3336 (ii).
Census in Regina, Complaints *re* Correctness: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1440, 1574 (i).
——— M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Knowles) 563 (i).
Census Enumerators and Returning Officers, Delays in Payment: Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2156 (ii).
Census Returns, Number of Males, Females, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 561 (i).
Census of Saskatchewan, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5261 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4983 (iii).
Census Report: Presented (Mr. Burrell) 4037 (iii).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup. 619 (i), 6462 (iv).
Central Ry. Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Champlain Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6485 (iv).
Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 554 (i).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).
Chard, Mr. J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 2458 (ii).
Charges of Management, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 619, 1033 (i),
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 1862 (i).
Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1584 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 2460 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Charlos Cove Breakwater, in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).
Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1208 (i).
Charwomen, Pay, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i).
Chateauguay County Inundated Lands, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Brown) 6660 (iv).
Chatham, I.C.R. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
Chatham, N.B., Public Building: Conc., 6804 (iv).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Service, Pets. from Boards of Trade: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 4190 (iii).
Chats Falls Timber Slides, Date of Deed with D. O'Connor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4549 (iii).
Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt. *re* Investigation by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1414 (i).
See 'Hull.'
Cheese Weighing at Montreal: *See* 'Dairying.'
Chester Canal Cutting: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 2049 (ii).

Chester Canal Cutting, Discontinuance of Work: Ques. (Mr. A. K. McLean) 716 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 806 (i).
Chevrier, Isidore, Charges *re*, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4039, 4780 (iii).
Chicago Drainage Canal, Damage to Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Lavalee) 4260 (iii).
—— Rep. *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Chicoutimi Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 11 (i).
Chinese Entering B.C., Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4778 (iii).
Chinese and Japanese in B.C., Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 555 (i).
Chinese Tax in B.C.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 285 (i).
See 'Immigration.'
Christmas Holidays Adjournment for: M. (Mr. Borden) 927 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 702 (i).
Chubb, George, Customs Officer, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4459 (iii).
Cigarettes, Quantity manufactured and imported in each Prov. for 1905, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 556 (i).
Civil Service Act, Private Secretaries, Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 60'
Civil Service Act (C.S. commission) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104 and 106.'
Civil Service Act (customs, P.O. depts.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 113, 116, 124.'
Civil Service Act (rural mail) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Civil Service Apptmts. between Dissolution of Parlt. and Sept. 21st: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Edwards) 562 (i).
Civil Service Association, Representations to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 3334 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, Addition to: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Civil Service Commission, Additional Apptmt: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
—— Increase in Number: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 728 (i).
Civil Service Commission of Investigation Apptmts., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 283 (ii).
Civil Service Competitive Examination, Extension *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Civil Service Increases since 1900: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Aikins) 561 (i).
Civil Service Investigation *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1581 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Civil Service List: Inquiry for (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 6187 (iv).
Civil Service Reform, and Outside Service: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 727 (i).
Clarkboro, Sask., C.N.R. Right of Way, Title *re*: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 934 (i).
Clifford, Private: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Clock Towers on Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
Clothing for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).
Clouthier, Jos., Dismissal, Postmaster at St. Alphonse Dudswell, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4549 (iii).
Coal Combine in B.C., Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4240 (iii).
Coal Contracts for I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iv).
See 'Can. Coal.'
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1203 (i).
Coal Shortage in the West for Household Consumption, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Warnock) 568 (i).
Coal Strike in Alberta Settlement: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Coal Strike in Fernie, B.C., Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Warnock) 568 (i).
Coal Strike in the West, Stmnt. of Min. of Int. *re* Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 571 (i).
—— Strikes in the West, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 567 (i).
—— Remission of Duties: Remarks (Mr. McCraney) 178, 230; Stmnt. (Mr. Rogers) 230 (i).
Coasting Trade, Foreign Shipping, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Kyte) 2861 (ii).
—— O.C., Extending Time: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1814 (i).
Cockshutt Plough Co., Stmnt. of Member for Edmonton *re* Prices in East and West: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Cockshutt) 807 (i).
Codd, Staff Sergeant, Retiring Gratuity: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iv).
Coffin, Henry, Apptmt. to H. of C., Dismissal of M. Picotte: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 2459 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 2289 (ii).
Coin Circulation: in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3148 (ii).
Cold Storage for Bait *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Cold Storage Establishments in Canada, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Verville) 3343 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Verville) 5561 (iv).

Cole Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Combines Investigation Act, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
Commercial Agent in France as Successor to Mr. A. Poindron: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4041 (iii).
Commissioners *re* Investigations, Number of Appointees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5680, 6336 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Mr. Borden) 10 (i).
——— Lists: Presented (Mr. Borden) 703 (i).
——— M. to present Rep. (Mr. Borden) 794 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Borden) to add Names, 1019 (i), 2217 (ii).
Companies Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 529 (i).
Companies Incorporation, Ref. to Supreme Court, Withdrawal by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 529 (i).
Connolly, John, Coal Inspector, Complaints *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).
Conservation Commission, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1069 (i), 6579 (iv).
——— Water Powers Report: Presented (Mr. Burrell) 407 (i).
Continental Can Co., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Conway, Patrick J., Lightkeeper at White Island, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587, 3342 (ii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
Copyright Bill, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 557, 1208 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 935 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Lower Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2667 (ii).
Courchesne, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).
Courcy, Mr. P., Apptmt. at St. Pacome de Kamouraska: Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) 5821 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 5952 (iv).
Courtenay Bay Harbour Works, Contracts *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).
See 'St. John.'
Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2242 (ii).
Cow Bay Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).
Cox, Mr. A. B., Dismissals, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).
Cream Exports into U.S., Quantity and Value for 1911: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 3535 (ii).
Creosoted Timber *re* Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
Cresine, Geo., Quarter Master on SS. 'Scotia,' Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1582 (i).
Cribbin's Point Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2046 (ii).
Criminal Code (log stealing) Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Criminal Code (race tracks) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Crown Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1587 (i).
Crystal Beach Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. E. Buck: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Cuillier, Ass't. Electrician, Soulanges Canal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4457 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges on Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iv).
Customs, Outside Service, Salary Increases: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Customs Collector, P. J. Venoit, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1590 (i).
Customs Contracts given without Tender: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 877 (i).
Customs Deptl. Report: Presented (Mr. J. D. Reid) 971 (i).
Customs Dues *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).
Customs Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
——— Outside Ports Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1073 (i).
Customs Smuggling Case by M.P., Par. in Montreal 'Star': Ques. (Mr. Baker) 2072 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brown) 2216 (ii).
Customs Tariff, Changes *re* Jute Cloth Dressed Lumber, &c., Rulings, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Turriff) 2459 (ii).
Customs Tariff: *See* 'Tariff Commission B. 88.'
Customs Weighing of Goods, Decree of French Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Weichel) 721 (i).
Dairying Industry in Canada, Grievances *re* Weighing at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5711 (iv).
Dalaire, Mr. L. P., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2454 (ii).
Dartmouth Branch Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
Dartmouth to Denus Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).
Daoust, Done, Postmaster at Alfred, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Proulx) 3945 (ii).

Dauphin Custom House: Remarks (Mr. Cruise) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
Davidson, David George, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Davis, John, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).
Day, Luke, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Taylor) to conc., 2841 (ii).
——— Correction (Mr. Ethier) *re* Man. Bill Voting on 3°, 4983 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
——— Reporters' Examination Papers, 6338 (iv).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1811 (i).
Decoste, Peter, Dismissal from Dredge Cape Breton: Ques. (Mr. W. Chisholm) 548 (i).
——— Defective Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 803 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) for Cor., 1268 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).
Delisle, L. Treffé, of Trois Pistoles, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4781 (iii).
Denny, James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 112.'
Deputy Minister of Justice, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3150 (ii).
See 'Justice.'
Deschenes, Louis, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Deschamps, Mr. R., Apptmt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6277 (iv).
Deschamps, Raoul, Apptmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2667 (ii).
Desjardins, Baptiste, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6784 (iv).
Devils Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (i).
Diamond Light and Heating Co., Investigation *re*: on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Public Accounts Com., 5832 (iv).
See 'Pub. Accounts Com.'
Digby Clock Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).
Dionne, Thos., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 2460 (ii).
Dismissals of Govt. Employees, Investigation *re*: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
DISMISSALS—
Anse a Valeau Postmistress, Charges *re* Madame Proulx: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2072 (ii).
DISMISSALS—*Con.*
Archambault, Emile, Letter Carrier, Montreal, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5950 (iv).
——— M. for Cor* (Mr. Seguin) 5957 (iii).
Baldwin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs at Coaticooke: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1361 (i).
Barss, Mr. Archibald, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv)
Bath Postmistress, Dismissal: in Com of Sup., 6282 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
Beauchemin, J. A., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3337 (ii).
Beauchesne, Mr., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3151 (ii).
Belanger, Amedee, Dismissal from I. C. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3050 (ii).
Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Apptmt. as Commissioner of Inquiry: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2062 (ii).
Bohan, John W., Dismissal from Customs at Bath: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3055 (ii).
Boucher, Mr. O. F., Pet. *re* Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 975 (i).
Bourgoin, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 5557 (iv).
Boyle, D. R., Fishery Overseer at Arichat, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).
Braine, Dr. Lawrence, Indian Medical Attendant at Chester, N.S.: Dismissal, &c., Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4976 (iii).
Brazeau, Mr. Emile, Postmaster at Cote Rouge, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 6337 (iv).
Brian, Mr., Dismissals for Political Partisanship: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Brown, Wm., Pet. from Dr. E. Montpetit, *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).
Brymer, Arthur, Fishery Officer at Lower L'Ardoise, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3752 (ii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 4781 (iii).
Buck, A. E., Postmaster at Crystal Beach, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv).
Bull, Mr. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Campeau, Michel, Dismissal from P. O. at St. Louis du Mile End: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1414 (i).
——— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
Canals Staffs, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Kyte, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Canso Postmaster, Pet. *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Canso Postmaster, Dismissal of R. Sutherland: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).
See 'Sutherland.'

Canso Public Buildings, Dismissal of Caretaker: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 581; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 581 (i).

Carmichael, Dr. A. G., Supt. of Fish Hatchery, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).

Cavanagh, Geo., Dismissal from Customs Service: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3342 (ii).

Chard, Mr. J. A., Indian Agent at Grand View, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 2458 (ii).

Charlos Cove Lightkeeper, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1208 (i).

Chauvin, Hector, K.C., Apptmt. *re* Investigation by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1414 (i).

Chevrier, Isidore, Charges *re*, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4039, 4780 (iii).

Chubb, George, Customs Officer, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4459 (iii).

Clouthier, Joseph, Postmaster at St. Adolphe de Dudswell, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4549 (iii).

——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).

Commissioners, Number employed by Govt., Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5680, 6336 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2063 (ii).

Civil Service Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1581 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Dismissals, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5950 (iv).

——— Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as Assistants: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 5954 (iv).
See 'Public Service,' 'Morine,' &c.

Connolly, John, Coal Inspector, Complaints *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).

Conway, Patrick, Lightkeeper at White Head Island: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587, 3342 (ii).

Copper Cliff Post Office, Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).

Cote, Mrs. J. N., Dismissal as Charwoman: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2667 (ii).

Courchesne, Mr. P. E. C., Dismissal from Inland Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).

Couture, Mr. A., Dismissal from I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2242 (ii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Cox, Mr., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr Sinclair) 6784 (iv).

Cresine, Geo., Quartermaster on SS. 'Scotia,' Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1582 (i).

Crystal Beach Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. E. Buck: Remarks (Mr. German) 3908 (ii), 5960 (iv)

Cuillier, Ass't Electrician, Soulanges Canal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4457 (iii).

Dalaire, Mr. L. P., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 2454 (ii).

Davis, John, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).

Day, Luke, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).

Decoste, Capt. Peter, Dismissal from Dredge 'Cape Breton': Ques. (Mr. W. Chisholm) 548 (i).

——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 803 (i).

——— M. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) for Cor., 1268 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).

Delisle, L. Treffle, Trois Pistoles, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4781 (iii).

Deschenes, Louis, Wharfinger at River Ouelle, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Desjardins, Baptiste, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6784 (iv).

Desmarais, Mr., Dismissal *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 5817 (iv).

Digby Clock Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3272 (ii).

Dionne, Thos., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 2460 (ii).

Dismissals, &c., Apptmt. of Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3247 (ii).

——— Irrelevancy of Debate (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3253 (ii).

——— Objection to Ruling (Mr. Macdonald) 3254 (ii).

Dismissal of Conservative Postmaster *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2295 (ii).

Dismissals Generally, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5803 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 2018 (ii), 4187 (iii).

Dismissals from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 1955 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Dismissals in Hull, Official Inquiry *re*: Ques. 550 (i); Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 4140 (iii).

Dismissals *re* Inland Rev. Dept., Policy of Minister: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iv).

Dismissals by Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Par. in 'Le Devoir' read: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2452 (ii).

Dismissals in Ottawa, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1275 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 3834 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).

Dismissals for Political Partisanship: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).

——— Ques. of Order (Messrs. A. K. Maclean and Hon. S. Hughes) 1183 (i).

Dismissals of Public Officials: M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, &c., 878, 944 (i).

Dismissal from Public Works, Par. in Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 3058 (ii).

Dismissals from Public Offices from 1896 to 1911: M. (Mr. Goodeve) for Ret.* 1280 (i).

Dismissals in Rimouski County: Remarks (Mr. Boulay) 1276 (i).

Disraeli Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).

Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 552 (i).

Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame des Lourdes, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 1863 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Pacaud) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).

Duchaine, Pierre, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2454 (ii).

Ducharme, Mr. G. N., Apptmt. of as Commissioner: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).

——— Resignation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4979 (iii).

Dumelong, E., Postmaster at L'Assomption, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 580, 720 (i).

Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4039 (iii).

Dupont, Rene, Dismissal as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).

Dupre, Dr., Postmaster at St. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).

——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).

East Roman Valley Post Office, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Elevator Men in Govt. Employ: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).

——— Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).

Falconer, R. S., Dismissal as Inspector on I.C.R., Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).

Farly, Mrs., Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2579 (ii).

Ferguson, S. M., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2459 (ii).

Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3053 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).

Fisheries Inspectors, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).

Fishery Overseer, J. A. Doucet, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1590 (i).

Fishery Overseer, W. C. Robichaud, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1589 (i).

Flemming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Rev. at Petrolia: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 4259 (iii).

Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 726 (i).

Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).

——— Inspector at Stellarton, I.C.R., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3935 (ii).

Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).

Garceau, Mr. N., Apptmt. as Inquiry Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2860 (ii).

Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2242 (ii).

Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4976 (iii).

Gerrior, Mr. William, Dismissal from Customs at Larry's River, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3051 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).

Gillies, Capt., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 3261 (ii).

Girard, Louis, Dismissal as Postmaster at Ste. Angele de Merici: M. for Pets.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2587 (ii).

Glenelg, N.S., Postmaster, Complaints *re* Pets., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 1817 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. in Govt., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3752 (ii).

——M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).

Goucher, Wesley, Dismissal as Lightkeeper: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Dismissal, Resignations, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1818 (i).

Govt. Employees, Inside and Outside Service, Dismissals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Kyte) 2587 (ii).

Gray, W. W., Coal Inspector, Charges *re*, Investigation by H. P. Duchemin: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).

Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. White) 6183 (iii).

Griever, Mr. S., Charges *re* Lighthouse Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).

Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).

Guimond, Eugene, Dismissal of: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).

Hagerty, Mr. S. W., Dismissal from Inspectorship of Ry. Station: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4976 (iii).

Hale, Thos., Dismissal as Correspondent, 'Labour Gazette,' Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4459 (iii).

——M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4263 (iii).

Hamel, Hector, Customs Appraiser, Montreal, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 3343 (ii).

Ham Nord Postmaster, Investigation, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).

Harbour, Geo. T., Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).

——Letter *re* Dismissal: Read (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3252 (ii).

Harris, W. H., Postmaster at White Head, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 2588 (ii).

Hatfield, Mr., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Law) in Com. of Sup., 5252 (iii).

Hattie, Mr. W. A., Preventive Officers, Mulgrave, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1815 (i).

——M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2460 (ii).

Hayden, W. W., Wharfinger at Digby, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5957 (iii).

Hebert, Auguste, Postmaster at St. Pascal, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

——Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Hefferman, Mr. E. S., Dismissal from Customs at Spring Hill, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).

Hendsbee, David S., Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries Dept.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3342 (ii).

Homestead Inspectors, Number employed in Sask., Number dismissed: Ques. (Mr. L. Thomson) 1588 (i).

Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of Mr. Irving: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4259 (iii).

I.C.R. Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Lesperance) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iv).

——Employees in Pictou, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 2246 (ii).

Investigations into Dismissals: *See* 'Commission,' &c.

Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 3339 (ii).

Jones, Chas. O., Dismissal, Evidence, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).

Kelly, Edward, Dismissal from Canso Reduction Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).

Kennedy, Allan, Govt. Telegraph Repairer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).

Kennie, Capt. Edmund, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 6782 (iv).

Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 2579 (ii).

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1411 (i).

Lacombe, Mr. J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastien P.O., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 974 (i).

——Remarks (Mr. Beland) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).

Lalonde, Mr. Alfred, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Cardin) 6783 (iv).

Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 4549 (iii).

Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brouillard) 3339 (ii).

Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1864 (i).

——M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

Legault, Mr. Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5950 (iv).

Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5949 (iv).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Lemieux, Hon. Mr., late P.M.G., Par. in 'Le Devoir' *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2664 (ii).

——— Ques. Ruled out (Mr. Speaker) 2580 (ii).

Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4458 (iii).

Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iii).

Lightkeepers in N.S., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).

Lightkeepers in P.E.I., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).

Lizotte, Luc., Postmaster at Pacome, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).

Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3338 (ii).

Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 6337 (iv).

Lotbiniere County Postmasters, Dismissal, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 972 (i).

McAdam, Alex. R., Fishery Officer at Antigonish, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 3343 (ii).

McDonald, Dr. D., Dismissal from Indian Reserve, Baddeck: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).

McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2243 (ii).

McFarlane, J. D., Postmaster at Southwest Margaree, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3756 (ii).

McGrath, James, Postmaster at Aspen, N. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587 (ii).

McIsaac, Colin, Preventive Officer at Port Hood, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 5956 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).

McLean, Donald E., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 4980 (iii).

McLean, W. D., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).

McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 2017 (ii).

McLeod, John, Dismissal as Postmaster at Denmark, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 4460 (iii).

H

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

McLeod, Dr. J. R., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury, Charges *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).

McPhee, James, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).

McPherson, John H., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4259 (iii).

Mader, Mr. D., Dismissal from Mahone Bay P.O.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).

Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).

Matte, Arthur J., Postmaster at Montauban, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Delisle) 5957 (iii).

Michaud, Mr. E., Dismissal from P.O. at St. Germain: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).

Michaud, Mr. J., Postmaster at St. Moise Station, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1864 (i).

Montcalm Postmaster, Pets. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 575 (i).

Montpetit, Dr. E., Pet. sent to P.M.G. *re* Dismissal of William Brown: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).

Montreal Customs House, Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Retention of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2062 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1708 (i); 2057 (ii).

——— Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1812 (i).

Moreau, Mr. Jos., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1818 (i).

Morine, A. B., Letter received by Prime Minister: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6185 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6185 (iii).

——— Correction *re* Ruling on Question (Mr. Speaker) 6335 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6335 (iv).

Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* as Public Commissioner: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).

Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).

Mount Oscar, Postmaster, Dismissal of I. Chevrier: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4780 (iii).

Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P.O. Dept., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Power) 1583 (i).

Mundle, D. I., Dismissal as sub-collector at Richibucto, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Notre Dame des Anges Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 554 (i).

O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Office at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 717 (i).

Oyster Pond Preventive Officer, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).

Payson, Mr. W. W., Dismissal from Deep Brook Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 2243 (ii).

Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).

Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).

Postmasters dismissed: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).

Post Office Dismissals, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

Post Office Dismissals since Oct. 1911, Pets. *re*, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 1395, 1589 (i).

—— List read (Mr. Lemieux) 6636 (iv).

Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6781 (iv).

Postmasters in Lotbiniere County, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Fortier) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

Postmasters in Temiscouata County, Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 548 (i).

Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, Quebec City: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2071 (ii).

Pouliott, Louis, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).

Powassan Postmaster, Change *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Arthurs) 2459 (ii).

Power, Lawrence F., Supt. of Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3751 (ii); 4781 (iii).

Printing Bureau, Dismissals and Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).

Provost, Raoul, Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 2453 (ii).

Public Service Commission, Charges *re* A. B. Morine: on M. for Sup., (Mr. Carvell) 6528 (iv).

See 'Morine.'

Public Works, Dismissal of Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2584 (ii).

Rathburn Post Office, Removal of Postmaster, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Pardee) 4262 (iii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

Rayne, R. W., Caretaker Truro Armoury, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 6184 (iii).

Renfrew, N., Dismissal of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

Renfrew, S., Dismissal of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

Richards, Mr. S., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5821, 6652 (iv).

Rivers, Lachapelle and Dubois, Messrs., Dismissal &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii).

Roberts, Capt. Alex., Postmaster at Canso, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).

Robert, Wm., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).

Robitaille, Mr. J. C., Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2858 (ii).

Rogers, J. M., Dismissal from East Roman Valley P. O., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 722 (i).

—— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).

Rutherford, Mr. John, Land Agent at Moosejaw, Dismissal, &c.: M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 1395 (i).

St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2068 (ii).

St. Agathe des Monts, Dismissal of Postmistress: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 973 (i).

—— M. for Cor. (Mr. Lemieux) 1591 (i).

St. Amour Postmaster, Changes since Jan. 1912: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2666 (ii).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Proulx) 2861 (ii)

St. Ancilet Postmaster, Request for Dismissal: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2588 (ii).

St. Angele de Laval Postmaster, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii), 4039 (iii).

St. Germain Postmaster, Changes *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1579 (i).

—— M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).

St Martin, Madame, Dismissal from St. Louis de Bonsecours: M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).

St. Paul d'Abbottsford Postmaster, P. L. St. Pierre, Investigation *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 1589 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).

St. Peter of Wakefield Postmaster, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 6286 (iv).

St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*
—— Remarks (Mr. Bureau) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Sauve, Mr. L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 575 (i).
Sayabec Postmistress, Pet. *re* Dismissal, Apptmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2585 (ii).
Scotch Village Postmaster, Apptmt. in 1903, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2666 (ii).
Sheltus, Anson, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).
Shurtloff, Dr., Investigation *re* J. Clouthier: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Smith, Angus, Pilot of D.G.S. 'Earl Grey,' Suspension of: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1590 (i).
Smith, Lyman C., Customs Collector at Oshawa, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2861 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. on Customs Bill, 4575 (iii).
Stellarton Postmaster, Mr. John Fraser, Dismissal: M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor.* 1589 (i).
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. Reid) 5054 (iii).
Sudbury Post Office, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Sutherland, Mr., Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i), 2018; Cor. read 2022 (ii).
See 'Canso.'
Therrien, F., Charges *re* Political Partisanship, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1413 (i), 3152 (ii).
—— (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iv).
Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3339 (ii).
Thompson, Dr., Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6784 (iv).
Three Rivers, Inland Revenue, Charges *re* Collector C. D. Herbert: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1209 (i).
Tory, Mr. H. L., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).
Valois, J. B., Dismissal from Vaudreuil Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).
Veit, Frederick, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 6783 (iv).
Venoit, Mr. Joseph, Complaints *re* Suspension, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1817 (i).
Waterways Treaty, Dismissal of Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
Webber, James, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).
Webster, Dr. C. A., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Law) 6186 (iv).
Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Westville Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Whitehead, N. S., Dismissal of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2855 (ii).
White Head Island Lighthouse, Dismissal of Patrick Conway, Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2857 (ii).
White, James, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Williams, Mr., Dismissal from H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Yule, Mr., Customs Officer at Aurora, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4779 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 5950 (iv).
Disraeli Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Divorce: *See* 'B. Nos. 102, 109, 110, 112, 120, 122, 131, 142, 147, 162, 163, 164, 173, 174 and 175.
Documents handed in to 'Hansard' not read: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6718 (iv).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sinclair) 1391 (i).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Dom. Gresham Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. N. 29.'
Dom. Gresham Guarantee and Casualty Co.: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Dom. Guarantee Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 29.'
Dom. Exhibition Grant to Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).
Dom. Lands Agent at Medicine Hat, Suspension or Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 552 (i).
Dom. Lands in N.W. Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1587 (i).
Dom, Notes, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Dom. Notes and Stamps Printing Contract, Complaints *re* British Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5843 (iv).
—— Limitation as to Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 1820 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 1841 (i).
Dom. Trust Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 46 and 80.'
Doncaster Indian Reserve Road Repairs: Conc., 6806 (iv).

Dorchester Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
Double Tracking, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5637 (iv).
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Cor. *re* Ry. Station Sites: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lavallee) 2460 (ii).
—— Position on N. T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 2245 (ii).
Doucet, Odilon, Postmaster at Notre Dame des Lourdes, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 1863 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pacaud) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Downey, W. H., Returning Officer, Kings and Albert, Non-Payment of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 2057 (ii).
Dredges and Boiler Inspection: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 5953 (iv).
Drill Halls in the West, Donation of Lands *re* Sites: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1815 (i).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 180.'
See 'Collingwood.'
Duchaine, Pierre, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2454 (ii).
Ducharme, Mr., Apptmt. to Civil Service Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2830 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).
—— Resignation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4979 (iii).
Duffy, Edith Harriet, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2858 (ii).
Dumelong, Mr. E., Dismissal from L'Assomption, P. O.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 580, 720 (i).
Dumontier, Joseph, Apptmt. as Inland Rev. Inspector at Quebec, Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarks) 3340 (ii).
Dunn, Albert, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4039 (iii).
Dunnville Customs Revenue for 1910-11, Postal Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2066 (ii).
Dupont, René, Dismissal as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1864 (i).
Dupré, Dr., Postmaster at St. Robert, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).
—— M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
Dynamite and Explosives, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 724 (i).
'Earl Grey' and 'Minto,' Govt. Steamers, Names of Employees: M. for Ret..* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1816 (i).
Eastern Block Addition: in Com. of Sup., 1339 (i).
Eastern Townships, Field for Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. McCrea) 6557 (iv).
East River, Pictou County, Deepening, &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
East Roman Valley Post Office, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
Eddy, Ezra Butler Bessey, Change of Name: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2206 (ii).
Edmonton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Low) 725 (i).
Election Accounts, Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 4460 (iii).
Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 4, 8, 17.'
Election Deposits: *See* 'B. Nos. 8 and 17.'
Electric Light Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iv).
Elevator Men in Govt. Employ: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3244 (ii).
—— Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3245 (ii).
Elevators, Control of by Govt.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 137 (i).
—— Ref. to in debate on Address, 154, 287 (i).
Elevators, Ownership and Operation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 2853 (ii).
See 'Grain B. 32.'
Empire Trade Commission, Apptmt. of Representative: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 5951 (iv).
Erie, London and Tillsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 12.'
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6220 (iv).
Estende to Baddeck Line I.C.R., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 576 (i).
Estimates, The (1911-12) Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 525 (i).
—— Suppl., Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 971 (i), 4974 (iii), 6154 (iv).
Estimates Discussion in Concurrence: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6805 (iv).
Estimates, Discussion of Outside Works: Remarks *re* Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2443 (ii).
Estimates, Discussion of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) *re* Adjournment, 5937 (iv).
Estimates, Suppl.: Inquiry for (Mr. A. J. Maclean) 1575 (i).
Estimates Omitted: *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Estmere to Baddeck Branch Ry., Tenders *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 1589 (i).
Excavators purchased from Mr. Harris, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 559 (i).

Exchequer Court Act. (asst. judge) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Exchequer Court Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1035, 1039 (i).
Excise Customs Duties: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iv).
Excise Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Excise Preventive Officers: in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iv).
Excise Salaries to Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Excise Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 6477 (iv).
—— Branch Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6477 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farm Bulletins, Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).
Explosive Apparatus Testing Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
External Affairs Dept.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Eyesight, Insurance of: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Falconer, R. S., Dismissal as Inspector on I.C.R., Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).
See 'Faulkner.'
False Creek Flats, Date of Application of Lease from Marpole and Macdonald: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5953 (iv).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 6186 (iv).
Farly, Mrs., Postmistress at St. Gabriel de Brandon, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 2579 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Indemnifying Shareholders, Speech of Hon. Mr. Crothers *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 3147 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Inquiry by Chief Justice Meredith: Remarks (Mr. Morphy) 6710 (iv).
Farmers' Bank Investigation, Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3332 (ii).
—— O. C. *re* Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith: M. for Copy* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2853 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Promises to Reimburse by Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 713 (i).
Farmers' Bank Reimbursements: (Ques.) (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
Farmers' Bank, St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Speech of Hon. Mr. Crothers: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 3332 (ii).
Farming Implements, Cost of: *See* 'Cockshutt.'
Fast Atlantic Service and Halifax Terminals: (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 6496 (iv).
Fast Atlantic SS. Service, Conference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5695 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Faulkner, R. S., Emplymt. by Public Works as Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 5261 (iii).
See 'Falconer.'
Fenian Raid Veterans, Bounties to: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3334 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
Ferguson, S. M., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2459 (ii).
Fidelity Trust Co., Incorporation, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 3757 (ii).
Fife, Duke of, Decease of: Remarks (Mr. Borden) 2154 (ii).
FINANCE.
Aud. Gen.'s Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 970 (i).
Banking Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Demers) on M. to introduce (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Banking Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1820 (i).
Bounties on Steel and Iron, Administration of Act: in Com. of Sup., 687 (i), 5934 (iv).
—— Budget Speech: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4249 (iii).
—— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Kyte) 2588 (ii).
Bounties on Steel Rods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 529 (i).
B.C. Provincial Subsidy, Consultations with other Provs.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 573 (i).
Budget, The, 4985 (iii).
Charges of Management, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 619 (i).
Coin Circulation: in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
Debt of Canada, Average Interest: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1811 (i).
Dom. Notes, Engraving, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4778 (iii).
Dom. Notes, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., Limitations *re* Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 1820, 1841 (i).
—— Complaints *re* British Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5843 (iv).
Estimates, The (1911-12): Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 525 (i).
—— Suppl. (1912): Presented, 4974 (iii).
—— 1912-13: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 971 (i), 6154 (iv).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Investigation, O.C. *re* Apptmt. of Sir William Meredith: M. for Copy* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
——— Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2853 (ii)
——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3332 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Morphy) 6710 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, Promises to Reimburse by Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 713 (i), 3147, 3332 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Reimbursements: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
Farmers' Bank, and Bank of St. Jean, Indemnity to Depositors: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551 (i).
Finance, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
Financial Review (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 6707 (iv).
Gold Coinage, by Mint: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1213 (i).
Govt. Loans, Amounts, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4777 (iii).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe, Investigation *re* Liquidation: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2069 (ii).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
Man. and N.S. Federal Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4258 (iii).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5954 (iv).
P.E.I. Better Terms: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
Public Accounts Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 11 (i).
Royal Mint: in Com. of Sup., 6584 (iv).
Fisheries Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
FISHERIES.
Alder Point Lobster Hatchery, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3053 (ii).
B.C. Herring Fishing, Authority *re* Close Season: Ques. (Mr. Shepherd) 4256 (iii).
B.C. Fishing Licenses, Transfers, &c.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3945 (ii).
B.C. Fisheries Question: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 290 (i).
Canso Reduction Works, Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 874 (i).
Cold Storage for Bait *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Dogfish Scrap, Price *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sinclair) 1391 (i).
Fish, Fresh, Expenditure *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2666 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.'
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fishery Act, Prosecutions in Pictou County: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1589 (i).
Fisheries Contracts with Stewards on Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 681 (i).
Fisheries Department, Reorganisation of: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 936 (i).
Fishery Guardians in Guysborough County, Names, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3053 (ii).
——— Dismissals: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4257 (iii).
Fisheries Inspectors, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction *re* Provinces: Ques. (Mr. H. Clark) 3339 (ii).
Fishery Overseer, J. A. Doucet, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1590 (i).
Fishery Overseer, W. C. Robichaud, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Turgeon) 1589 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Turgeon) 5259 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 5386 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service on Pacific Coast, Capt. Newcombe's Rep.: M. for Copy (Mr. Clements) 2467 (ii).
Fishery Treaty with U.S., Withdrawal *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 408 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Shepherd) 4256 (iii).
Fish Reduction Works at Arichat, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 2289 (ii).
Fish Scrap as Fertilizer: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
Fish Trap Licenses issued to Capt. J. H. Thorburn: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Law) 2861 (ii).
Gasoline Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2666 (ii).
Hague Tribunal, Fishery Regulations *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3830 (ii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2860 (ii).
I.C.R. Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 6748 (iv).
See 'Fish, Fresh.'
International Congress *re* Fisheries, Delegates: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
International Fisheries Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6646; conc., 6778 (iv).
'Kestrel' Fishery Cruiser, Condemnation of: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 549 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limitation *re* Catch: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 3055 (ii).
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer on Lake Aylmer: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
Lobster Fishing Season in St. John, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).
Lobster Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii).
Lobster Traps, Customs Changes in Tariff: on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 1362 (i).
Marine Hospitals for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 6787 (iv).
Medical Attendance, Free, for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Murray, Dr., Poaching for Salmon on East River, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 5255 (iii).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, Ratification of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4460 (iii).
—— Explanation (Mr. Borden) 4550 (iii).
—— Compensation *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 4776 (iii).
—— Remuneration to Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
—— Treaty between G.B., U.S. and Japan: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
Salmon Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations *re* Exportations, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).
Steam Trawlers and Fisheries Bounties: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 5957 (iv).
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts: M. for Papers (Mr. Sinclair) 2461 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5388 (iii).
Twine for Lobster Nets: Remark (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for Sup., 5587 (iv).
—— Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3536 (ii).
—— Customs Duties: on M. for Sup. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1070 (i).
Flags, Flying of: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Flax Seed, Stmnt. of, Excessive Freight Rates: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 661 (i).
Flemming, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Inland Rev. at Petrolia: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 4259 (iii).
Flour Bags, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Foresters, Ancient Order of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Forest, Mr. Medard, Excise Officer at L'Epiphanie, Dismissal, Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 726 (i).
Fort McMurray and Athabasca Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Franco-Canadian Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 5747 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 5262 (iii).
Franking Campaign Literature: *See* 'Political.'
Fraser, Mr. John, Inspector at Stellarton, I.C.R., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3935 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4188 (iii).
Fraser, Mr. John, Postmaster at Stellarton, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
Fraserville Bridge Works, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 549 (i).
Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3150 (ii).
—— Cor. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3534 (ii).
Fredericton and Grand Lake Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6224 (iv).
Freight Rates, Discrimination in the West: Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).
—— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Turriff) 3048 (ii).
See 'Railways.'
French Canadian Repatriation, Policy of Govt. (Mr. Paquet) 619 (i).
French River, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Devlin) *re* Provision in Estimates, 6729 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Murphy) Conc., 6776 (iv).
French Translation of Revised Statutes: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
French Translator, Apptmt. of Mr. C. E. Duckett: M. (Mr. Borden) 1969 (ii).
Fritz, Henry, Dismissal as Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).
Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).
Galops Canal, Upper Lock: in Com. of Sup., 5797 (iv).
Gananoque Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Garceau, Mr. N., Apptmt. as Inquiry Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2860 (ii).
—— Resignation as Commissioner: Remarks (Mr. Demers) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
Garthby, Lake Aylmer, Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (ii).
Gasoline Engines on Fishing Boats, Number, &c.: (Mr. Sinclair) 2666 (ii).

Gaspé Basin Marine Agency, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
——— Inquiry, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).
Gaspé Landing Pier, Appropriation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Gaspé Shore Tidal Wave, Govt. Aid *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2858 (ii).
Gaspé Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3305 (ii).
Gass, Trueman, Emplymt. and Dismissal on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2242 (ii).
Gatineau and Ungava Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Gauthier, Alderic, Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4976 (iii).
Geological Survey, Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Govt. Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
——— Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 3060 (ii).
See 'French River.'
——— Rep. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Speech of P.M.G. at Renfrew: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 1970 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Route and French River: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 6785 (iv).
Gerrior, Mr. William, Dismissal from Customs at Larry's River, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3051 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3056 (ii).
Gillies, Capt., Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 3261 (ii).
Gillis Point Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Girard, Louis, Dismissal as Postmaster at Ste. Angele de Merici: M. for Pets.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2587 (ii).
Girroir, John, Resignation from I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4185 (iii).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 804 (i).
Glenelg, N.S., Postmaster, Complaints *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 1817 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Emplymt. in Govt., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3752 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4980 (iii).
Gold Coinage, by Mint.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1213 (i).
See 'Coin.'
Good Roads, Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Good Roads, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 284 (i).
Goods purchased by Public Works Dept. since Oct. 1911, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 1578 (i).
See 'Pub. Works—Purchases.'
Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Goose Creek Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2372 (ii).
Goucher, Wesley, Dismissal as Lightkeeper: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4977 (iii).
Goulet, Mr., Apptmt. as Station Inspector, N. T.Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3935 (ii).
Govt. Appointments of Relatives of Members: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6295-7 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays: M. (Mr. Borden) 2376 (ii).
Govt. Dredges, Contract *re* Boarding Employees: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5953 (iv).
See 'Marine.'
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5952 (iv).
Govt. Employees, Dismissal, Resignations, &c: M. for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1818 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Govt. Employees, Inside and Outside Service, Dismissals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Kyte) 2587 (ii).
Govt. House Property, Toronto, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Govt. Loans, Amounts, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4777 (iii).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Cable,' 'Freight Rates,' 'Parcel Post,' 'Railways,' &c.
Govt. Printing Patronage to Quebec Papers: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1357 (i).
Govt. Purchases for Public Works, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1204 (i).
Govt. Railways Management, Abolition of Govt. Ry. Managing Board: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 569 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5262 (iii).
Govt. Steamers, Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
——— Repairs, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
See 'Marine.'
Govt. Works Tolls Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Gov. Gen.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 1035, 1041 (i).
Governor General of Canada, Letters Patent: M. for Copy* (Mr. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).

Grain Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Foster) Res. prop., 793, 869, in Com. on Res., 870; 1°* of B., 874 (i); 2°, 2161; in Com., 2179, 2186, 2302, 2382, 2535, 2560, 2755, 3156, 3451, 3491, 3630, 3757 (ii), 4042, 4153, 4787; 3°m., 4788, agreed to, 4835 (iii).
See 'B. 96.'

In committee:
Agents car reports, 2573 (ii).
Binning, 3452,, 3460 (ii).
Car distribution, 3461, 3491 (ii); 4788 (iii).
Car orders and distribution, 3183, 3190 (ii).
Car rights, 2565 (ii).
Certificates, 3180 (ii).
Certificates with grain, 2400 (ii).
Commission's offices, 2182; salaries, 2181 (ii), 4154 (iii).
——— Regulations, 2187 (ii).
——— Transportation, 2187 (ii).
Country elevators, rules, &c., 2562 (ii).
Country elevators and warehouses, 2568, 3181 (ii).
See 'Warehouse.'
Fees, 2304, 2323, 2326, 2573, 3156 (ii).
Flat warehouses, 2568 (ii).
Fort William elevators, 2317, 2383 (ii).
Grades, 2536, 2767 (ii).
Grading, 2535 (ii).
Grain in bond, 2401, 3453 (ii).
Grain delivery on receipts, 4046 (iii).
Grain rejected, 2554, 2767, 3176, 3456 (ii).
Grain of same grade to be kept together, 2383 (ii).
Grain Survey Board, 2535 (ii).
Grain Offices in Winnipeg, 2536, 3159, 3453 (ii).
Hospital elevators, 2547, 2548, 3177, 3757 (ii), 4042 (iii).
Inspection, 3157 (ii).
Inspectors security, 2202 (ii).
Inspection at Terminal elevators, 2561 (ii).
Interpretation, 2548 (ii).
Licenses, 2561, 3182, 3457, 3761, 3798 (ii).
Loading platforms, 2570, 3188, 3461 (ii).
'Manitoba Hard,' 2538, 2771, 3162 (ii), 4155 (iii).
Manufacturing license, 2561 (ii).
Mixing, 2313, 3458, 3799 (ii).
Oaths, 2201, 2302 (ii).
Overage, 2399, 3452 (ii).
Reinspection, 2382, 2755 (ii).
Sample markets, 2306, 2383, 3630, 3799 (ii), 4077 (iii).
Samples, rejection of, 2545 (ii).
Screenings, 2554 (ii).
See 'Grain rejected.'
Seed grain, 2564 (ii).
Seed elevators, 3761 (ii).

In committee—*Con.*
Security by licenses, 3798 (ii).
Standards, establishment of, 2203, 2302, 2305, 2397, 3157, 3161 (ii).
Terminal elevators, acquisition of, 3526 (ii).
——— privileges, buying and selling, 3762, 3773 (ii), 4042, 4058 (iii).
——— Storage at, 2560 (ii).
Time for loading cars, 2572, 3183 (ii).
U.S. grain, grading of, 2547 (ii).
Weigh masters, apptmnt., 2323 (ii).
Weights, 2323, 2770 (ii).
Warehouse receipts, 3183, 3458 (ii).
Warehouse receipts and fees, 2183, 2186 (ii).
3°m., 4788 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Cash) 6 m. h., 4808 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Cruise) *re* car distribution, 4788 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Knowles) *re* elevator owners buying and selling grain, 4804 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. McCraney) *re* mixing, 4803 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Oliver) *re* expenses of administration, 4806 (iii).
Amt. (Mr. Thomson) *re* sample markets, 4794 (iii).
Grain Bill, Notice for Discussion (Mr. W. F. Knowles) 1574 (i).
——— Tel. from Grain Growers Association: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4744 (iii).
Grain Carriage to Duluth, &c., Ref. to Washington Despatches: Stmnt. (Mr. Foster) 2577 (ii).
Grain Congestion in the North West: Remarks (Mr. McCraney) on M. for Sup., 5760 (iv).
Grain Congestion in the West, Car Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6186, 6556 (iv).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Foster) 5954 (iv).
Grain Congestion in N.W.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Oliver) 6203 (v).
Grain Shipments from Canadian Ports, Quantity, Grades, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 536 (i).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 539 (i).
Grain Shipments to Terminal Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6792 (iv).
Grain Shipments from the West, Regulation of Freight Rates, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3975, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 84) 4035 (ii).
Grain Storage at Minneapolis: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Oliver) 6493 (iv).
Grain Transportation in the West, Par. in Toronto Globe: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 5928 (iv).
Grand Lake and Belle River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6307 (iv).
G. T. R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike: *See* 'B. No. 130.'

G. T. Ry., Strikes and Board of Conciliation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. MacNutt) 3756 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement by late Govt., Judge Barron's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2580 (ii).
G. T. R., Running Rights over T. & N. O. R., *See* 'B. No. 145.'
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s (charter extension) Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
G. T. P. Ry., Privy Council Judgment: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
G. T. P. Ry. (Brandon) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6324 (iv).
—— Bridge at Assiniboine, Subsidy: in Com. on Res., Amt. (Mr. Borden) 6060 (iii).
—— Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5900 (iv).
—— Remuneration to Govt. Director: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
—— Workshops at Quebec, Agreement *re* Site: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 3050 (ii).
Gray, W. W., Coal Inspector, Charges *re* Investigation by H. P. Duchemin: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2588 (ii).
Great Northern Mining & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6224 (iv).
Green, John B., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. White) 6183 (iii).
Griever, Mr. S., Charges *re* Lighthouse Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).
Guarantee Life Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Guillemette, Mr. N., Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).
Guimond, Eugene, Dismissal of: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N. T. Ry. Investigation Commission, British Subject, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4038 (iii).
—— Improper form of Question: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (ii).
—— Naturalization of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4978 (iii).
See 'N. T. Ry.'
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for Sup., 1445 (i), 5621 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Line, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 676 (i).
—— Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 571 (i).
Hagerty, Mr. S. W., Dismissal from Inspectorship of Ry. Station: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4976 (iii).
Ha Ha Bay Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5895, 6212 (iv).
Hale, Mr. Thos., Discharge as Labour Correspondent: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4263 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4459 (iii).
Halifax, &c., Newfoundland & G. B., Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Halifax Dock Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5596 (iv).
Halifax Terminal Facilities: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 4196 (iii).
See 'G.B. and Can. Mail Service,' 'Fast Atlantic.'
Hamel, Hector, Customs Appraiser, Montreal, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 3343 (ii).
Hamilton Harbour: *See* 'B. No. 23.'
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Ham Nord Postmaster, Investigation Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Ham., Robt., Dismissal from Trachoma Hospital, Halifax: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 875 (i).
Hampton Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1527 (i).
Hampton Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 675 (i).
—— Construction *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 572 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, 269 (i).
See 'Debates.'
Harbour Commissioners Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 1571 (i).
Harbour, Geo. T., Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
—— Letter *re* Dismissal: Read (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3252 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
—— Improvements, &c., Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
—— Man., Repairs, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
—— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i), 2366 (ii).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
Harmony to Elmira Branch Ry., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).
Harris, W. H., Postmaster at White Head, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sinclair) 2588 (ii).
See 'Whitehead.'
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Contract *re* Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4171 (iii).
—— Ry.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Pugsley) 1843 (i).
See 'Albert,' &c.

Hatfield, A. M., Charges *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Law) 5263 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Law) in Com. of Sup., 5252 (iii).
Hattie, Wm. A., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2460 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1815 (i).
Hawkes, Mr. A., Apptmt. in Immigration Dept.: M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. Cs., 605 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
Hayden, W. W., Wharfinger at Digby, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5957 (iii).
Headquarters Staff, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5536 (iii).
Health Ass'n.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Health Department, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 1585 (i).
Hebert, Auguste, Postmaster at St. Pascal, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. Lapointe) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
Hefferman, Mr. F. S., Dismissal from Customs at Spring Hill, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).
Hendsbee, David S., Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries Dept.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3342 (ii).
Henry, Norbert, Contract *re* Mails between Scott Junction and Station: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 975 (i).
Highlands Bridge Construction: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 1197 (i), 5790 (iv).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Highways and Road Construction: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Pugsley) 142 (i).
Highways, Assistance to: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Highways Improvements, Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
Highways in N.S., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Highway Crossings eliminated on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5595 (iv).
Hillsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
Historic Tableaus in Ottawa Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Homestead Inspectors, Number employed in Sask., Number dismissed: Ques. (Mr. L. Thomson) 1588 (i).
Horncastle, Isabella Helen, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Horse Racing: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Horses destroyed at Weyburn, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6790 (iv).
Horses imported from U.S., Destruction of for Glanders: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 5693, 5939 (iv).
Horsfall, Herbert, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Houle, Stanislas, Emplymt. on Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3537 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Additional Accommodation for Members: in Com. of Sup., 1951 (i).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment for: M. (Mr. Borden) 3343 (ii).
Ballots, Voting by Divisions: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 4979 (iii).
Bibeau, Mr. A., Sessional Clerk, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4248 (iii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 4775 (iii).
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Borden) 4980 (iii).
Carleton County Electoral Vacancy, Issue of Writ: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1810 (i).
Chicoutimi Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 11 (i).
Christmas Adjournment for Holidays: M. (Mr. Borden) 927 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 702 (i).
Coffin, Mr. Henry, Emplymt. as Sessional Messenger, Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 2289 (ii).
—— M. Picotte: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 2459 (ii).
See 'Picotte.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Mr. Borden) 10 (i).
—— Lists: Presented (Mr. Borden) 703 (i).
—— M. to present Rep. (Mr. Borden) 794 (i).
Distribution Office, Salaries: M. to conc. in Senate Report, &c.: (Mr. Borden) 6660 (iv).
Downey, W. H., Returning Officer, Kings and Albert, Non-Payment of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 2057 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays: M. (Mr. Borden) 2376 (ii).
—— Wednesday Sittings, M. (Mr. Borden) *re* Precedence, 1969 (ii).
House of Commons Desks, Changes *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
House of Commons Employees, Salary Increases: M. (Mr. Borden) to conc. in report of Mr. Speaker, 6660 (iv).
—— Improvements *re* Acoustics: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 1335 (i).
—— Messengers, Dismissals, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Ethier) 562 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 6807 (iv).
—— Stenographers: in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).
—— Remarks *re* (Mr. Pugsley) 1846 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
—— Ventilation: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Names. presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
Joliette County Returning Officer, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 4979 (iii).
Lanctot Investigation, Counsel Fees *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Legislation, Joint Com.: M. (Mr. Borden) 2217 (ii).
Library Committee: M. (Mr. Borden) 795 (i).
Library, House of Commons, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1950 (ii).
——— Report presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
McDougall, J. M., Counsel Fees *re* Lanctot Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Maskinonge Election Expenses, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 4776 (iii).
Members Travelling Allowances during Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1848 (i).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Parliament, Opening of Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
Picotte, Mederic, Messenger H. of C., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2065 (ii).
See 'Coffin.'
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1585 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time: M. (Mr. Borden) 930 (i).
—— Rep. of Examiner *re* Pets., Divergency of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 643 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6780 (iv).
Quebec West Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Questions, Improperly drafted: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4983, 5054 (iii).
Renfrew South, Electoral Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 926 (i).
Restaurant Com.: M. for Com. (Mr. Borden) 710 (i).
Restaurant, Payments to Waiters: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2861 (ii).
—— Minimum Wages paid in Cites: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 3049 (ii).
Rooms allotted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 670 (i).
Saturday Sittings: Stmnt. (Mr. Borden) 5830 (iv).
Sessional Employees dismissed, Number &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 568 (i), 2064 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Speaker, Election of: M. (Mr. Borden) 2, 5 (i).
—— Deputy: M. (Mr. Borden) 519, 523 (i).
Speaker, Mr., Congratulations *re* Reading Prayers in French (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1808 (i).
Statutes of Previous Sessions, Delay *re* Distribution: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Telephones, Long Distance, &c., in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Min. of the Int.: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 553 (i).
Voters' Lists in Man., Distribution *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3056 (ii).
Yamaska Electoral Agent: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1584 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Construction: in Com. of Sup., 622, 677 (i), 5762, 6605 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Construction, Cor. *re*: M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1213 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Neely) for O. Cs., 732 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 132 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Murphy) 6776 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ports, Nav., &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Aikins) 3756 (ii).
—— Surveys, *re* Navigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Aikins) 3943 (ii).
Hull City Hall Square, Improvements by Improvement Commission: Ques. (Mr. Kidd) 2293 (ii).
Hull Dismissals: *See* 'Dismissals.'
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4261 (iii).
See 'Chauvin.'
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Fishery Inspector at Belleville, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2860 (ii).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Power for Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3289 (ii).
Ice-breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Ile Bezard and Ste. Genevieve Wharfs, Completion of repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 557 (i).
Ile Rouge Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of Mr. Irving: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4259 (iii).
IMMIGRATION—
Agents in Belgium, Number &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Agents, Dismissals, Number and Names: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 877 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Agencies, G. B. and Can., Salaries, &c.: in Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1212 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Agencies, G. B. and Can., Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3305, 3911 (ii).
Agents, Notification to Booking Agents *re* Bonus: Ques. (Mr. Sutherland) 875 (i).
Asselin, Mr. Oliver, Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
'British News,' &c., Purchase by Dept. of Int.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6660 (iv).
Chinese entering B. C., Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4778 (iii).
Chinese Tax in B. C.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stevens) 285 (i).
Chinese and Japanese in B. C., Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 555 (i).
Eastern Townships, Field for Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. McCrea) 6557 (iv).
Farm Labourers, Placing of, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sutherland) 5263 (iii).
—— Agents *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sutherland) 874 (i).
—— Complaints *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Sutherland) 4781 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sutherland) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Farm Labourers in Quebec, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1359 (i).
French Canadian Repatriation, Policy of Govt. (Mr. Paquet) 619 (i).
Hawkes, Mr. Arthur, Apptmt. *re* Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 527 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Oliver) for O. Cs. 605 (i).
—— Report of Mr. Hawkes: Inquiry for (Mr. Oliver) 6551 (iv).
Hospitals, Number and Location: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1210 (i).
Immigration, Amount expended, Number of Immigrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1211 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1213 (i).
Immigrant Inspection before Sailing for Canada: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 618 (i).
Immigration Office in London, Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2451 (ii).
Immigration in Ont., Promise to Premier *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1212 (i).
Immigration Regulations *re* entering Canada: in Com. of Sup., 3911 (ii).
IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigration Societies, State-Aid, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1211 (i).
Immigration from U.S., *re* Wm. Pearson Co.: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 3152 (ii).
Immigration from U.S., Opposition by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 3154 (ii).
—— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 3154 (ii).
Japanese, Oriental, Immigration, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 875 (i).
Labour Conditions in B. C., Emplymt. of Orientals: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 177 (i).
Laforce, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2242 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette, Mich.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. R., Immigration Agent at Detroit: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Literature, French Publications: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1212 (i).
Mar. Provs. Immigration Policy: Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2072 (ii).
Medical Examiners, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1213 (i).
Murray, J. P., Carpet Co., Breach of Immigration Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Negro Immigration: Remarks on Immigration Question (Mr. Thoburn) 608 (i).
Oriental Immigration, Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4779 (iii).
Sevigny, Mr. J. E., Apptmt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1205, 1588, 1814 (i).
Sikhs in B.C., Decision *re* bringing in their wives: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2457 (ii).
Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* O.C.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 1209 (i).
Imperial Loan and Investment Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Imperial Naturalization, Uniformity *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2420 (ii).
Indemnity to Members: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
INDIANS:
Abenakis Indian Agent, Apptmt. and Salary: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1587 (i).
Doncaster Indian Reserve Road Repairs: in Conc., 6806 (iv).
Indians, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1039 (i).
Police Point Reserve Transfer: M. for Papers* (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Watha Indian Reserve, Tenders *re* Timber: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3055 (ii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act: in Com. of Sup., 1498 (i), 6615 (iv).
Industrial Training and Education Royal Commission: in Com. of Sup., 1527 (i).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Salaries: in Conc., 6770 (iv).
—— Private Secretary: in Com. of Sup., 6490 (iv).
—— Promotions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6490 Conc., 6771 (iv).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1040, 1061 (i).
Inland Revenue Reports: Presented (Mr. Nantel) 565 (i).
Inquiries Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Insect and Pest Destruction Act, Enforcement of: in Com. of Sup., 6479 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Inspectors *re* Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iv).
INTERCOLONIAL RY.:
Air Brakes: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii).
Archibald, Mr. P. B., Emplymt. by Ry Dept.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).
Ash, Mr. Earl, Claims *re* Damages for Fire on I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Emmerson) 2246 (ii).
Benoit, Mr. Joseph, Dismissal from I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4184 (iii).
Board of Management: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (iii).
—— Abolition of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 5571 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 569 (i).
Bourque, Mr. Jeffrey, Claims *re* Damages on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2243 (ii).
—— M. for Reps.* (Mr. Boulay) 2459 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
Branch Lines, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 622 (i), 4135 (iii).
Branch Lines: Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 985 (i).
—— Accommodation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Davidson) in Com. of Sup., 4218 (iii).
Branch Lines, Acquisition by Govt., Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 565 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Acquisition: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 569 (i).
—— Subsidies to, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5618 (iv).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
INTERCOLONIAL—*Con.*
Brotherhood Unions, Agreements, &c.: M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 793 (i).
Campbellton Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).
Caraquet and North Shore Branch Line, I.C. Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Turgeon) 4192 (iii).
Chatham Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
Coal Supply, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2457 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iv).
Condon, D. Murray, Passenger Agent: Transfer of, Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 3337 (ii).
Construction and Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).
Dartmouth Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
Dartmouth to Denus Branch Line, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 543 (i).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 5637 (iv).
Estende to Baddeck Branch Line, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 576 (i).
—— M. for Papers (Mr. McKenzie) 2494 (ii).
Extension Branches: in Com. of Sup., 673 (i).
Facilities on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5809; conc., 6774 (iv).
Fences, Number of Rods, Campbellton Division: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 6748 (iv).
Freight on Fish, Aid *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 6748 (iv).
Girroir, John, Resignation from I.C.Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4185 (iii).
Guysborough Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 676 (i).
—— Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 571 (i).
Halifax Dock Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5596 (iv).
Hampton Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
Hampton Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 675 (i).
Highway Crossings eliminated: in Com. of Sup., 5595 (iv).
Hillsborough Branch, Rails loaned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4978 (iii).
I.C.R. and G.T. Ry. Arbitration, Delays in Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3939 (ii).
I.C.R., Control by Ry. Commission, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 4979 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL—*Con.*
Lavoie, Mr. Absolon, Inquiry *re* Death on I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Locomotives manufactured at Moncton: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iv).
—— &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boulay) in Com. of Sup., 5655 (iv).
Madore, Alphonse, Claims for Damages: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3055 (ii).
'Market Tickets' to Employees: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iv).
Matapedia to Gaspé Basin Line, I.C. Ry. Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 4194 (iii).
Matapedia Water Works Co., Claims against I.C. Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Moncton Ry. Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
Moncton Office, Tenders *re* Heating, Stmnt. *re*: Ans. (Mr. Monk) 6744 (iv).
Moncton Shops, Contract for Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5611, 5762 (iv).
—— Operation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iv).
—— Transfer to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
Morice, Theophile, Dismissal from: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4262 (iii).
Mulgrave Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
North Sydney Diversion Line: in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
Ocean Limited, Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2241 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on conc., 6774 (iv).
Passes to Employees, Newspaper Reporters, &c., Instruction from Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 2328 (ii).
Pay Day, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Brouillard) 3340 (ii).
—— Instructions *re* Holiday and Sunday Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 1583 (i).
Pictou Employees, Charges *re* Political Partisanship: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 2246 (ii).
Provident Fund, Payments to Dismissed Officials: M. (Mr. Emmerson) to Com. of Sup., 5930 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2450 (ii).
Pullman Conductors, Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1413 (i).
Ry. Ties, Contract *re* at Sayabec: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4041 (iii).
—— Contract with Dame Boulay: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Carvell) 5957 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL—*Con.*
Refrigerator Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5603 (iv).
Rivière du Loup, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).
—— Shops Removal to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 570 (i).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5609, 5653, 6461 (iv).
Roy, Wm., Rep. of H. Boulay *re* Charges on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 934 (i).
—— M. for Papers (Mr. Boulay) 1391 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Fence Poles, Charges *re* Removal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2586 (ii).
St. Laurent, Xavier, Claims for Loss of Horse killed: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Ste. Rosalie Branch Line, Accommodation, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4134 (iii).
Snow Blockade, Delay to Trains: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1409 (i).
Steamship Connections with I.C.R., Subsidies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5597 (iv).
Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Ry., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2289 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 542 (i).
—— Supt., Application from Member of H. C.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4040 (iii).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (iv).
Ticket Collectors, Appmt of.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 6786 (iv).
Truro Station: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).
—— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1412 (i).
Vale Railroad, Operation by I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iv).
—— Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).
Wallace Harbour Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
Working Expenses, Construction, &c., Statement (read): in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).

INTERIOR:
Crown Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, Reservations for School Lands: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1587 (i).
Interior Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).
Internal Economy Commission Names: presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
International Congress *re* Fisheries, Delegates: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
International Fisheries Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6646; conc., 6778 (iv).
International Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'

International Institute of Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv).
International Waterways: *See* 'Boundary.'
Interprovincial Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Inverness Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
Investigation *re* Govt. Dismissals: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
See 'Dismissals.'
Investigation *re* Dismissals, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5950 (iv).
Isaac, Isobell, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Jacques, Leander, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 3339 (ii).
James Bay Ry. Subsidy: in Com., 6309 (iv).
Japanese, Oriental, Immigration, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 875 (i).
See 'Immigration.'
Jenkins, Wm. A. Hunt, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Joint Stock Companies Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2857 (ii).
Joliette County Returning Officer, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Guilbault) 4979 (iii).
Jones, Chas. O., Dismissal, Evidence, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).
—— Remarks, 5161 (iii).
Judges Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Additional in Ont.: Remarks (Mr. German) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Judges in Yukon: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Judges of Superior Court, Montreal, Superannuation, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ethier) 2459 (ii).
JUSTICE:
Burrard Power Co. v. The King, Judgment of Judicial Com.: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1409 (i).
Deputy Minister of Justice, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3150 (ii).
—— Extra Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cruise) 2458 (ii).
Dugas, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2858 (ii).
Hull Superior Court, Apptmt. of Mr. Chauvin: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4261 (iii).
Judges for Ont., Apptmt. of Additional in Ont.: Remarks (Mr German) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Judges of Superior Court, Montreal, Superannuation, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ethier) 2459 (ii).
Justice, Deptl. Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 6584 (iv).
—— Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Justice, Min. of, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 725 (i).
Letellier, Judge Blaise, Residence *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3150 (ii).
Montreal Circuit Court Judge, Additional: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 545 (i), 2855 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3907 (ii).
—— Additional Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6597 (iv).
Northwest Territories, Administration of Justice: in Com. of Sup., 6565 (iv).
Ottawa County Superior Court, Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4121 (iii).
Penitentiaries in Canada Report: Presented (Mr. Doherty) 970 (i).
Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 3331 (ii).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1816 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1577 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5162 (iii).
Solicitor General, Payment of Salary to Min. of Justice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 725 (i).
Supreme Court of Canada, Division *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).
Tourigny, Mr. Justice, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3147 (ii).
Juvenile Delinquents Act: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Keewatin, Pet. *re* Educational Clause: Ques. (Mr. Barrette) 3149 (ii), 4240 (iii).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Keewatin, R. C. Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Law) 3340 (ii).
Kelly, Edward, Dismissal from Canso Reduction Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).
Kennedy, Allan, Govt. Telegraph Repairer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).
Kennedy, John Rogers, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Kennedy, Mr., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2020 (ii).
Kennie, Capt., Edmund, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 6782 (iv).
'Kestrel' Fishery Cruiser, Condemnation of: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 549 (i).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5899, 6220, 6322 (iv).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy: in Com., 6327 (iv).
Kidsons' Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3054 (ii).

King's Printer, Apptmt. of Assistant: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).
Kingston, R. M. C. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Kirouac, Mr., Postmaster at Manseau, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Pacaud) 2579 (ii).
Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5899, 6219 (iv).
La Banque de St. Hyacinthe and La Banque St. Jean, Reimbursements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 528 (i).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
—— Investigation *re* Liquidation: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2069 (ii).
Laberge, Mr., Compensation to Family *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Labour Conditions in B. C., Emplymt. of Orientals: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 177 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
—— Private Secretary: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
'Labour Gazette' Correspondents, Apptmt. in Richelieu County: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2292 (ii).
—— Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1411 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Verville) on M. for Sup., 1441 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1468 (i).
—— Names of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1865 (i).
'Labour Gazette,' Printing and Distribution &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1468 (i).
Labour Strike Funds: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Lachenaie Postmaster, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5949 (iv).
L'Achigan Ice Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2294 (ii).
Lachine Canal, Lock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
—— Rockfield Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5790 (iv).
Lachine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i), 1952 (ii).
Lacombe, Mr. J. A., Dismissal from St. Sebastien P. O., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 974 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Beland) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Lac Seul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Ry Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6217 (iv).
Laforce, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 3535 (ii).
Laforce, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2242 (ii).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., 6312 (iv).
Lake Temiskaming Dam, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pugsley) 2459 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Lake Winnipegosis Fishery, Limitation *re* Catch: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 3055 (ii).
Lalonde, Alfred, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4779 (iii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Cardin) 6783 (iv).
Lalonde, Mr. Damien, Rep. *re* Assault: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4255 (iii).
Lanctot Investigation, Counsel Fees *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
See 'House of Commons..
Land Grants to Railways in Western Provs., prior to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 725 (i).
Land Scrip, &c., to Veterans: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'
Lapointe, Mr. Joseph, Apptmt. as Overseer on Lake Aylmer: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
Laroche, Capt. Leon, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 4549 (iii).
Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5055 (iii).
La Societe National Gymnastique, Grant to: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iv).
L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii), 5951, 6781 (iv).
—— Continuation of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2579 (ii).
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. C. A., Immigration Agent at Marquette, Mich.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Laurier, Mr. R., Immigration Agent at Detroit: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 2454 (ii).
Lauzon, Desire, Emplymt. by Govt., References as to Character: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3538 (ii).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Lavoie, Mr. Absolon, Inquiry *re* Death on I. C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Lavoie, Mr. Calixte, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brouillard) 3339 (ii).
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 1341, 1531 (i).
—— Memorials, *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2460 (ii).
Leaitch, Alvena Bell, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Lebel, Mr. W., Dismissal from Customs: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1864 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
'Le Devoir,' Quotations from: Ques. of Order (Mr. Blondin) 371; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 372 (i).

Legault, Mr. Ophir, Postmaster at L'Ile Perrot, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5950 (iv).
Legislation, Joint Com.: M. (Mr. Borden) 2217 (ii).
Leigh, Mr. W. M., Dismissal from Kirkton Post Office: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5949 (iv).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Ex. P.M.G., Par in 'Le Devoir' *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2664 (ii).
——— Ques. Ruled out (Mr. Speaker) 2580 (ii).
Lemieux, Mr., Relatives appointed to Govt. Service: List read (Mr. Boulay) in Com. of Sup., 6297 (iv).
Lepage, M. J., Preventive Officer, Rimouski, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4458 (iii).
Leroux, Mr., Soulanges Canal, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6183 (iii).
Letellier, Judge Blaise, Residence *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3150 (ii).
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 729 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Buchanan) in Com. of Sup., 2210 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 728 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
L'Evenement Publishing Co., Minister acting as Director: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
Levis Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Levis Dry Dock: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Béland) 6492 (iv).
Levis Graving Dock, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
Library Committee: M. (Mr. Borden) 795 (i).
Library, House of Commons, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1950 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Report Presented (Mr. Borden) 11 (i).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5228 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers at Repentigny, Charges *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii), 5949 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
Lightkeepers in N.S., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
Lightkeepers in P.E.I., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Linwood and Grosvenor Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
Little Anse Harbour Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 2043 (ii).
Liverpool-Manitoba Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).
Live Stock, Inspection *re* Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Live Stock Record Assns.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Living, Cost of, Special Rep.: Presented (Mr. Crothers) 6332 (iv).
Lizotte, Luc., Postmaster at Pacome, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3756 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Season in St. John, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).
Lobster Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 5256 (iii).
Lobster Traps, Twine, Customs Changes in Tariff: on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Papers, 1362 (i).
——— on M. for Sup. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1070 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Locas, Mr. Henri, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3338 (ii).
Locomotives manufactured at Moncton I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iv).
——— Renewing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boulay) in Com. of Sup., 5655 (iv).
Logs, Stealing of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Londonderry Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 6337 (iv).
London, Eng., Dom. Building: in Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).
See 'Can. Offices.'
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 269 (i).
Lords Day Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Lorneville Breakwater, N.B. Tests *re* Foundation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Lotbiniere County Postmasters, Dismissal, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 972 (i).
Louiseville Public Building: Conc., 6794 (iv).
Lowe, Robt. S., Emplymt. by Public Works Dept., Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Loyal Order of Moose: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Lumber Duties, Inspection *re*, Report in Winnipeg 'Free Press': Ques. (Mr. Turriff) 2446 (ii).
——— Interpretaion and Enforcement: M. for Papers (Mr. Knowles) 582 (i).

Lumber Duties, Violation of Customs Act: Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 1723 (i); Neg. (Y. 62; N. 107) 1806 (i).
Lumber, Stealing of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
McAdam, Alex. R., Fishery Officer at Antigonish, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 3343 (ii).
McAllister, Mr., Moving Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6596 (iv).
McAuley, Angus, Claims for Damages *re* Fire Investigation: M. for Rep.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).
McDonald, Dr. D., Dismissal from Indian Reserve, Baddeck: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 2861 (ii).
McDougall, J. M., Counsel Fees *re* Lanctot Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
See 'Lanctot.'
McEachren, Mr. Charles, Dismissal from Tatamagouche Post Office: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2243 (ii).
McFarlane, J. D., Postmaster at Southwest Margaree, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3756 (ii).
McGrath, James, Postmaster at Aspen, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2587 (ii).
McIssac, Colin, Preventive Officer at Port Hood, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 5956 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 5816 (iv).
McLean, Donald E., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 4980 (iii).
McLean, W. D., Dismissal from Customs at L'Etang: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).
McLennan, Mr., Dismissal from Inverness Public Building: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 2017 (ii).
McLeod, John, Dismissal as Postmaster at Denmark, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonald) 4460 (iii).
McLeod, Dr. J. R., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury, Charges *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Kyte) 3945 (ii).
McPhee, James, Customs Officer, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 3757 (ii).
McPherson, John H., Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4259 (iii).
McRae, Mr. F. D., Pets. *re* Clemency: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 713 (i).
Madeleine de Verchères Monument, Erection of: in Com. of Sup., 2824 (ii).
Mader, Mr. D., Dismissal from Mahone Bay P.O.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 722 (i).
Madore, Alphonse, Claims for Damages in I. C. Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 3055 (ii).
Magdalen Island Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).
Magdalen Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4730 (iii).
Magdalen Islands Marconi News Service, Copy of Instructions: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'News' *re*: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 4159 (iii).
——— Remarks, 3833 (ii).
——— Salary of Correspondent: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4262 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Hazen) 4041 (iii).
Magdalen Island Telegraph and Telephone: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
Mahone Bay and Tancook Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4733 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4777 (iii).
Mail Carriers, Como to Oka, Compensation to Family: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Mail Clerks, Salary Increases: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 5693 (iv).
Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
Mail Service between G.B. and Canada, Letter of Board of Trade, Quebec: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 1843 (i).
See 'Can. and G.B.,' 'Fast Atlantic,' 'Post Office,' &c.
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i), 4714 (iii), 5934 (iv).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Maisonneuve Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1347 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Discussion *re* Man. School Question: Ques. (Mr. Nesbitt) 534 (i).
——— Conference *re* Separate Schools: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 715 (i).
——— Cor., &c., *re* Settlement with Provs. of Man. and Ont.: M. for Papers (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 774, 789 (i).
——— Eastern and Western Line: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 971 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension B. 115 (Mr. Borden) Res. prop., 3538; in Com. on Res., 3835, 3886; 1°* of B., 3898 (ii); 2° m., 4263, 4353; Amt. (Sir W. Laurier) 6 m. h., 4375, Neg. (Y. 65; N. 103) 4395; 2°, rsmd., 4397, 4461; agreed to (Y. 114; N. 76) 4495; in Com., 4496, 4584, 4656, 4701, 4836; 3° m., 4838; Amt. (Mr. Mondou) Separate Schools, 4839, Neg. (Y. 24; N. 160) 4925; Amt. (Mr. Béland) 4934, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 108) 4973; 3° agreed to, 4974 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Eastern Extension: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Form of Ques., 3936; Ans. (Mr. Borden) 3936-7 (ii).
—— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 3755 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor. with Ont. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Meighen) 2459 (ii).
—— Extension of, Par. in 'Montreal Star': Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 489 (i).
—— Financial Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 558 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Oliver) 3448, 3834 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Turriff) 1820 (i).
—— Swamp Lands, Acreage, &c.: Inquiry for Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3751 (ii).
—— Terms *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 716 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
See 'Grain B. 32.'
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6314 (iv).
Man. and N.S. Federal Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4258 (iii).
Manitoba Questions: Remarks *re* Answers (Mr. Nesbitt) 581 (i).
See 'Man. Boundaries B. 115.'
Man. Separate School Bill: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Monk) 226, 231 (i).
Maple Sugar, Cancellation of O. C. *re* Standards: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 716 (i).
Marcil, Mr. Tancrède, Application *re* Govt. Position: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2069 (ii).
Marconi Co., Negotiations *re* Wireless Messages to all Dominions: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2585 (ii).
See 'Magdalen.'
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
MARINE:
'Aboukir' Cruiser, Paying off of Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 408 (i).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Hazen) 489 (i).
Adams, Mr., Resignation as Examiner of Pilots: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5227 (iii).
Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
'Arctic' Steamship, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5398 (iii).
Atlantic Coast Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Biological Board, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4257 (iii).
Bird Rocks Lighthouse, Drowning of Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 5258 (iii).
Coal for Govt. Steamers, Average Cost per Ton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1203 (i).
Coasting Trade, O.C., Extending Time: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1814 (i).
—— Foreign Shipping, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Kyte) 2861 (ii).
'Earl Grey' and 'Minto' Govt. Steamers, Names of Employees: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1816 (i).
Fisheries Contracts with Stewards on Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 681 (i).
Gaspé Basin Marine Agency, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
—— Deptl. Inquiry, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1358 (i).
Govt. Dredges and Tugs, Instructions *re* Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5952 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, B.C., Use for Political Purposes: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5262 (iii).
Govt. Steamers, Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
—— Repairs, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
Ice-breaker at St. Gerard, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Insurance of Canadian Marine, Govt. Co-operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1582 (i).
Kidson's Island Lighthouse, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 3054 (ii).
L'Achigan Ice Breaker, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2294 (ii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5228 (iii).
Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5237 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5232 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers, Pensions to: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
Live Stock Inspection *re* Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1041 (i), 6651 (iv).
Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
—— Ships for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 6787 (iv).
Marine Workshops at Quebec, Instructions *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 554 (i).

Naval Ships, Construction of, Rep. of Admiral Kingsmill: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lemieux) 2459 (ii).
See 'Navy.'
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
Patrol Vessels in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5949 (iv).
Radiotelegraphic Service, Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (ii).
Registration of Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Repentigny Lighthouse Keepers, Charges *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii), 5949 (iv).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 6784 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel, Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 5680 (iv).
St. Patrick's Channel Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration: Ques. (Mr. Barrette) 974 (i).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 1571 (i).
Tidal Service, Surveying Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5400 (iii).
Vickers-Maxim Co.'s Contract *re* Construction of Montreal Dry Dock: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2450 (ii).
Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Wrecks Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Maritime Law International Conference, Invitation to Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2586 (ii).
Mar. Provs. Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Mar. Provs. Immigration Policy: Prop. Res. (Mr. Rhodes) 2072 (ii).
Maritime Telephone Co. and P. E. I. Connection: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
'Market Tickets' to I. C. R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iv).
Marlin, Mrs. A. S., Postmistress, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Marriage Act Amt., Decision of Privy Council: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2855 (ii).
——— Ref. to Privy Council, Provl. Representation: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii).
Marriage Act Amt., Ref. to Supreme Court, 3332 (ii).
——— Correction in Speech (Mr. Pelletier) 3532 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) *re* Order for 2°, 582 (i).
Marriages in Canada, Power of Dom. Govt. *re* Legalization: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 575 (i).
Marriage Law, Cor. with Federal Govt. *re* Legislation: M. for copies* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3341 (ii).
——— Cor. with Prime Minister *re* Legislation: M. for copy* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2861 (ii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'Star': Ques. (Mr. Burnham): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3942 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Dom. Legislation: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 528 (i).
——— Ref. to Supreme Court: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3332 (ii).
Marriage Question *re* Catholic Hierarchy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 573 (i).
See 'Ne Temere.'
Maskinonge Election Expenses, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 4776 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Matapedia to Gaspe Basin Line, I. C. Ry., Inspection *re* Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 4194 (iii).
Matapedia Water Works Co., Claims against I. C. Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
Matheson, Jas. W., Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5263 (iii).
Matte, Arthur J., Postmaster at Montauban, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Delisle) 5957 (iii).
Medical Attendance, Free for Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Medical Director General, Apptmt., &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2667 (ii).
Melford Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
——— Notice to suspend work: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 549 (i).
Members Indemnity: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Members Travelling Allowances during Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1848 (i).
Meredith, Hon. Sir William, Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5954 (iv).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
Mess. from His Royal Highness, Estimates 1911-12: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 525, 971 (i), 4974 (iii), 6154 (iv).
Methodist Church: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Methot, D., Apptmt. on Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4255 (iii).

Mexican Interurban Electric Ry. Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Mexico Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Michaud, Mr. E., Dismissal from P. O. at St. Germain: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).
Michaud, Mr. J., Postmaster at St. Moise Station, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1864 (i).
Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Militia Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
MILITIA:
Airships for Military Purposes, Purchases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Aldershot Rifle Range, Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3536 (ii).
Allowances in Com. of Sup., 5447 (iii).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).
Armouries: in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).
Armouries and Public Buildings, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Arsenal at Quebec, Payment to Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
Automobiles purchased for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
Bands, and Association Grants, *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii); 6653 (iv).
Battlefields Commission: M. (Mr. White) to strike out vote, 5299 (iii).
Cadet Corps, Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (iii).
Camps for Militia Training: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).
Caretakers for Militia, Wages, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).
Civil Engineers, Recall from Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 580 (i).
Clothing for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5521 (iii).
Customs Dues *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).
Drill Halls in the West, Donation of Lands *re* Sites: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1815 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boivin) 3334 (ii).
See main heading.
Headquarters Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5536 (iii).
Kingston, R.M.C. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Lavergne, Capt. Armand, Apptmt. *re* Capt. of 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Military Conference, Invitations *re* Canon Dauth, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 552 (i).
Militia Council Rep. (presented) 2668 (ii).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Militia, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).
Military Touring Cars, Order to Ford Motor Co.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4040 (iii).
See 'Automobiles.'
Montreal Military School, Site *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).
National Battlefields Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Competition at Bisley: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3730 (ii).
Ordnances: in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).
Properties: in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).
Regiments of Foreign born Citizens, Organization of: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 534 (i).
Rifle Associations and Bands: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii); 6653 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
—— Acquisition of Additional Land: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
Rosignol, Major J. E., Qualifications *re* Commandant of 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Schools of Instruction for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).
S.A. Bounty Scrip, Delay in Distribution, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 3153 (ii).
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1202 (i).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1066 (i).
—— Ore Deposits, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6490, 6602 (iv).
—— Reports, French Translation: in Com. of Sup., 6490 (iv).
Mining Rights Administration, O.C. Resolution: Remarks (Mr. Rogers) 6792 (iv).
Ministers from Quebec, Statements at St. Eustache Election Campaign: Ques. (Mr. M. Martin) 553 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
'Minto,' Apptmt. of Pilot, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Molson, Kenneth, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Moncton Ry. Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).
—— Shops, I.C.R., Contract for Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.'
—— Tenders *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Emmerson) 5762 (iv).

Moncton Shop, I.C.R., Operation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iv).
—— Shops, Transfer to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
Monday Sittings, Precedence of Govt. Business: M. (Mr. Borden) 2376 (ii).
Montcalm Postmaster, Pets. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 575 (i).
Montpetit, Dr. E., Pet. sent to P.M.G. *re* Dismissal of William Brown: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4977 (iii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Montreal Athletic Association at Nancy, Pet. *re* Govt. Aid: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1722 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1350 (i).
Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Additional: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2855 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3907 (ii).
Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Additional Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6597 (iv).
See 'Justice.'
Montreal Customs Appraiser Building: in Com. of Sup., 1351 (i).
Montreal Customs House, Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).
Montreal Dry Dock, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3301 (ii); 6652 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. Nos. 97 and 150.'
Montreal Central Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 49 and 194.'
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmt. of Accountants *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 6661 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Delegations *re* from Corn Exchange, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2069 (ii).
—— Dismissal of Mr. J. A. Masse: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3943 (ii).
—— Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1708, 1960 (i), 2057 (ii), 6551 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, National and Free Port: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 554 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Res. from Board of Trade *re* Dismissals: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1812 (i).
—— Retention of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2062 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Total Debt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1357 (i).
Montreal Harbour Officials, Apptmt. of, Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3944 (ii).
Montreal Judiciary, *re* Increase of Judges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 545 (i).
See 'Justice.'
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 572 (i).
Montreal Military School, Site *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4040 (iii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Montreal Postal Station F.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
Montreal Post Office Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 24 and 194.'
Montreal Transcl. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
See 'Can. Northern.'
Moose to Drulingville Loop Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2820 (ii).
Moosejaw Armoury Site, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Knowles) 3972 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Knowles) in Com. of Sup., 2040, 2206 (ii).
Moosejaw Post Office, Names and Locations: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 976 (i).
Moosejaw District, Proposed Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 3342 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) 4237 (iii).
Moosejaw P.O. Inspector, Pets. *re* Apptmt.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Knowles) 1590 (i).
Moosejaw Post Office Inspector: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) 4981 (iii).
—— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4982 (iii).
Moosejaw Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
—— Tender of McDiarmid Co., Limited: M. for Copy* (Mr. Knowles) 562 (i).
Moose, Loyal Order of: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Monuments, Erection of, Sites, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2823 (ii).
Moreau, Mr. Jos., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1818 (i).
Morice, Théophile, Dismissal from I.C.R.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Gauvreau) 4262 (iii).
Morine, Mr. A. B., Charges *re* as Public Commissioner: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) on M. for Sup., 6528 (iv).
—— Letter to Prime Minister *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6185 (iii).
—— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6185 (iv).
—— Correction *re* Ruling on Question (Mr. Speaker) 6335 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 6335 (iv).
See 'Dismissals.'
Morin, Mr. Theo., Reinstatement of: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).
Mosher, Mr. G. A., Preventive Officer at Ship Harbour, Dismissal, &c.: Ques (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4039 (iii).
Mounted Police, Annuities to Families of Messrs. Fitzgerald, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 5176 (iii).
—— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 5175 (iii).

Mounted Police, Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6485 (iv).
See 'N. W. Mounted Police.'
Mount Oscar Postmaster, Dismissal of I. Chevrier: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4780 (iii).
Mulgrave Highway Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (iii).
Mullaly, Mr., Emplymt. in P. O. Dept., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Power) 1583 (i).
Mundle, D. I., Dismissal as sub-Collector at Richibucto, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4780 (iii).
Municipal Elections and Civil Servants: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1813 (i).
Murray Canal, Levelling High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
Murray, J. P., Carpet Co., Breach of Immigration Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Murray, Dr., Poaching for Salmon on East River, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).
Musicians Holiday on Sunday: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Naas and Skeena River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6321 (iv).
Napierville Post Office Site, Agreement, Instructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lanctot) 3153; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 3153 (ii).
——— Payment to Mr. Bourgeois: Remarks Mr. Lanctot) on M. for Sup., 2373 (ii).
Napierville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i).
——— Purchase of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lanctot) 5263 (iii).
National Art Gallery, Ownership of Painting: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 6337 (iv).
——— Paintings, &c., purchased since 1891: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 6184 (iii).
——— Presentation of Oil Painting by H. R. H. Princess Louise: Announcement (Mr. Monk) 5056 (iii).
See 'Art Gallery.'
National Battlefields Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).
National Ports: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
National Rifle Association, Rules *re* Competition at Bisley: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3730 (ii).
Natl. Transcl. Ry., Implementing Privy Council Judgment: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Natl. Transcl. Ry. Time Extension: *See* "B. No. 21.'
N. T. Ry. Bill 95, Factums *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2589 (ii).
Natl. Transcl. Ry. Commissioners, Reduction of Number: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY:
Claims for Damages in Dorchester County, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 6184 (iv).
Commission, Apptmt. of Mr. R. W. Leonard: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Emmerson) 2246 (ii).
——— Duties assigned to New Chairman: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
——— Notification of Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 1196 (i).
——— Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 1199 (i).
Commission, Payments to Mr. E. Taschereau: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2244 (ii).
Commission, Payments to Taschereau, Cannon & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2245 (ii).
Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iv).
Doucet, Mr. A. E., Cor. *re* Ry. Station Sites: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lavallee) 2460 (ii).
——— Position on N. T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 2245 (ii).
Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 6732 (iv).
——— Stmnt. re: Ans. (Mr. Cochrane) 6733 (iv).
Goulet, Mr., Apptmt. as Station Inspector, Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3935 (ii).
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., Apptmt. to N. T. Ry. Board, British Subject, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4038 (iii).
——— Naturalization of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4978 (iii).
———Improper form of Question: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3934 (ii).
Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2157 (ii).
——— Apptmt., Salaries of Messrs. Gutelius and Lynch Staunton: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 4242 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2060 (ii).
Moncton to Levis, Portion uncompleted: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 932 (i).
——— Completion &c., Operation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).
Montreal Branch Lines, Cor., O. Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. L. A. Lapointe) 582 (i).
——— Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 554 (i).
——— Pet. *re* Subsidy to: Ques. (Mr. L. A. Lapointe) 573 (i).
Montreal Branch Subsidy: in Com., 5896, 6215 (iv).
N. T. Ry. (implementing) Bill 95, Factums *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2589 (ii)

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).

Repair Shops, Erection at Quebec and Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Burnham) 4977 (iii).

St. Damien Station, Change in Plans: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3532 (ii).

Station at Quebec, Contract *re* Building: M. for Cor. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 755 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6786 (iv).

Naturalization Legislation, Uniformity in: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 765 (i).

Naturalization: *See* 'Imperial.'

Natural Resources: *See* 'Provl. Control.'

Naval Bill Repeal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 4242 (iii).

—— Discussion *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lamarche) 4239 (iii).

Naval Cadets, Employmt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 6786 (iv).

Naval Defence of the Pacific Coast, Res. from B. C. Legislature, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 559 (i), 4458 (iii).

Naval Defences: Remark on debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 42 (i).

Naval Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1062 (i).

Naval Discipline Act, Application to Canada: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1203 (i).

Naval Policy, Interview with Hon. G. H. Perley in London: Remarks (Mr. Murphy) 1576 (i).

Naval Policy of Govt.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 58; (Mr. Monk) 234 (i); (Mr. Lemieux) 250; (Mr. Mondou) 270; (Mr. Northrup) 357; (Mr. Sinclair) 331; (Mr. Stevens) 291.

—— Promise *re* Referendum: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 526 (i).

—— Speech of Hon. Mr. Monk at Hull: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 551 (i).

—— Repeal of: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 3942; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3943 (ii).

Naval Service, Cor. between Can. and G. B.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lemieux) 562 (i).

Naval Service in Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 970 (i).

—— Maintenance, Purchase of Ships, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5303 (iii).

—— Minister's Visit to England *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 938 (i).

—— O. C. *re* Instructions, Circulars issued &c.: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2065 (ii).

—— Tenders *re* Shipbuilding, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carroll) 558 (i).

Naval Ships, Construction of, Rep. of Admiral Kingsmill: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lemieux) 2459 (i).

See 'Can. Navy.'

—— Ref. of Min. of Marine *re* Completion: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 1206 (i).

See 'Niobe.'

Navigable Waters, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 107.'

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'

New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Lease, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).

Negro Immigration: Remarks on Immigration Question (Mr. Thoburn) 608 (i).

Ne Temere Decree, Powers of Parlt.: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Pugsley) 797 (i).

Ne Temere Decree, Questions asked by the late Govt. Concurrence by present Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 719 (i).

—— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 720 (i).

—— Stmnt. by Member for Peterborough: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 731 (i).

Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'B. No. 3,' 'Marriage,' &c.

Neuville and C.N.Ry. Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2067 (ii).

Newcombe, Mr., Expenses &c.: *See* 'Justice—Dep. Min.'

New Harbour Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

Newmarket Canal, Commission *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong) 1319 (i).

—— Meeting at Newmarket: Par. in Press (Mr. Emmerson) 3057 (ii).

Newspaper Articles, Reading *re* Questions: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3059 (ii).

Newspapers, Postage *re* Dom. Elections Campaign: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1589 (i).

New Waterford Mail Service, Change *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 6294, 6630 (iv).

Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 724 (i).

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Contract *re* Provisioning: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2859 (ii).

—— Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 2859 (ii).

—— Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 577 (i).

See 'Naval.'

North Arm Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'

North Atlantic Trading Co.: Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Verville) 279 (i).

North Battleford Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
North Battleford to Isle la Crosse Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
Northern, N.B. and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6229 (iv).
Northern Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Northern Territorial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6234 (iv).
North Sydney, I.C.R., Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iv).
North Sydney Harbour Improvements: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5223 (iii).
North Sydney Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
N.W. Mounted Police, Increase *re* Pay: Remarks (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4743 (iii).
——— Police Report: Presented (Mr. Borden) 971 (i).
See 'Mounted Police.'
Northwest Territories, Administration of Justice: in Com. of Sup., 6565 (iv).
Northumberland County Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6186 (iv).
Notes, Printing of Govt.: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'
Notre Dame des Anges Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 554 (i).
Nursery Stock, Purchase of for Experimental Farm, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3333 (ii).
Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1.'
O'Brien, A. J., Dismissal from Immigration Office at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 717 (i).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5186, 5207 (iii).
'Ocean Limited,' Instructions *re* Transportation of Private Cars: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2241 (ii).
——— on conc., 6774 (iv).
Old Age Pensions: on M. (Mr. Burnham) 1362, 1822 (i).
Old Age Pensions: M. for Special Com., (Mr. Borden) 2217 (ii).
O'Leary to West Point, Ry. Branch Lines, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Richards) 721 (i).
Olympic Games, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Ont. Boundaries Extension: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Ontario Boundaries, Extension: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
See 'Boundaries.'
Ont., Grant to *re* T. & N. O. Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'
Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co. Grinding Machines: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 2060 (ii).
Ont. and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
Orangedale to Cheticamp Ry., Construction: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Ore Deposits, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6490, 6602 (iv).
Oriental Immigration, Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Stevens) 4779 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
——— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3293
——— Electric Power, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
——— Plumbing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1324 (i); 3290 (ii).
——— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Ottawa City Estimates: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Ottawa County Superior Court, Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4121 (iii).
Ottawa Dismissals, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 3262 (ii).
Ottawa Examining Warehouse, Site, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1949 (i).
Ottawa Exhibition Grant, 6479 (iv).
Ottawa Federal District, Referendum *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1356 (i).
Ottawa Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3239 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission and Architects Association *re*: M. for Papers (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 977 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Minutes of Meetings, Amounts expended: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 1588 (i).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).
Ottawa and Lake McGregor Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 139 and 192.'
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Ottawa Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
Ottawa, Plaza, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 876 (i).

Ottawa, Site for new Deptl. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3242 (ii).
—— Snow Cleaning, Rideau Hall, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Ottawa River Bridges: Conc., 6806 (iv).
Ottawa and Ungava Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Oyster Culture: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 5255 (iii).
Oyster Pond Preventive Officer, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1207 (i).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Pacific Trans. Can. and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Panama Canal, Tolls, &c., Reps. of U.S. Papers: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 2446 (ii).
Papal Zouaves, Investigation *re* Reception to Papal Legate: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, Signature *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 569 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 1396 (i).
Parcel Post Extension of System: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2329 (ii).
Parcel Post Rates to European Countries: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4776 (iii).
Parcel Post and Rural Mail System, on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) 4082 (iii).
See 'Rural,' 'Post Office.'
Parent, Hon. S. N., Resignation of: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 578 (i).
Paris Agency, Compensation to Mrs. Fabre: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).
Paris Exposition, Payments for Space: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Paquet) 582 (i).
Pariseau, Mr. S. B., Emplymt. by Ry. Dept. and Cedar Rapids Co.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 973 (i).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Parliament, Duration of Present and Redistribution Bill: Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Taylor: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 557, 715 (i).
See 'Taylor, Hon. Geo.'
Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
Parliamentary Restaurant, Payments to Waiters: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2861 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Patent Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Patent Relief: *See* 'B. Nos. 16, 53, 55, 70, 84 and 119.'
Patrol Vessels in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
Patronage Committee, Montreal, Recommendations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1866 (i).
See 'Montreal Harbour Commission.'
Payson, Mr. W. W., Dismissal from Deep Brook Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 2243 (ii).
Peace Memorial Monument in Queen's Park, Toronto, Action of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. German) 2590 (ii).
Peace River Block, Water Rights: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Peace River Tel. Line, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Peat Industry: in Com. of Sup., 6491 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
Pecuniary Claims: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Pelagic Sealing, Compensation *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 4776 (iii).
—— Remuneration to Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
—— Treaty between G.B., U.S. and Japan: M. for Copy* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4460 (iii).
Pelagic Sealing, Ratification of Agreement: Explanation (Mr. Borden) 4550 (iii).
Pelee Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Peloquin, Mr. F., Postmaster at St. Joseph de Sorel, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 3753 (ii).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Doherty) 970 (i).
Penitentiary Employees, Bonus: in Com. of Sup., 6600 (iv).
—— Salary Increases: in Com. of Sup., 6596 (iv).
—— Salaries, Increases *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1205 (i).
Pensions to Lighthouse Keepers: in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Best) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe' *re* Agriculture Com., 2155 (ii).
Petawawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).
Petit de Grat Breakwater: Remarks (Mr. Kyte) in Com. of Sup., 2050 (ii).
Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turgeon) 1358 (i).
Petroleum, Crude and Refined, Quantity imported yearly since 1902: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 730 (i).
Picotte, Mederic, Messenger H. of C., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2065 (ii).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Pictou and Cheticamp Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4736 (iii).
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Mail Service, Contract *re* Supplies to Crews: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2580 (ii).

Pictou Winter Steamers, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5949 (iv).
Pink Rock Wharf, N.B., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4257 (iii).
Piper, E. F., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Poaching in N.S.: *See* 'Murray.'
Point Aux Anglais, Drainage Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 4778 (iii).
Poirier, N. P., Investigation *re* Charges: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iv).
Police Point Reserve Transfer: M. for Papers* (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Political Literature, Application *re* Free Postage: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1585 (i).
Political Literature *re* Race and Religious Prejudices, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 6516 (iv).
See 'Campaign.'
Pollution of Navigable Waters: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Pollution of Red River: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Population of Canada and Quebec Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 731 (i).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1951 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Ice Breaking and Dredging: Personal Explanation (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 3331 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 5796 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Works: M. for Rep.* (Mr. Charlton) 3755 (ii).
Port Hawkesbury Public Building: Remarks 1345 (i), 2016 (ii).
Port Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).
——— Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).
——— Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr Kyte) 2460 (ii).
Porto Rico and Mar. Provs. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
Postmasters and Assistant Postmasters, Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
Post Office Dept., Grades of Clerks: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
POST OFFICE.
Bassano Post Office, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5557 (iv).
Beaver Bank Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Bedford Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Binks, Mr., Promotion to Dead Letter Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Henderson) 3946 (ii).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Blind River Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).
British Mails, Landing at North Sydney, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 5948 (iv).
Broderick Post Office, Change of Name: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCraney) 5263 (iii).
Brown, Wm., Postmaster at Point Fortune, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4779 (iii).
Cable Rates, Parcel Post, &c.: M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 4082; Amt. (Mr. Lemieux) 4097; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 70) 4120 (iii).
Canada and G. B. Mail Service, Renewal of Contract: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).
——— Letter of Board of Trade, Quebec: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 1843 (i).
Cap Chat P.O., Pet. *re* Change of Name: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Charlemagne Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 1862 (i).
Coldbrook Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3148 (ii).
Douglas Road Post Office, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Dunnville Customs Revenue for 1910-11, Postal Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2066 (ii).
Gananoque Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Gaspé, Magdeleine and Chlorydormes Mail Contracts, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1204 (i).
Glace Bay Mail Delivery, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 804 (i).
Henry, Norbert, Contract *re* Mails between Scott Junction and Stations: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 975 (i).
Lachenaie Postmaster, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Séguin) 5949 (iv).
Magdalen Island News Service, Marconi Connections: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3833 (ii).
——— Copy of Instructions: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'News' *re*: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 4159 (iii).
——— Salary of Correspondent: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4262 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Hazen) 4041 (iii).
Mail Bags Repairs, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4777 (iii).
Mail Carriers, Como to Oka, Compensation to Family: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).
Mail Contracts, Cancellation of: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Mail Contracts, M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lemieux) 2460 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 5693 (iv).
Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Moosejaw Post Office, Names and Locations: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 976 (i).
——— Inspector, Pet. *re* Apptmt.: M for Cor.* (Mr. Knowles) 1590 (i).
Neuville and C. N. Ry. Station Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques: (Mr. Delisle) 2067 (ii).
Newspapers, Postage *re* Dom. Elections Campaign: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1589 (i).
New Waterford Mail Service, Change *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carroll) in Com. of Sup., 6294, 6630 (iv).
Nicolet and St. Monique Mail Contract, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 724 (i).
Northumberland County Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6186 (iv).
Parcel Post Convention between Canada and France, Signature *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 569 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Papers, 935, 1396 (i).
Parcel Post, Extension of System: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2329 (ii).
Parcel Post and Rural Mail System, on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) 4082 (iii). *See* 'Postal Regulations.'
Parcel Post Rates to European Countries: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4776 (iii).
Pictou-Georgetown Winter Mail Service, Contract *re* Supplies to Crews: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 876 (i).
Pictou Mail Service, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2580 (ii).
Porto Rico and Mar. Provs. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).
Postage of Newspapers, Opinion of P.M.G. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2291 (ii).
Postal Convention between Canada and France: Request for Papers (Mr. Lemieux) 935 (i).
Postal Regulations, Commission *re* Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Armstrong) 2251 (ii).
——— Remarks on M. to take in Mondays (Mr. Armstrong) 2376 (ii).
Postmasters and Town Councillors Regulations *re* Acceptance: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2587 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Postmasters dismissed since Oct. 1911: List read (Mr. Lemieux) 6636 (iv).
Postmasters dismissed: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Postmasters in Kamouraska County, Names, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 6781 (iv).
Postmasters in Lotbiniere County, Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Fortier) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
Postmasters in Temiscouata County, Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 548 (i).
Post Offices, Change of Names: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 3751 (ii).
Post Office Deptl. Block, Condition *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i), 2010 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) 2015 (ii).
Post Office Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1066 (i).
——— Outside Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
——— Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).
Post Office Dept., Stmnt. *re* Dismissals since Oct. 1911: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lemieux) 1589 (i).
Post Office Dismissals, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
Post Office Dismissals since Oct. 1911, Pets. *re* &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lemieux) 1395 (i).
Railway Mail Clerks, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 5561 (iv).
Rigaud Postmaster, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2294 (ii).
River John Mail Carriers, Name, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1579 (i).
River John Mail Service, Cancellation of M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Extension: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2061 (ii).
——— Number of Boxes in Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6782 (iv).
——— Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4978 (iii).
——— Routes: Inquiry for (Mr. Lemieux) 5561 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Mail Boxes &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1580 (i).
Rural Postmasters, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 3060 (ii).
St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick, Cor. &c.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5922 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5260 (iii).
Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contract, Expiry of: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5951 (iv).
St. Isidore de Prescott, Postmastership, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 3055 (ii).
St. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1584 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 2294 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue, &c. P. O.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 724 (i).
St. Paul L'Ermite, &c., Mail Carrier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2583 (ii).
St. Paul L'Ermite, Repentigny Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3341 (ii).
Ste Therese and Laurentides Post Offices, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3335 (ii).
Sayabec Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2068 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Seamen St., Annapolis Co., Post Office, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).
Scott Junction Mail Contract, Cancellation *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Beland) 2459 (ii).
Small Pox in Ottawa Post Office: Explanation (Mr. Pelletier) 1242 (i).
——— Further Explanation (Mr. Pelletier) 1280 (i).
Sorel and St. Victoria Mail Service, Date of Tenders &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4248 (iii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Cardin) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Spry Bay P. O., Request *re* Remo all of: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 577 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 582 (i).
Stellarton Station Mail Service, Cancellation of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).
Sydney and Glace Bay Mail Service, Delay, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Pelletier) 934 (i).
Tracadie Road Post Office, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4459 (iii).
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249 (iii).
——— Date of Wm. Robert's Contract: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4778 (iii).
Verret, Mr. H. B., Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Williamsville Post Office, Removal: Personal Explanation (Mr. Edwards) 6271 (iv).
Potatoes, Weight of Bag: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Poulin, Mr. E., Dismissal from Customs, Quebec City: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2071 (ii).
Pouliott, Louis, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4459 (iii).
Powassan Postmaster, Change *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Arthurs) 2459 (ii).
Powers, Laurence G., Supt. of Lobster Hatchery at Arichat, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 3752 (ii), 4781 (iii).
Preferential Tariff to G. B., Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 553 (i).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Pugsley) M. to withdraw, 1390 (i).
Preferential Trade within the Empire: Remarks in debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 55 (i).
Premier Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Prime Minister's Visit to Archbishop of Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 534 (i).
Prince Edward and Hastings Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
P. E. I., Additional Subsidy to: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
P. E. I. Better Terms: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 5171 (iii).
P. E. I. Car Ferry, Construction &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1206 (i).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Car Ferry System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Emmerson) 2072 (ii).
——— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland Govt. Car Ferry, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 1580 (i).
——— Tel. sent to A. A. McLean: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1577 (i).
——— Tels. Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pardee) 2458 (ii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Macdonald) for Return, 4232 (iii).
P.E.I. Estimates: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 2439 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Claims for Compensation, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).
——— Increased Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 5661 (iv).
See 'Railways.'
P.E.I. Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii); Conc., 6794 (iv).
See 'Mar. Telephone Co.'
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Ry. Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 3830 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Car Ferry System: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5207 (iii).

Prince Rupert Dry Dock, Subsidy, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).
Printing Bureau, Clocks, Number installed, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. White, Alberta) 2859 (ii).
——— Dismissals and Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).
——— Changes *re* Duties: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2243 (ii).
——— Plant: in Com. of Sup., 6611 (iv).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 546 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).
——— Salary Increases: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2066 (ii).
——— Weekly Consultations: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 2243 (ii).
Printing Com., 1st Rep.: Presented, M. (Mr. Currie) to conc., 3330 (ii).
——— 3rd Rep.: M. (Mr. Currie) to conc., 6578 (iv).
Prisons and Reformatories: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Private Bills, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Currie) 6578 (iv).
——— Extension of Time: M. (Mr. Borden) 930 (i).
——— Rep. of Examiner *re* Pets, Divergency of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 643 (i).
——— Suspension of Rules: M. (Mr. Ames) 5902 (iv).
See 'Senate Amts.'
Private Secretaries, Status of: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Private Secretaries, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5808 (iv).
Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re*: in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
Privy Council Implementing Judgment *re* G.T.P. Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Privy Council Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6460 (iv).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6780 (iv).
——— Mess. from Senate, 6824 (iv).
Provident Trust Co., Incorporation, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii).
Provincial Boundaries, Res. from Legre. of Saskatchewan, *re* Negotiations for Transfer of Natural Resources: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2577 (ii).
See 'Man. Extension Boundaries.'
Provincial Control of Western Natural Resources, Promise *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 553 (i).
Provincial Railways and Public Buildings, Govt. Assistance: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 562 (i).
Provl. Subsidies: *See* 'B. Nos. 77, 115, 151, 152, 178 and 186.'
See 'Man. and N.S.' 'P.E.I.'
Provincial Subsidies *re* Agriculture: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Provost, Raoul, Dismissal from Marine and Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 2453 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Attendance of R. C. Miller, 3rd Rep.: M. to conc. (Mr. Middlebro) 6333 (iv).
——— 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Middlebro) to conc., 5832 (iv).
——— 4th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Middlebro) 6492 (iv).
——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Middlebro) 6732 (iv).
——— 6th Rep.: M. (Mr. Ames) to conc., 6062 (iii).
See 'Diamond Light.'
Public Accounts Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 11 (i).
Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. White, Alberta) 2068 (ii).
Public Expenditures, Scandals, &c., by late Govt.: Remarks in debate on Address (Mr. Monk) 231 (i).
Public Health Assn.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Public Officials, Inquiries *re* Conduct, Apptmt. of Commissioners in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2063 (ii).
Public Ownership of Public Utilities: on M. for Sup. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 645 (i).
See 'Cable,' 'Freight Rates,' 'Parcel Post,' 'Railways,' &c.
Public Service Commission, Apptmt. of Messrs. Jackson and Schwitzer as Assistants: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 5954 (iv).
Public Service Commission, Charges *re* A. B. Morine: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Carvell) 6528 (iv).
See 'Dismissals,' &c.
PUBLIC WORKS:
Advertisements for Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2449 (ii).
Anse au Canard Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).
——— Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 878 (i).
Arichat, Retaining Wall: in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Athabasca Landing to Grand Prairie Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).
Athabasca River Landing: in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
Aurora Public Building, Papers, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 561 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Baddeck Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6658 (iv).

Bathurst Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2363 (ii).

Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).

Beaumont Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2366 (ii).

Berthier en-Haut Post Office, Purchase, Repairs, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Barrette) 1409 (i).

Blue Rocks Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).

B.C. Public Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).

Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1358 (i).

Calgary Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).

Canadian Coal used to heat Govt. Buildings: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).

Cape Breton Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).

Causapscal Post Office, Pet. *re* Site: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1020 (i).

Chance Harbour, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 554 (i).

Chapel Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).

Charles Forest's Cove Breakwater, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1584 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kyte) 2460 (ii).

Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2040 (ii).

Chatham, N.B., Public Building: Conc., 6804 (iv).

Chester Canal, N.S., Discontinuance of Work: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 716 (i).

Cole Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).

Cow Bay Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).

Creosoted Timber *re* Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).

Devil's Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).

Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2206 (ii).

Edmonton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).

Eganville Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Low) 725 (i).

Faulkner, R. S., Emplymt. by Public Works as Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 5261 (iii).

Fort McMurray and Athabasca Tel Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2819 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Fraserville Bridge Works, Interview with Messrs. LeBel and Riou: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 549 (i).

Fraserville Wharf, Cor. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3534 (ii).

Fraserville Wharf and Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3150 (ii).

French River, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).

Garthby, Lake Aylmer, Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).

Gaspé Landing Pier, Appropriation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).

Gaspé Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3305 (ii).

Gillis Point Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).

Gooseberry Cove, N.B., Improvements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).

Goose Creek Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2372 (ii).

Govt. Dredges, Contract *re* Boarding Employees: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 5953 (iv).

Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1527 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).

——— Man., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).

——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).

——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i), 2366 (ii).

——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2785 (ii).

Hillsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).

Hull City Hall Square, Improvements by Improvement Commission: Ques. (Mr. Kidd) 2293 (ii).

Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).

Ile Bezard and Ste. Geneviève Wharfs, Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 557 (i).

Inverness Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).

Kelley's Cove Breakwater, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Law) 3340 (ii).

Lachine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1346, 1952 (i).

Larry's River Dredging, Apptmt. of Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 5055 (iii).

L'Assomption Wharf, Appropriations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii), 5951, 6781 (iv).

——— Continuation of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2579 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Laurentides Public Building, Acquisition of Property: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2451 (ii).
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 1341, 1531 (i).
——— Memorials, *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2460 (ii).
Lethbridge Armoury, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 729 (i).
Lethbridge Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 728 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).
Levis Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
Levis Graving Dock, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
Lorneville Breakwater, N.B., Tests *re* Foundation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 555 (i).
Louiseville Public Buildings: Conc., 6794 (iv).
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Magdalen Island Telegraph and Telephone: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
Maisonneuve Postal Station, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 550 (i).
Maisonneuve Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1347 (i).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
Mar. Provs. Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2816 (ii).
Melford Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
——— Notice to suspend work: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 549 (i).
Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1350 (i).
Montreal Customs Appraiser Building: in Com. of Sup., 1351 (i).
Montreal Post Office Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1348 (i).
Montreal Postal Station F.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
Moose to Drulingville Loop Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2820 (ii).
Moosejaw Public Building, Tender of McDiarmid Co., Limited: M. for Copy* (Mr. Knowles) 562 (i).
Napierville Post Office Site, Payment to Mr. Bourgeois: Remarks (Mr. Lanctot) on M. for Sup., 2373 (ii).
Napierville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i).
——— Purchase of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lanctot) 5263 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
National Ports: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).
North Battleford Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
North Battleford to Isle la Crosse Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
Ottawa City Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
——— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3293 (ii).
——— Eastern Block Addition: in Com. of Sup., 1339 (i).
——— Electric Power, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
——— Examining Warehouse, Site, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1949 (i).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).
——— Leases, Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1324 (i), 3290 (ii).
——— Military Stores Building, Contract *re* Racks: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).
——— Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
——— Plumbing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
——— Post Office Deptl. Block, Condition *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 2010; Remarks (Mr. Pelletier) 2015 (ii).
——— Privy Council Chamber, Improvements *re*: in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
——— Site for new Deptl. Building: in Com. of Sup., 3242 (ii).
——— Sussex St. Property: in Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).
——— Sussex Street Property, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1359 (i).
——— Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2294 (ii).
——— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
Ottawa City Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3239 (ii).
Ottawa City, Rideau Hall, Furniture, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3279, 3285 (ii). (ii).
——— Improvements, Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupancy: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 547 (i).
——— Improvements, Amount expented from 1896 to 1911: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 876 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. of Priv., *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire,' (Mr. Pugsley) 799 (i).
——— Snow Cleaning, &c.: in Com of Sup., 3279 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Ottawa City, Rideau Hall, Stmnt. *re* Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 726 (i).

Ottawa River Bridges: Conc., 6806 (iv).

Peace River Tel. Line, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).

Petawawa Public Wharf, Tenders *re*, Contract awarded: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 532 (i).

Petite Lameque Wharf, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turgeon) 1358 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf, N.B., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4257 (iii).

Plaza at Ottawa, Fences and Posters, Responsibility *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 876 (i).

Point Aux Amglais, Drainage Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 4778 (iii).

Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1951 (i).

Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging: Personal Explanation (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 3331 (ii).

Port Dover Harbour Works: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3755 (ii).

Port Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

——— Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Kyte) 1585 (i).

——— Reports, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Kyte) 2460 (ii).

P. E. I. Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).

Prince Rupert Dry Dock Subsidy, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).

Provincial Railways and Public Buildings, Govt. Assistance: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 562 (i).

Public Buildings in Alberta and Sask., Purchase of Sites, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. White, Alberta) 2068 (ii).

Public Works, Appropriations of Last Year: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 2436 (ii).

Public Works in Cape Breton, Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 805 (i).

Public Works, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald 559 (i).

Public Works Contracts, Amounts given without tender: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 877 (i).

——— Montreal and Quebec, Without tender: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 877 (i).

Public Works, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1064 (i).

——— Private Sec's Allowance: Conc. 6779 (iv).

Public Works, Dismissal of Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2584 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Public Works Engineering Branch, Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1058-9 (i).

Public Works Estimates, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3278 (ii).

Public Works Expenditure for last ten years in different Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 2064 (ii).

Public Works, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).

Public Works Omitted from Estimates: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 2794 (ii).

Public Works, Suspension of, Names and Locations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 530, 531 (i).

Public Works Votes of Last Year, Continuation &c.: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).

Purchase of Goods by Public Works Dept. since Oct. 1911, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 1204, 1578 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2459 (ii).

Quebec, Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).

——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).

——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1851 (i).

Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2836 (ii).

Regina Armoury and Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).

——— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 580 (i).

Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

Rivieres des Prairies Nav. Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 2441 (ii).

——— Drainage, Amount voted: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 714 (i).

St. Andrew Wharf, Discontinuance of Works, *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 724 (i).

Ste Anne de la Pocatiere, Experimental Farm, Tenders *re* Buildings: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 577 (i).

St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).

St. Croix Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Fortier) 5557 (iv).

St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 560 (i).

St. Johns and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551, 571 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. John, N.B., Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1529 (i).
St. John Dry Dock, Contract, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3296 (ii).
St. John Harbour Improvements, Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 566 (i).
—— Tugs employed, Amount paid per day: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 548 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 1530 (i).
St. John Wharf, Appropriation *re* Site: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2370 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of of Sup., 1853 (i).
St. Laurent Public Building, Conc., 6804 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Emplymt. of Govt. Dredges: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4256 (iii).
St. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2068 (ii).
—— Contract of Alex. Duchesneau: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 4263 (iii).
Sackville, N.B., Harbour Improvements, Conc., 6805 (iv).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1952 (i).
—— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 555 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Pardee) 1589 (i).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).
Shediac Public Buildings: Conc., 6793 (iv).
Sherbrooke Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1853 (i).
Sorel Workshops Investigations, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1205 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Whafs, Contractors *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallée) 2859 (ii).
—— Claim of Mr. Larivière for Timber supplied: Ques. (Mr. Lavallée) 3535 (ii).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Sudbury Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
Telegraphs, Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
—— Quebec, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Temiskaming Dam., Water Storage Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2827 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Temiskaming Dam, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4262 (iii).
—— Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pugsley) 2459 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2441 (ii).
Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).
Toronto Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 1963 (i).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2445 (ii).
Weedon Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for last ten years: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).
Wheatley Creek Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Wood Mountain Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
York Bridge over Grand River, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Yukon Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
Quarantine Station Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
See 'Lawlor.'
Quebec Arsenal, Payment to Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
Quebec Boundaries Extension: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Quebec Boundary Extension: M. for Cor.* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1590 (i).
See 'Ungava.'
Quebec Bridge Construction Contract: Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) *re* English Criticism, on M. for Sup., 5415 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Erection of Shops: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iv).
—— Reconstruction, Reps., Plans, Tenders, &c.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Papers, 1401 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6305 (iv).
Quebec Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).
—— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1849 (i).
Quebec Dry Dock, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 4260 (iii).
—— Construction: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6784 (iv).

Quebec Dry Dock, Site, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Béland) 4263 (iii).
——— Subsidy, Reps. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6493 (iv).
Quebec and Gaspé Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Quebec Harbour Commission, Names of Members in 1896 and after: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
——— Removal of Members, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 560 (i).
——— Reorganization *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 580 (i).
——— Resignation from Board of Members: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 579 (i).
——— Solicitor, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1814 (i).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2836 (ii).
Quebec Ministers of the Cabinet, Apptmt. by Min. of Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 545 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
Quebec Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1851 (i).
Quebec and Saguenay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5896, 6214 (iv).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Quebec West Controverted Election, Certificate of Judge: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 407 (i).
Queen's Hotel Co., Limited, Litigation *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii).
Queen's Theological College: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Queen's University at Kingston: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
——— Ref. to Minister of Justice *re* Provl. Jurisdiction: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 3730 (ii).
Questions Improperly drafted: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4983, 5054 (iii).
Questions not Answered: M. (Mr. Borden) 6732 (iv).
Questions *re* Mr. Lemieux ruled out (Mr. Speaker) 2580 (ii).
Questions and Notices of Motions, Rules *re* Standing: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 1015 (i).
Quinze River and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Race Track Meets: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Radiotelegraphic Service—Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 86.'
Ry. Belt and Peace River Block of Land: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Ry. Bridges in N.B., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Ry. Cos., Incorporation of: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Ry. Mail Clerks, Salary Increases: *See* 'B. Nos. 105 and 106.'
Railway Sections and Section Men, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Ry. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 183.'
Ry. Tariffs: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
RAILWAYS:
Alberta Great Waterways Ry., Disallowance of: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 1575 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Bonds, Govt. Guarantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Martin) 4247 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry. Bridge at Morris, Representations *re* Objections: Ques. (Mr. Molloy) 2587 (ii).
Can. Northern Ont. Ry., Subsidy, Guarantee, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 4781 (iii).
Can. Northern and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Maintenance of Road in L'Ile Bourdon: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 5261 (iii).
C.P.Ry., Irrigation, Complaint from Alberta Farmers: Ques. (Mr. Buchanan) 5262 (iii).
Car Shortage in the West: Remarks (Mr. Buchanan) 1709 (i).
——— Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 1709 (i).
——— Govtl. Action *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Buchanan) 1714 (i).
Chatham and Newcastle Ry. Service, Pets. from Boards of Trade: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 4190 (iii).
Clarkboro, Sask., C.N.R. Right of Way, Title *re*: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 934 (i).
Estmere to Baddeck Branch Ry., Tenders *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 1589 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., Discrimination in the West: Amt. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).
——— Transportation, Generally: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 645, 1902 (i).
G.T.Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Settlement by late Govt., Judge Barron's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2580 (ii).
——— Board of Conciliation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. MacNutt) 3756 (ii).
G.T.P. Remuneration to Govt. Director: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Guysborough Branch Ry. Appropriation: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for Sup., 1445 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5621 (iv).
Hampton Spur Line, Construction *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 572 (i).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry., Contract *re* Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4171 (iii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Construction: in Com. of Sup., 622, 677 (i); 5762, 6605 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Hudson Bay Ry., Contract: M. (Mr. Neely) for O.Cs., 732 (i).

—— Cor. *re*: M. (Mr. Aikins) for Papers, 1213 (i).

—— Ports, Nav., &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Aikins) 3756 (ii).

—— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. H. Bennett) 132 (i).

—— Surveys *re* Navigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Aikins) 3943 (ii).

Land Grants to Railways in Western Provs. prior to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 725 (i).

New Glasgow to Thorburn Ry. Co.'s Lease, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (i).

Orangedale to Cheticamp Ry., Construction: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Claims for Compensation, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).

P.E.I. Car Ferry, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1206 (i).

—— Cor. with Govt. *re* Car Ferry System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Emmerson) 2072 (ii).

—— Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 1580 (i).

—— Tel. sent to A. A. McLean: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1577 (i).

—— Tels., Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Pardee) 2458 (ii).

—— Inquiry (Mr. Macdonald) for Return, 4232 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony to Elmira Branch Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (iv).

—— Increased Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 5661 (iv).

—— O'Leary to West Point, Ry. Branch Lines, Construction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Richards) 721 (i).

—— Winter Communication, Ry. Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 3830 (ii).

Rys. and Canals, Annual Stmnt.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 4122 (iii).

Railway Bridges, N.B., Aid: Prop. Res. (Mr. Borden) 5691 (iv).

Ry. Commissioners, Board of: in Com. of Sup., 5800 (iv).

Railway Committee, Apptmt. of Sub-Committee *re* G.T. Ry. Bill, Liberals Omitted: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iv).

Railway Construction in the West, Shortage of Steel Rails: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) on M. for Sup., 6543 (iv).

Railways Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1064 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Railway Facilities in N.S.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

—— Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5800-1 (iv).

Railway Mail Clerks, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 5561 (iv).

Railway Question: Notice of Discussion (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1494 (i).
See 'Freight Rates.'

Railway Rates and Freight Charges: (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 645 (i).

—— Staff Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).

Railway Subsidies: Prop. Res., 5681 (iv).

Railway Ties, Contract with Dame Boulay: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Carvell) 5957 (iii).

Ry. Ties, Contract *re* at Sayabec: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4041 (iii).

St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 4233, 4461 (iii).

—— Contracts *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).

St. John Valley Ry., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 577 (i).

—— Contract to Grand Falls: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 4977 (i).

—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Michaud) 2460 (ii).

St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3049 (ii).

Salisbury and Harvey Ry., Cor. *re* Opening of Hillsborough Ry.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Pugsley) 562 (i).

—— Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).

Students, Railway Fares, Reduction to: Remarks (Mr. Currie) 6277 (iv).

Subsidies to Railways in Man. and N.W., &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. McCraney) 562 (i).

Sunnybrae to Country Harbour Ry. Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6228 (iv).

Sunnybrae and Guysborough Branch Lines: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).

Sunnybrae Branch Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

Transportation Question: *See* 'Freight Rates.'

Rambaut, Thomas D., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. Nos. 55 and 84.'

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'

Rainy River Radial Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6312 (iv).

Rathburn Post Office, Removal of Postmaster, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Pardee) 4262 (iii).

Rayne, R. W., Caretaker Truro Armoury, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 6184 (iii).

Reciprocity in Trade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 645 (i).

Reciprocity Treaty with U.S., Cor. with British Ambassador: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1817 (i).

——— Cor. between Can. Govt. and U.S.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1817 (i).

——— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Borden) 51; (Mr. Emmerson) 426; (Mr. Foster) 76; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 36; (Mr. Lemieux) 244; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 466; (Mr. Monk) 231; (Mr. Oliver) 449; (Mr. Pugsley) 142; (Mr. Sinclair) 323; (Mr. Verville) 277; (Mr. W. T. White) 447 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S., from 1890 to 1891: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 5263 (iii).

Red River, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 64.'

Red River Pollution: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 5166 (iii).

Refrigerator Cars on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5603 (iv).

Regiments of Foreign born Citizens, Organization of: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 534 (i).

Regina Armoury and Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2212 (ii).

——— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 580 (i).

Regina Census: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Knowles) 1574 (i).

See 'Census.'

Registration of Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).

Renfrew, N., Contracts Awarded, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2857 (ii).

Renfrew, S., Apptmts. to Public Service: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 3334 (ii).

——— Contracts awarded, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

——— Dismissal of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2856 (ii).

Renfrew, S., Election, Issue of Writ: M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to adjn. Hse., 2218 (ii).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1576, 1707 (i), 1971, 2058, 2377 (ii).

——— Speech of Min. of Customs: Remarks *re* Georgian Bay Canal (Mr. Devlin) 1573 (i).

——— Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 926 (i).

Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Repentigny Lightkeepers, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Seguin) 6784 (iv).

See 'Dismissals.'

Restaurant Com.: M. for Com. (Mr. Borden) 710 (i).

See 'House of Commons.'

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Kyte) 5939 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. E. Lapointe) 4744 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2056 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 6494 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Murphy) 4836 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Murphy) 5560 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 2377 (ii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'

Revised Statutes, French Version: *See* 'B. No. 65.'

Richards, Mr. Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5821, 6652 (iv).

Rideau Canal, Bank St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).

Rideau Canal, New Dredging Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).

Rideau Hall, Expenditure *re*: Ques. of Priv., *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire' (Mr. Pugsley) 799 (i).

——— Furniture, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3279, 3285 (ii).

——— Improvements, Amount expended *re* H.R.H. Occupancy: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 547 (i).

——— Improvements, Amount expended from 1896 to 1911: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 876 (i).

——— Lighting and Heating, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

——— Stmnt. *re* Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 726 (i).

See 'Pub. Works.'

Rifle Associations and Bands: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv).

Rigaud Postmaster, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2294 (ii).

Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

Ritchie, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 3331, 3449 (ii).

Rivière du Loup, I.C.R. Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iv).

——— Workshops, Removal to Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 570 (i).

Rivières des Prairies, Nav. Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 621 (i), 2441 (ii).

——— Drainage, Amount voted: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 714 (i).

River John Mail Carriers, Name, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1579 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).

Rivers, Lachapelle and Dubois, Messrs., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3752 (ii).

Roberts, Capt. Alex., Postmaster at Canso, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 3341 (ii).

Robert, Wm., Dismissal from Val des Eboulis Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).

Robinson, Mr. Fred. P., Apptmt. as Preventive Officer for N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 4241 (iii).

Robitaille, Mr. J. C., Charges *re* Political Partisanship: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2858 (ii).

Rockfield Bridge, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1197 (i), 5790 (iv).

Rockliffe Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).

—— Acquisition of Additional Land: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).

Rogers, J. M., Dismissal from East Roman Valley P.O., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 722 (i).

—— M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1409 (i).

Rolling Stock, IC.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5609, 5653, 6461 (iv).

Rooms allotted to Liberal Members, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 670, 1951 (i).

Rosignol, Major J. E., Qualifications *re* Commandant of 61st Regiment: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 723 (i).

Ross Rifle: *See* 'N.R.A.'

Royal Assent: *See* 'Bills.'

Royal Mint: in Com. of Sup., 6584 (iv).

Royal Society of Canada Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).

Roy, Wm., Rep. of H. Boulay *re* Charges on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 934 (i).

—— M. for Papers (Mr. Boulay) 1391 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Prop. Res. (Mr. Pelletier) 5680 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'

Rural Mail Delivery Extension: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 2061 (ii).

—— Number of Boxes in Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6782 (iv).

—— Routes: Inquiry for (Mr. Lemieux) 5561 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* Mail Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1580 (i).

—— Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4978 (iii).

See 'Post Office.'

Rural Telephone System, Placing in Post Offices: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 2247; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) Res. out of Order, 2250; Remarks (Mr. Speaker) *re* M. to restore to Order Paper, 2287 (ii).

—— M. (Mr. Blain) to stand, 2460 (ii).

Rutherford, Mr. John, Land Agent at Moosejaw, Dismissal, &c.: M. (Mr. Knowles) for Papers, 1395 (i).

St. Adelaide de Pabos Postmaster, Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2068 (ii).

Ste. Agathe des Monts, Dismissal of Postmistress: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 973 (i).

—— M. for Cor. (Mr. Lemieux) 1591 (i).

Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5895 (iv).

St. Aldwyn Post Office, Change of Name from Broderick, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5922 (iv).

St. Amour Postmaster, Changes since Jan. 1912: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 2666 (ii).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Proulx) 2861 (ii).

St. Ancilet Postmaster, Request for Dismissal: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 2588 (ii).

St. Andrew Wharf, Discontinuance of Works *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 724 (i).

St. Angele de Laval, County of Nicolet, Postmaster, Charges *res* Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3755 (ii), 4039 (iii).

Ste. Anne de Bellevue and L'Ile Perrot Mail Contraits, Expiry of: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 5951 (iv).

Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Non-delivery of Mail; (Mr. Boyer) 5260 (iii).

Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Experimental Farm, Tenders *re* Buildings: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 577 (i).

St. Charles and Huron River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6308 (iv).

St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2837 (ii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'

St. Croix Wharf Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Fortier) 5557 (iv).

St. Germain Postmaster, Charges *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. E. Papointe) 1579 (i).

St. Germain Postmaster, Mr. C. Michaud: M. for Cor. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 1592 (i).

St. Isidore de Prescott, Postmastership, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 3055 (ii).

St. Jacques de l'Achigan Post Office Site: Remarks (Mr. Lafortune) in Com. of Sup., 2442 (ii).

St. Jacques Post Office, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 560 (i).

St. John and Iberville Bridge, Amount voted *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 551, 571 (i).

St. John Ambulance Association, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6583 (iv).

St John and Courtenay Bay Contract: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii), 6187 (iv).

St. John and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).

St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1529 (i).
St. John Dry Dock, Contract, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3296 (ii).
St. John and Halifax Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i), 4739 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Dredging Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 5694 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 623, 669 (i).
——— Contracts *re*: Remarks- (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).
——— Tel. *re* Terminal Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 566 (i).
St. John Harbour, Tugs employed, Amount paid per day: Ques. (Mr. Pugsley) 548 (i).
St. John Harbour Works, Contract: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
St. John Ry. Crossing at Haymarket Square: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Cor., 402 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 1530 (i).
St. John Valley Ry., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
St. John Valley Ry., Agreement *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 4233, 4461 (iii).
——— Contract *re*:Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 577 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4743 (iii).
——— Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Michaud) 2460 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. and Bridges, Subsidy: in Com. on Bill, 6211 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3049 (ii).
——— Contract to Grand Falls: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 4977 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Carvell) 3946 (ii).
St. John Wharf, Appropriation *re* Site: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2370 (ii).
St. John and W. Indies Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i), 4740 (iii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1853 (i).
St. Laurent Public Building: Conc., 6804 (iv).
St. Laurent, Xavier, Claims for Loss of Horse Killed on I.C.Ry.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4263 (iii).
St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
——— Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 5680 (iv).
St. Lawrence River Power, Res., from Montreal Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2456 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Average Depth of Water between Montreal and Quebec, Cap a la Roche at Low Tide: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 544 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Emplymt. of Govt. Dredges: Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4256 (iii).
St. Lorette Lake, Man., Pier, Completion of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 2813 (ii).
St. Martin, Madame, Dismissal from St. Louis de Bonsecours: M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
St. Monique Mail Contract, Annulment of: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1584 (i).
St. Pascal Mail Contract, Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 2294 (ii).
St. Patrick de Brandon, Population, Revenue of P.O.: Ques. (Mr. Lafortune) 724 (i).
St. Patrick's Channel Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
St. Paul d'Abbottsford Postmaster, P. L.. St. Pierre, Investigation *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 1589 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
St. Paul L'Ermite, Mail Carrier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 2583 (ii).
——— Repentigny Mail Service, Cancellation of Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3341 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'
St. Peters Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
St. Peter of Wakefield Postmaster, Dismissal: Remarks (Mr. Devlin) 6286 (iv).
Sainte Roche Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Cardin) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
Ste. Rosalie Branch Lines, I.C.R., Accommodation, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 4134 (iii).
Ste. Therese and Laurentide Post Offices, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3335 (ii).
Ste. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1210 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bureau) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
St. Vallier Wharf, Award of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Deliste) 2068 (ii).
——— Contract of Alex. Duchesneau: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. Lapointe) 4263 (iii).
Sainte Victor de Sorel Mail Contract: Remarks (Mr. Cardin) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 6586 (iv).
Sabbath Observance, *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Sackville, N. B., Harbour Improvements, Conc., 6805 (iv).
Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co., Cor. *re* Opening of Hillsborough Ry.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Pugsley) 562 (i).

Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co., Negotiations *re* Supply of Rails: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Pugsley) 938 (i).

See 'Railways.'

Salmon Fisheries, B. C., Negotiations *re* Exportations, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3756 (ii).

Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1952 (i).

——— Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 555 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Pardee) 1589 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Pardee) in Com. of Sup., 2208 (ii).

Sarnia Winter Harbour: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Pardee) 1589 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., (Mr, Pardee) 3946 (ii).

Saskatchewan, Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 89.'

Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'

Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'

Saskatchewan Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'

Saturday Sittings: Stmnt. (Mr. Borden) 5830 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal Locks: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).

Sauve, Mr. L. A., Dismissal from Soulanges Canal: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 575 (i).

Sayabec Station Postmistress, Apptmt. of Miss Boulay: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2068 (ii).

——— Pet. *re* Dismissal, Apptmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2585 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).

Schools of Instruction for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5546 (iii).

Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).

Scotch Village Postmaster, Apptmt. in 1903, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2666 (ii).

Scott Junction Mail Contract, Cancellation *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Beland) 2459 (ii).

See 'Post Office.'

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Seager Wheeler, Congratulations *re* Prize Wheat at N.Y. Exhibition: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 542 (i).

Seamen, St., Annapolis Co., Post Office, Date of Opening: Ques. (Mr. Davidson) 3754 (ii).

Sec. of State, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).

——— Report: Presented (Mr. W. T. White) 565 (i).

Security Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'

Seed Control Act: in Com. of Sup., 6469 (iv).

Seed Grain Distribution, Res. from Board of Trade of Wilcox: Remarks (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2299 (i).

Seeley Keitha, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 174.'

Sen. and H. of C. Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'

Senate Amendments, Railway Bills: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6493, 6577 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 6544 (iv).

Senate, Sessional Indemnities: in Com. of Sup., 6460 (iv).

Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. of Acadian in N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 541 (i).

——— Pet. *re* French Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Michaud) 2755 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 1576 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5161 (iii).

Separate Schools in Man. and Keewatin, Demand from Members: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4247 (iii).

——— Establishment of in Man.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Lemieux) 4263 (iii).

See 'Man. Boundaries.'

Sessional Employees, Number dismissed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 568 (i), 2064 (ii).

See 'Dismissals,' 'House of Commons.'

Sevigny, Mr. J. E., Apptmt. in Immigration Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 1205 (i); 1814 (i).

Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

Shediac Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 2373 (ii).

Shediac Public Buildings: Conc., 6793 (iv).

Sheldon v. Rex.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lemieux) 3756 (ii).

Sheltus, Anson, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Kay) 3757 (ii).

Sherbrooke Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1853 (i).

Shurtleff, Dr., Investigation *re* J. Clouthier: Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).

Sikhs in B. C., Decision *re* bringing in their Wives: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 2457 (ii).

Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5911 (iv).

Small Pox in Ottawa Post Office: Explanation (Mr. Pelletier) 1242, 1280 (i).

Smith, Angus, Pilot of D.G.S. 'Earl Grey,' Suspension of: M. for Papers* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1590 (i).

Smith, Lyman, C., Customs Collector at Oshawa, Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2861 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. on Customs Bill, 4575 (iii).
Solicitor General, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 546 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1816 (i).
Solicitor General, Payment of Salary to Min. of Justice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 725 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1577 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5162 (iii).
Sorel Deep Water Wharfs, Contractors *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 2859 (ii).
Sorel Marine Yards, Inquiry *re* Administration: Ques. (Mr. Barrette) 974 (i).
Sorel and Ste. Victoria Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Cardin) 4782 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Cardin) 4248 (iii).
See 'Post Office.'
Sorel Wharf, Claim of Mr. Lariviere for Timber supplied: Ques. (Mr. Lavallee) 3535 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
Sorel Workshops Investigations, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1205 (i).
Soulanges Canal, Charges *re* Damien Lalonde: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249 (iii).
——— Claim of Denis Martin for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2292 (ii).
——— Employees, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4250 (iii).
——— Guard Pier: in Com. of Sup., 5798 (iv).
——— Patronage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3536 (ii).
——— Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 5791 (iv).
S. A. Bounty Scrip, Delay in Distribution, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 2061, 3153 (ii).
Southampton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6224 (iv).
South Ont. Pac. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Speaker, Election of: M. (Mr. Borden) 2, 5 (i).
——— Congratulations *re* Reading Prayers in French (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1808 (i).
Speaker, Deputy: M. (Mr. Borden) 519; Reply, 523 (i).
Speech from Throne, 8 (i).
Spirella Co. of Can., Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Spittal, C. D., at Bisley: *See* 'N.R.A.'
Spry Bay P.O., Request *re* Removal of: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 577 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 582 (i).
Statistical Officers: in Com. of Sup., 5801 (iv).
Statue erected on Federal Land in Quebec City by Provl. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2667 (ii).
Statutes of Previous Sessions, Delay *re* Distribution: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5238 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Report: Presented (Mr. Hazen) 1571 (i).
Steamship Connections with I.C.R., Subsidies &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5597 (iv).
Steam Trawling on Canadian Coasts: M. for Papers (Mr. Sinclair) 2461 (ii).
Steam Trawlers and Fisheries Bounties: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Sinclair) 5957 (iv).
——— Protection against: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5388 (iii).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Kyte) 2588 (ii).
Steel and Iron Bounties *re* Budget Speech: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4249 (iii).
See 'Bounties.'
Stellarton Postmaster, Mr. John Fraser, Dismissal: M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) for Cor.* 1589 (i).
Stellarton Station Mail Service, Cancellation of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2247 (ii).
Stenographic Assistance for Members: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 1846 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 6461 (iv).
Sterling Life Ass. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Stewart, Ethel May, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Storey, Wm., Dismissal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. Reid) 5054 (iii).
Stoves, Ranges, Incubators exported to Argentine Republic, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. H. V. White) 561 (i).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Strikes and Strike Funds: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Sudbury Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
——— Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 2033 (ii).
Sunnybrae to Country Harbour Ry., Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6228 (iv).
Sunnybrae to Guysborough Branch Line, I.C.R., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 542 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2289 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4262 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 18 and 193.'

Supply: M. for Com. (Mr. W. T. White) 525 (i).

SUPPLY—

Committee:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 6461 (iv).
Census and Statistics, 619 (i), 6462 (iv).
Destructive Pest Act, 6479 (iv).
Distribution of Bulletins, 6465 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 6479 (iv).
Experimental Farms, 6465, 6477, 6484 (iv).
Health of Animals, 6469 (iv).
International Institute, 6478 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, 6469 (iv).
Seed Control Act, 6469 (iv).
Tobacco Growing, 6478 (iv).
Toronto Exhibition, Grant, 6480 (iv).
Year Book, 6465 (iv).

Charges of Management:

Dom. Notes, Printing, 1033 (i).
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 1034 (i).
Public Debt, 619 (i).

Civil Government:

Agriculture, 1041 (i), 6485 (iv).
Archives, 6460 (iv).
Auditor General's Office, 1040, 1031 (i).
Civil Service Commission, 6615 (iv).
Conservation Commission, 1069 (i).
Customs, 1040 (i).
Depts., Generally, 1067 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 1035 (i).
Indian Affairs, 1039 (i).
Inland Revenue, 1040, 1061 (i), 6490 (iv).
Interior, 1038 (i).
Justice, 1035, 1039 (i), 6584 (iv).
Labour, 6615 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries, 1041 (i), 6651 (iv).
Militia, 1037 (i).
Mines, 1066 (i).
Naval Service, 1062 (i).
Post Office, 1066 (i), 6278 (iv).
Privy Council, 1035 (i), 6460 (iv).
Public Printing and Stationery, 1038 (i).
Public Works, 1064 (i).
Railway and Canals, 1064 (i), 5808 (iv).
Secretary of State, 1038 (i).

Customs:

General Vote, 1195 (i).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 1073 (i).

Excise:

Provisional Allowances, 5827 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 5812 (iv).
Stamps, 5826 (iv).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 5826 (iv).

Weights and Measures:
Salaries, &c., 5828 (iv).

Fisheries:

Cold Storage for Bait, 6653 (iv).
General Vote, 680 (i).
International Fisheries Commission, 6646 (iv).
Protection Service, 5386 (iii).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 5242 (iii).

Immigration:

Agents' Salaries, &c., 3305 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., 3911 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of:
Judges Allowances, 6597, 6601 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6561 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 6560 (iv).
Moving Allowances, 6596 (iv).
N.W.T., 6560 (iv).
Penitentiaries, 6561, 6583 (iv).
Bonuses, 6600 (iv).
U.S., Pecuniary Claims Convention, 6579 (iv).

Labour Dept.:
Accident Inspectors, 1525 (i).
Combines Investigation Act, 1500 (i).
Conciliation and Labour Act, Expenses, 1468 (i).
Contingencies, 6615 (iv)
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1498 (i), 6615 (iv).
Technical Education Commission, 1527 (i).

Legislation:
Members' Stenographers, 6461 (iv).
Senate, 6460 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Aids to Navigation, 5236 (iii).
International Navigation Congress, 5237 (iii).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamer, 5237 (iii).
Pensions to Pilots, 5236 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 5232 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subsidies:
General Vote., 640, 677-680 (i), 4714-4742, 5934-5938 (iv).
Marine Hospitals, 5238 (iii).

Militia:
Allowances, 5447 (iii).
Annual Drill, 5452, 5484 (iii).
Clothing and Necessaries, 5521 (iii).
Customs Dues, 5522 (iii).
Grants to Assns., 5528 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Headquarters and District Staff, 5536 (iii).
Military Camps, 5521 (iii).
Military Properties, 5539 (iii).
Ordnance, &c., 5541 (iii), 6653 (iv).
Quebec Arsenal, 6654 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 5546 (iii).
Schools of Instruction, 5546 (iii).

Mines Dept.:
Metallurgical Problems, Investigation, 6491 (iv).
Ore Deposits, Investigation, 6490, 6602 (iv).
Printing of Reports, 6490 (iv).
Salaries, &c., *re* Explosives Investigation, 6603 (iv).

Miscellaneous:
Champlain, Monument, 6485 (iv).
Conservation Commission, 6579 (iv).
Gymnastic Meet, Nancy, 5811 (iv).
Legal Expenses, Lanctot Charges, 6486 (iv).
Mint, Royal, 6584 (iv).
Olympic Games, Grant, 6486 (iv).
Paris Agency, 6614 (iv).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution, 6613 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—*Con.*

Pelagic Sealing Congress, 5810 (iv).
Printing Bureau, 6611 (iv).
Retiring Allowances, Sgt. Codd, 5811 (iv).
St. John Ambulance Assn., 6583 (iv).
Tuberculosis Assn., Grant, 6579 (iv).
Wiley, Mrs., Claim, 6489 (iv).

Mounted Police:

General Vote, 5175 (iii).
Gratuities, 6485 (iv).

Naval Service:

Construction and Maintenance, 5303 (iii).
Fisheries Protection Service, 5386 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 5398 (iii).
Radiotelegraphic Service, 5399 (iii).

Ocean and River Service:

Cattle Inspection, 5229 (iii).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 5186, 5207 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 5231 (iii).
Registration of Shipping, 5229 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 5228 (iii).
Schools of Navigation, 5229 (iii).
Wreck Investigations, 5229 (iii).
Wrecking Plant, 5231 (iii).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 6280 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 6615 (iv).

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:

Eastern Block, Addition, 1339 (i).
Halifax, Quarantine Buildings, 1341 (i).
London, Eng., Can. Office, 6655 (iv).
Ottawa, New Buildings, 1321 (i).

Harbours and Rivers:

French River Improvements, 6657 (iv).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:

British Columbia, 2215 (ii).
Generally, 623 (i).
New Brunswick, 1527, 1530 (i).
Nova Scotia, 1343 (i), 2039-2056 (ii).
Ontario, 1855, 1949-1966 (i).
Quebec, 1346-1356, 1849-1854 (i).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 3239-3279, 3285-3294 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2204-2213 (ii).

Dredging:

Mar. Provs., 2816 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers:

Generally, 623 (i), 3235 (ii).
Manitoba, 2813 (ii).
Maritime Provinces, 2440 (ii).
New Brunswick, 2363-2372 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 639 (i).
Ontario, 640 (i), 2445 (ii).
Quebec, 2441, 2785, 2836 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2814 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Public Works—*Con.*

Miscellaneous:

Monuments to Distinguished Canadians, 2823 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 2825 (ii).
Upper Ottawa, Storage Dams, 2827 (ii).

Roads and Bridges:

Grand River Bridge, York, Ont., 2817 (ii).

Slides and Booms, &c.:

Levis Graving Dock, 3295 (ii).

Telegraph Lines:

Cape Breton, 2817 (ii).
Generally, 3303 (ii).
Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 3302 (ii).
Quebec, 2817 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2819-2822 (ii).
Yukon, 3303 (ii).

Railways and Canals:

Canals:

Cornwall, 5797 (iv).
Lachine, 5790, 6611 (iv).
Rideau, 5791, 5798 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, 5791 (iv).
Soulanges, 5791, 5798 (iv).
Staff and Repairs, 5801 (iv).
Statistical Officers, 5801 (iv).
Trent, 5792, 5799 (iv).
Welland, 5786, 5796, 6607 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Compassionate Allowances, 5678 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Director, 5801 (iv).
Litigation, 5800 (iv).
Railway Commission, 5800 (iv).

Railways:

Hudson's Bay Railway, 622, 677 (i), 5762, 6605 (iv).
Intercolonial Railway, 622, 670 (i), 4124-4137, 4162-4236 (iii), 5595-5658, 5809, 6461, 6604 (iv).
National Transcontinental Railway, 5765 (iv).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 5659-5677 (iv).

Steamboat Inspection:

General Vote, 5238 (iii).

Trade and Commerce:

Bounties, Expenses *re*, 5934 (iv).
Old Age Pension Fund, 688 (i).

Concurrence:

Doncaster Indian Reserve, Road, 6806 (iv).
French River Improvements, 6776 (iv).
Inland Revenue, Salaries, 6770 (iv).
Intercolonial Railway, 6774 (iv).
International Fishery Commission, 6778 (iv).
Louiseville, Public Building, 6794 (iv).
Mines Dept., Salaries, 6771 (iv).
Ottawa River Bridges, Clearing, 6806 (iv).
Public Works Dept., Private Secretary, 6779 (iv).
Sackville Wharf, 6805 (iv).
Shediac, Public Building, 6793 (iv).

Supreme Court of Canada, Division *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 547 (i).

Sussex St. Property, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).

—— Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) *re* abandonment, 2007 (ii).

—— Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 1359 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'

Sutherland, George Mackay, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 153.'

Sutherland, Mr. Roderick, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) 1274 (i),, 2018 (ii).

—— Cor. Read, 2022 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'

Sutherland Rifle Sight: *See* 'N.R.A.'

Svaigher, A., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 6186 (iv).

Swift Current Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) in Com. of Sup., 3263 (ii).

Sydney and Glace Bay Mail Service, Delay, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Pelletier) 934 (i).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (iv).

Sydney and Wycocomagh Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4740 (iii).

Syrian Immigration, Pet. *re* O.C.; Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 1209 (i).

Tableaux in H. of C., 1336 (i).

Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of: *See* 'B. No. 88.'

Tariff Commission, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 529 (i).

—— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 938 (i).

—— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. M. Martin) 466 (i).

Taylor, Hon. Geo., Promise *re* Senate Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 545 (i).
See 'Parliament.'

Technical Education Commission, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1202 (i).
See 'Industrial,' &c.

Telegraph Lines, Quebec, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).

Telegraph Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).

Telegraph and Telephone Lines, Govt. Ownership: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 2007 (ii).
See 'Cable.'

Telephones, Long Distance, &c. in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).

Telephone Wires, Permission of Govt. to place on Tel. Poles: Remarks (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).

Temiscouata Election Expenses, Delays *re* Payment to Dep. Ret. Officer: Remarks 1707 (i).

Temiskaming Lake Dam Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boulay) 4262 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Pugsley) 5928, 6661 (iv).
See 'Lake Temiskaming.'

Temiskaming Dam, Water Storage Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2827 (ii).

T. & N.O.Ry. and G.T.R., Running Rights: *See* 'B. No. 145.'

T. & N.O.Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iii).

T. & N.O.Ry., Subsidy to: *See* 'B. No. 186.'

Therrien, F., Charges *re* Political Partisanship, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1413 (i), 3152 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iv).

Thibault, Theophile, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3339 (ii).

Thibodeau, George, Resignation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Beland) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).

Thompson, Dr., Dismissal from Mounted Police: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6784 (iv).

Three Rivers Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2441 (ii).

Three Rivers Inland Revenue, Charges *re* Collector C. D. Hebert: Ques. (Mr. Bureau) 1209 (i).

Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1854 (i).

Tidal Service, Surveying Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5400 (iii).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com., 6217 (iv).

Timber Slides, Dues: *See* 'B. No. 103.'

Tobacco Growing, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 6478 (iv).

Tobacco Growers of Yamaska, Govt. Aid to: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lemieux) 1591 (i).

Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).

Toronto Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 1963 (i).

Toronto Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 6480 (iv).

Toronto, Govt. House, Sale of to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 182.'

Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2445 (ii).

Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5898, 6217 (iv).

Tory, Mr. H. L., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6784 (iv).

Tourigny, Mr. Justice, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boulay) 3147 (ii).

Tower Clock, Repairs to: Remarks (Mr. M. Clark) 1575 (i).

Tower Clock, Explanation (Mr. Monk) 1708 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 1530 (i).
Tracadie Road Post Office, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4459 (iii).
Trade Agents: *See* 'Can. Agencies,' 'Commercial.'
Trade and Commerce Deptl. Report: Presented (Mr. Foster) 971 (i), 2591 (ii), 6780 (iv).
Trade Relations between Canada, Australia and W. Indies: (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Sup., 1971 (ii).
See 'British West Indies,' 'West Indies.'
Trade Relations with Japan, Stmnt. by Japanese Consul at Vancouver: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 559 (i).
Trade Relations: *See* 'Franco-Canadian.'
Trent Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5799 (iv).
—— Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 5792 (iv).
See 'Canals.'
Trent Canal Water Power, Claims of Prov. of Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 5794 (iv).
Truro Station: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).
Trust and Loan Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Tuberculosis Association, Grant to: in Com. of Sup., 6579 (iv).
Tuberculosis in St. Jean and Iberville, Govt. Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 3533 (ii).
Twine Materials Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3536 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Typewriter Supplies, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 1809 (i).
'Tyrian' Telegraph Service Boat: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
Under Secretaries of State, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3059 (ii).
Ungava Annexation, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 2060 (ii).
See 'Que. Boundaries.'
Ungava Territory, Legislation *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. E. Lapointe) 577 (i).
Union Bank of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Union Jack Flag, Use of: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Union Labour Funds: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
United Gold Fields of B. C., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Appeal: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 6783 (iv).
—— Investigation, Application to Min. of Jus.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3148 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 572 (i).
—— Proceedings *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2455 (ii).
Universal Eyesight Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Val des Eboulis and Rigaud Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4249, 4778 (iii).
Vale Railroad, Operation by I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 933 (ii).
Valois, J. B., Dismissal from Vaudreuil Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3537 (ii).
Vanantwerp, C. B., Emplymt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Boivin) in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iv).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Vancouver Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 5898, 6218, 6325 (iv).
Vegetables, Weight of Bag: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Vegreville and Lloydminster Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. W. H. White) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Veitch Farm, Purchase of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 933 (i).
Veit, Frederick, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lemieux) 6783 (iv).
Venoit, J., Suspension: *See* 'Benoit.'
Verret, Mr. H. B., Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).
Veterans, Bounties to: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Bounties to: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1202 (i).
See 'Bounties.'
Vickers-Maxim Co.'s Contract *re* Construction of Montreal Dry Dock: Ques. (Mr. Sevigny) 2450 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bellemare) 2294 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 137 & 190.'
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 1577 (i).
Voters Lists in Man., Distribution *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3056 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of by Federal Govt., Stmnt. of Min. of the Int.: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 553 (i).
Wadge, Thomas, Patent Relief: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Waiters, Holiday on Sunday: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Waiters in Restaurants, Minimum Wages paid in Cities: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 3049 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Wallace Harbour Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6604 (iv).

Water in Ry. Belt, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Commissioners: M. for O. C.'s, &c.: (Mr. Pugsley) 981 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c., and Appointments: M. (Mr. Pugsley) to Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 966 (i).
——— Ratification of Apptmt. by late Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Murphy) 533 (i).
See 'Boundary Waters.'
Watha Indian Reserve, Tenders *re* Timber: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3055 (ii).
Ways and Means—Financial Statement (Mr. White) 4985 (iii).
——— M. for Com. (Mr. White) 702 (i).
See 'Budget.'
Webber, James, Dismissal: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6783 (iv).
Webster, Dr. C. A., Dismissal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Law) 6186 (iv).
Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent at Edmonton, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Wednesday Sittings, Govt. Business: M. (Mr. Borden) *re* Precedence, 1969 (ii).
Weedon Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 4550 (iii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Tobin) 4781 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Tobin) 6492 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Tobin) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iv).
Welland Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6607 (iv).
——— Quantity of American Freight passing through: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 3535 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5786 (iv).
——— Water Power, Diversion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 6747 (iv).
Wells, Edna, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 102.'
Western Dom. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
West. Ont. Pac. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
West Indies, Australia and Canada Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Sup., 1971 (ii).
West Indies and British Guiana Trade Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Murphy) 1820 (i).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Murphy) 977 (i).
West Indies Mail Service, Establishment by Dom.: Remarks (Mr. McCurdy) in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Westville Public Building, Dismissal of Caretaker: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 1531 (i).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2213 (ii).
Wharfs, Total Expenditure for last ten years: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1811 (i).
Wheat Grades: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 663 (i).
See 'Grain Bill.'
Wheatley Creek Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Wheeler, Seager: *See* 'Seager.'
White Head Island Lighthouse, Dismissal of Patrick Conway, Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2857 (ii).
See 'Dismissals.'
Whitehead, N.S., Dismissal of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2855 (ii).
See 'Harris.'
White, James, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 3338 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs., Claims *re* Yukon Property: in Com. of Sup., 6489 (iv).
Williams, Mr., Dismissal from H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 3279 (ii).
Williamsville Post Office, Removal: Personal Explanation (Mr. Edwards) 6271 (iv).
Wills, Henry Greek, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Winnipeg Ordnance Lands, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Wireless Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5399 (iii).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1343 (i).
Wood Mountain Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmt. as Excise Officer: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iv).
Wrecks Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Wrecks Subsidies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5231 (iii).
Wright County Public Works Employees, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 550 (i).
See 'Dismissals.'
Yamaska Electoral Agent: Ques. (Mr. Mondou) 1584 (i).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2056 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 3273 (ii).
Yarmouth Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Law) in Com. of Sup., 3269 (ii).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 6465 (iv).
York Bridge over Grand River, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
Yukon Act (Judges) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Yukon Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
Yule,, Mr., Customs Officer at Aurora, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4779 (iii), 5950 (iv).